

AGENDA

THIS DOCUMENT IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. FOR OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, PLEASE CONTACT THE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE

GLASTONBURY BOARD OF FINANCE - AGENDA OF REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, February 16, 2022, 4:00 PM

Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, CT – Council Chambers

With an option for Zoom Video Conferencing (details on page 2)

Board Members: Constantine Constantine; Chairman, Jennifer Sanford; Vice Chairman, Susan Karp, Robert Lynn, James McIntosh, and James Zeller.

The Board's normal monthly topics:

1. Public Comment Session: Comments pertaining to the call.
2. Communication:
 - a. Minutes of January 24, 2022 – Special BOE Meeting
 - b. Minutes of February 1, 2022 – Town Operating & CIP Special Meeting
 - c. Minutes of February 2, 2022 – BOE Budget Special Meeting
3. Communication: Pension Report (December 2021) and Flash Report (January 2022)
4. Communication: Month End Investments – December 2021
5. Communication: Financial Summary (Expenditures) for 7 months - January 2022
6. Communication: Capital Projects – January 2022
7. Communication: Self Insurance Reserve Fund – January 2022
8. Communication: Transfers Approved by Town Manager Since Last Meeting
 - a. \$3,000 Town Council for Annual Audit Fees
9. **Action:** Transfers over \$5,000
 - a. \$30,000 Sewer Operating Fund – for locations on Addison Road
 - b. \$45,000 Sewer Operating Fund – for Stallion Ridge Subdivision
10. Communication: Audit Review Meeting
11. Board of Finance Committee Reports, comments and remarks (no action to be taken)

The balance of the meeting will include Budgetary Topics:

12. Communication: Presentation of Grand List Report
13. Potential for Any Unfinished Business: FY 2022/2023 Budget
14. Possible Action: The Board of Finance pursuant to Section 605 of the Town Charter submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the following proposals:
 - a. Action: Propose to Town Council FY22/23 Town Operating Budget
 - b. Action: Propose to Town Council FY22/23 Education Budget
 - c. Action: Propose to Town Council FY22/23 Debt & Transfers Budget
 - d. Action: Propose to Town Council FY22/23 General Fund Revenues & Transfers Budget
 - e. Action: Propose to Town Council FY22/23 Capital Improvement Program Budget, including Capital Reserve Fund, Town Aid Road and Sewer Sinking Fund
 - f. Action: Propose to Town Council FY22/23 Sewer Operating Fund Budget (Special Revenue Fund)
15. Adjournment

THIS BOARD OF FINANCE REGULAR MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED IN PERSON IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF TOWN HALL AT 2155 MAIN STREET, GLASTONBURY, WITH AN OPTION FOR ATTENDANCE THROUGH ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING.

Join the Meeting - The public may join the Zoom Video Conference as an Attendee (view and listen function only) as follows:

Join by Zoom Meeting link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83456913897?pwd=eFR6QmlycFIQRSt3b3dTZ25HaHZMQT09>

Passcode: 661482

Join by Phone:

Dial: +1 301 715 8592 **or** +1 312 626 6799

Webinar ID: 834 5691 3897

Passcode: 661482

Public Comment - May be submitted through a form at the following link no later than 2:00 p.m. one business day BEFORE the meeting is held for your comments to be included in the public comment session of the meeting. Be sure to select *Board of Finance* in question 4 of the form:

www.glastonbury-ct.gov/publiccomment

There is also the opportunity to give Public Comment as part of the virtual meeting if joining through the Zoom Meeting Link.

Watch the Meeting - This meeting will be broadcast in real-time through Public Access Television on Channel 16, or live streamed on the town website. [Click here to view by live streaming.](#)

If you are unable to join/participate in the meeting at the time it is held, the meeting will be available on the [Video On Demand page of the town website](#) within one week of the meeting date.*

**The Video On Demand page is accessible through any web browser EXCLUDING Internet Explorer. Please use Chrome, Edge, Firefox, Safari or any other web browser excluding IE to access meeting video content.*

**GLASTONBURY BOARD OF FINANCE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2022**

The Glastonbury Board of Finance, along with Finance Director, Julie Twilley, and Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, held a special meeting at 4:00 p.m. via Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

Also present were Narae McManus, Controller; Chris Kachmar from Fiducient Advisors; and Becky Sielman from Milliman.

Roll Call

Members

Mr. Constantine "Gus" Constantine, Chairman
Ms. Jennifer Sanford, Vice Chairman
Mr. James McIntosh
Ms. Susan Karp
Mr. Robert Lynn
Mr. James Zeller

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

2. Communication: Becky Sielman from Milliman to discuss Pension Valuation

Ms. Sielman explained that the valuation reflects what has happened through July 2021; it is not a predictor of what will happen in the future. While the pandemic has caused more deaths than is normal in any given year, they have chosen not to make any adjustments to the calculations. Ms. Sanford asked when the mortality tables will be updated. Ms. Sielman stated that, due to the pandemic, the typical scheduled update of once every five years may be delayed by a year or two. It will also be difficult to reflect normal, pre-pandemic levels of mortality versus the abnormal levels caused by COVID-19. They have chosen not to make an adjustment as a statement of conservatism.

Ms. Sielman reviewed the plan's assets. Investments performed well, with returns just under 27%. However, in order to provide budgetary stability for municipal plans, they calculate an actuarial value of assets that gradually reflects market gains and losses over a five-year period. The actuarial value only reflects one-fifth of those big market gains, but that is what they use to calculate the town's contribution and measure the plan's funded status. Should the fiscal year end with a market loss, last year's gains will provide a cushion.

Mr. McIntosh would like to see a longer timeline, looking 9 years back, to see which numbers are smoothed out. Ms. Sielman explained that they chose to show just 5 years of history because that is the recent past. If it is helpful to show a longer history on the graphs, they can provide that. She noted that the actuarial value of assets does not include anything about the future. It looks at the market value today and the unrecognized market gains and losses that have occurred

over the past four years. Mr. McIntosh would find it helpful to look at the valuation numbers before going into budget season. He asked if it is possible to receive the report at a later date, like January 1, instead of July 1. Ms. Sielman stated that they must measure the plan's assets and liabilities as of June 30 for purposes of the Town's annual financial report.

Ms. Sanford finds that the pension is moving in the right direction. There is a lot of volatility worldwide, which they are trying to smooth out so that the ADC is less volatile in the future. Ms. Sielman stated that the most volatile piece of this picture is market returns. Liabilities move very little from year to year. The most important tool at their disposal for controlling market volatility is calculating the actuarial value of assets, which is used to determine the ADC.

Mr. McIntosh asked if the unfunded liability ratio is calculated based on market value of assets or the actuarial value of assets. Ms. Sielman stated that it could be calculated either way. However, the Town's financial report requires it to be calculated off the market value of assets. Mr. McIntosh stated that the financial report will show the plan as 100% funded, but in the ADC, it will show that it is 72% funded. Ms. Sielman explained that those gains have piled up as of June 30, 2021. The actuarial smoothing leaves some room for a market correction. She explained that the plan is doing what it was designed to do. It is not uncommon for plan benefits to increase over time. They also project that the plan's assets will increase. Ms. Sanford asked if last year's 3.5% growth rate assumption in wages is still the same, given the pressures from inflation. Ms. Sielman stated that they did not take into account short term inflationary or disinflationary effects when setting the long-term assumption.

Ms. Sielman explained that the members who are covered by the plan have held fairly steady over the years, with a modest number of terminated members. Mr. McIntosh asked what the reference to refunds is on page 7. Ms. Sielman explained that if someone terminates before becoming vested in the pension benefit, then they are entitled to a refund of their contributions, with interest.

Ms. Sielman reviewed the accrued liability, which is \$252 million as of July 2021. The bulk of that, \$135.7 million, is for service retirees. \$100.9 million is active member liability. She explained how the liability numbers fit into the historical patterns. Because this is the funding actuarial report, they used the actuarial value of assets, not the market value. It is a normal pattern for both the accrued liability and the funded ratio to be growing. However, assets should be growing faster than liability.

Ms. Karp asked, when setting the recommended contribution levels, do the actuaries work towards a goal for the funding ratio. Ms. Sielman explained that the contribution is three parts: the normal cost, which is the all-in cost of having the benefit exist in this year and providing benefits to the active members. The second, bigger piece is the past service cost, which is this year's payment to gradually get the plan to 100% funded. The Town has 12 years left in the amortization schedule. The third component is interest. They have added one year's worth of interest to reflect the passage of time. This year's contribution is lower because of the great market performance last year.

Mr. Lynn stated that there is a \$70 million actuarial hole. They have also operated under actuarial tables that were not correct and people have been living longer. Based on what is known now, previous citizens did not pay the actual amount for the services rendered. Ms. Sielman stated that, 20 years ago, they operated under the best information and advice they had

available. Mr. Lynn brought it up in the context of the discussion of bonding for CIP projects. Taxpayers are already paying for services that were used in prior years.

Mr. Zeller stated that, last year, \$1 million was contributed to the pension. The return on that investment was 9.2%. He asked what a contribution of \$1 million would do to lower the town's operating budget this year. Ms. Sielman explained that there will be a reduction in the ADC, but it is not a dollar-for-dollar reduction. Amortizing over 12 years, an extra \$1 million contribution results in about a \$102,000 reduction in the past service cost. They are gaining the benefits over a shorter amortization.

Ms. Sielman explained that as the pension plan gets closer to being 100% funded and the amortization period gets shorter, this will lead to more contribution volatility. One of the mechanisms to address contribution volatility is to set aside money in a reserve fund, which can be drawn from at any time. West Hartford and Norwich have already set up pension reserve funds. She asked the Board to contemplate this modest investment opportunity. Mr. Zeller asked if the reserve fund will impact the ADC the same way it would in the pension. Ms. Sielman explained that it would not impact the ADC; however, reserve funds earn higher returns than the General Fund, but lower than the pension trust. She thinks of it as a hedging strategy.

Ms. Sanford's inclination is to go directly into the pension fund. She is not aware of ADC volatility. She finds it concerning to see the continued growth of the percentage of contributions to payroll. However, she does not view that as volatility, but rather, as the fact that pension benefits are growing faster than payroll. Ms. Sielman stated that the most volatile place to be, in terms of contributions, is 100% funded. There is a Connecticut statute that enables municipalities to establish reserve funds. Ms. Sanford asked if the liquidity of West Hartford and Norwich is a cash flow positive. She is concerned that Glastonbury is becoming cash flow negative, which drives one to sell assets before expecting to do so. Ms. Sielman stated that it is the opposite. Both the West Hartford and Norwich plans are more mature than this one. Because their pension plans are fully funded, the fact that they have negative cash flows is immaterial.

Ms. Sielman reviewed the long-range investment forecast, explaining that once the plan becomes fully funded and the contribution bottoms out, the plan will overshoot the mark a little bit. This projection does not assume that there is a market correction. If there is a market correction, the funded ratio will still end up being 100% 12 years from now, but the contribution will not decline as much.

She then presented a couple alternative scenarios that represent the biggest hurdles clients face: what if the Town under-contributes relative to the ADC? This will push contributions dramatically out to future years. And what if investments chronically fall short of the interest rate assumption? If investments are not yielding what the actuaries assume they will, it will just increase the Town's contributions going forward. This is why she finds it important to be conservative on the interest rate assumption. Ms. Sanford asked if it is a standard in the State of Connecticut that pension benefits are growing as a percent of payroll. Ms. Sielman clarified that it is not the pension benefit that has been growing, but rather, it is the Town's pension contribution as a percent of payroll that is growing. She went on to explain that the growth in the pension contribution is related to the reduction in the plan's rate of return assumption and implementation of new mortality tables, not growing benefits.

Mr. McIntosh asked if the “assuming that members” on page 38 should also include “and beneficiaries”. Ms. Sielman explained that “members” is an encompassing term which includes beneficiaries. Mr. McIntosh observed that there is a tension between controlling volatility and getting the ultimate economic benefit from the funds that they put aside for this purpose. Decisions are made by taxpayers and politicians who seek to avoid volatility, but the decisions increase the cost ultimately of funding pension benefits. Ms. Sielman agreed that this is a tension that every plan sponsor must come to terms with: the tradeoff between risk/volatility and reward. Ms. Sanford contended that volatility is a good opportunity to achieve higher returns in assets. The Board’s job is to identify those opportunities in the real world, which they have done. Mr. McIntosh agreed but noted that volatility is politically unacceptable. Mr. Zeller agreed that the Town is where it should be right now. However, 15 years ago, they thought the same thing. He would like to know which specific indicators they should watch out for to see if the Town is, in fact, where it needs to be.

3. Communication: Chris Kachmar from Fiducient Advisors to discuss Asset Allocation Analysis, Capital Markets Overview and Portfolio and Manager Review

Mr. Kachmar explained that capital markets are more volatile, due to growing interest rates, higher inflation, supply chain issues, and geopolitical risks, and that volatility is likely to continue. The Town’s mechanism to deflect some of that volatility has been through diversification and taking thoughtful risk. They expect global economic growth going forward. The 20-year outlook has not changed much year over year. Under fixed income, there are nominal, and in some cases, negative, returns. There has been no dramatic change in equities.

Ms. Sanford stated that negative real returns continue to make cash an expensive opportunity cost. 5-year forward rates are plummeting whereas crude oil rallies. In the near term, there is a break in correlation and a turning point for inflation. She asked if credit spreads will narrow. Mr. Kachmar expects that, year over year, spread levels will stabilize and stay about where they are.

Mr. Kachmar described the backdrop and philosophy of the asset allocation framework. The takeaway from the 20-year outlook is that the Town’s mix of assets will generate a return that is consistent with the actuarial expectation at the rate of return assumption of 6.25%. Therefore, no wholesale changes need to be made. Ms. Sanford discussed the difference in the outlook using the 10-year forecast and 20-year forecast. Mr. Kachmar explained that the 20-year outlook has more power in strategically managing the program than the 10-year outlook does.

Ms. Sanford asked if it is within the domain of the existing bond managers to invest in the dynamic bonds category. Mr. Kachmar explained that generally it is not. The managers are confined to a more traditional approach, and they are comfortable with the way that the Town is allocated today. Mr. Zeller asked if dynamic bonds are less volatile than equities but more volatile than the Town’s current bond strategies. Mr. Kachmar stated that is correct.

Mr. Lynn asked if there are any municipalities considering private equity. Mr. Kachmar stated that they are starting to see more interest in private capital. Manchester has been running a private capital program for years, and last year, Westport implemented a program, as well. Ms. Sanford is concerned that it is costly to get in, with start-up fees. She is also concerned that placing assets into private equity will decrease the liquidity of the pension. Mr. Kachmar will

share data with the Board to see if it is something that fits their risk appetite. He noted that the optics in a municipal setting is something to be mindful of.

Mr. Kachmar explained that, as of Friday night, the Town's portfolio was valued at \$207.5 million, which is a \$9 million reduction. The portfolio actual allocation versus target weights is not directionally off. Manager performance on an absolute basis in 2021 was good. However, Jackson Square and Vanguard International Growth struggled. They continue to spend a lot of time with the manager at Jackson Square. However, neither have been elevated to a level that necessitates action. No changes are recommended to the strategies.

Ms. Sanford noted that, at the last meeting, Mr. Kachmar stated that most of the underperformance of the managers versus benchmark was due to Jackson Square. She asked if that is still true or if Vanguard International is also responsible. Mr. Kachmar stated that the lion's share of the shortfall comes from those two managers. Ms. Sanford asked how committed they are to a small and mid-cap growth strategy. Mr. Kachmar explained that there is a case for consistent representation for small and mid-cap equities. Trying to time entry and exit points discreetly on the capitalization front is challenging.

Mr. McIntosh stated that, at the last meeting, Ms. Karp suggested that the BOF send materials to the Council and the BOE. He suggested that the reports from Mr. Kachmar and Ms. Sielman be copied to both groups to show the materials that have been made available to the BOF regarding the pension element of the budget. Ms. Karp agreed and suggested also including a brief summary of what the BOF heard today regarding the pension and how they are moving forward. Ms. Sanford looks forward to the study on dynamic bonds. She also asked to see if there are other options for Vanguard International, since they are very heavy on investments in China.

4. Communication: Minutes of December 15, 2021 Regular Meeting

Under Roll Call, Ms. Karp's name was incorrectly listed as Walter Cusson.

Minutes accepted as amended.

5. Communication: Pension Report – November 2021

Ms. Twilley reviewed the report dated December 22, 2021.

6. Communication: Month End Investments – November 2021

Ms. McManus reviewed the report dated December 17, 2021. Mr. McIntosh pointed out that Glastonbury is in these very low return investments because of state restrictions. He asked that when the Town Manager confers with state representatives, he suggests that a statute be enacted which would authorize towns with high credit ratings to have more flexibility in their investment of these types of funds. Mr. Johnson will pass along that request.

7. Communication: Financial Summary (Revenues & Expenditures) for 6 months - December 2021

Ms. Twilley reviewed the report dated January 12, 2022. Ms. Karp stated that information was provided at the CIP workshop about revenue loss funding that is similar to ARPA which could come to the town. She asked how that will tie into what they are seeing and how it will be managed. Mr. Johnson explained that loss revenue is a category of ARPA, not an addition to ARPA. The Treasury has decided to give a \$10 million assumed revenue loss, as a category within ARPA money, to provide for greater flexibility in how towns can use their funds.

8. Communication: Capital Projects – December 2021

Ms. Twilley reviewed the report dated January 11, 2022.

9. Communication: Self Insurance Reserve Fund – December 2021

Ms. Twilley reviewed the report dated January 7, 2022. The total reserve is \$15.2 million. There have been no large loss claims this year. Ms. Karp requested adding a line item at the bottom of the report that just says, “Town Policy Board Reserves”. Ms. Twilley stated that it is listed on the quarterly reports, but she can also add it to the monthly reports.

10. Communication: Transfers Approved by Town Manager Since Last Meeting

a. \$2K Community Development – Advertising

b. \$250 Property Assessment – Data Processing

Mr. Johnson explained that the Glastonbury Citizen has changed its submission deadline for public hearing notices, making it difficult for the Town to get their notices into the weekly paper. Consequently, they are seeking other publications for publishing notices, but it is more expensive.

11. **Action:** Transfers over \$5,000

a. \$16,250 Financial Administration – Lease Management Software

Motion by: Mr. Zeller

Seconded by: Mr. Lynn

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance hereby approves the transfer of \$16,250 from the General Fund - Insurance/Pensions - Casualty Insurance to the General Fund - Financial Administration - Data Processing as presented, without changes.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

12. Communication: Budget Schedule FY22/23

Mr. Johnson reviewed potential dates for the BOF budget workshops. He will confirm if Council Chambers are available for each date/time, but members also requested that a hybrid option (both in-person and Zoom) be made available for most meetings. The Board agreed upon the following Budget Meeting calendar:

- Town Operating Budget and CIP: Tuesday, February 1 from 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. via Hybrid (Zoom and Council Chambers)
- Board of Education and Public Hearing: Wednesday, February 2 from 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. via Hybrid (Zoom and Council Chambers)
- BOF Public Hearing and Unfinished Budget Related Items: Monday, February 7 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. via Zoom
- BOF Recommends Budget to Town Council: Wednesday, February 16 from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. via Hybrid (Zoom and Council Chambers)

13. Communication: Audit Review Meeting (identify BOF representatives)

Ms. Twilley stated that two BOF members are needed to serve as representatives at the annual Audit Review Meeting, which will tentatively be held on either February 9 or 10 at 12:00 p.m. She does not yet know whether the meeting will be held via Zoom or in-person. Mr. Constantine volunteered to serve. Mr. Lynn can participate via Zoom on February 9 and Ms. Karp on February 10. Ms. Twilley will circle back with more information on the meeting format and date.

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

Mr. McIntosh stated that, at the December meeting, he commented on his feelings about the scope of inquiries by BOF members. Following that meeting, his statement was questioned by Mr. Zeller. At a future time, he will submit a fuller explanation on what he thinks should be done in terms of inquiring about town operations and operations of the BOE. Mr. Zeller stated that he was not questioning Mr. McIntosh's right to raise the issue. He was simply trying to clarify what he was referring to by affordability.

15. Adjournment

Motion by: Mr. McIntosh

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance moves to adjourn their meeting of January 24, 2022, at 6:51 p.m.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {6-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan
Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

For anyone seeking more information about this meeting, a video on demand is available at [Public Broadcast Video on Demand | Glastonbury, CT \(glastonburyct.gov\)](#) click on [Public Broadcast Streaming Video Portal](#).

**GLASTONBURY BOARD OF FINANCE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2022**

The Glastonbury Board of Finance, along with Finance Director, Julie Twilley, and Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, held a special meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with the option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

Roll Call

Members

Mr. Constantine "Gus" Constantine, Chairman
Ms. Jennifer Sanford, Vice Chairman {participated via video conferencing}
Mr. James McIntosh
Ms. Susan Karp
Mr. Robert Lynn {participated via video conferencing}
Mr. James Zeller

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

Mr. Johnson reviewed the Town Operations budget, which is proposed to increase by 2.4%. In prior years, wage costs were able to be kept down through reductions in the workforce, contractual services, and job consolidation, but this year, operations are very tight. Ms. Sanford asked if the labor force is back in the office or still working from home. Mr. Johnson stated that, for the most part, they are back in the office. Ms. Karp asked if the two new police officers are the only new positions in the budget. Mr. Johnson stated that it is just the phasing. Attracting and retaining police officers has been a challenge. He did not put in the full amount for hiring two police officers, but he would like the authorization. Mr. Johnson explained that the average increase in the wage account history from the 2017 adopted to the 2023 proposed is 2.31%. This year's increase is higher because it is difficult to sustain such low rates.

Insurance has achieved a reduction from last year's increase. This year, premiums are in alignment with losses, and workers' compensation is up a bit. Mr. Johnson noted that the Town overfunded health insurance for a few years because the Self Insurance Reserve Fund was struggling to get out of the red. Previously appropriated additional funding is no longer budgeted. Ms. Sanford asked when the COVID-19 multiplier will end. Mr. Johnson stated that it continues in the coming year because the pandemic is ongoing. Mr. Zeller pointed out that the BOE took action this year to phase in bringing down their reserve. He asked if the Town would look into that in the future. Mr. Johnson does not anticipate using the reserve in the next year or two.

Regarding the pension, Mr. Johnson noted that this is the first year since 2006 when the ADC has not increased. The pension line item declined about \$162,000 altogether. Mr. Johnson noted

that when Becky Sielman of Milliman spoke to the BOF about volatility, she meant volatility in the ADC, not market volatility. She suggested the Board establish a reserve fund to help mitigate significant volatility in the ADC. Ms. Sanford asked to forward materials that the Board could read on Connecticut reserve funds. Mr. Johnson noted that he will talk about it in more detail at a later meeting.

Mr. Johnson reviewed data processing and technology, noting that there has been a focus on automating processes such as building permits and HR technologies. There is also a cost savings opportunity to transition one full time staff position to two part time positions. He then reviewed contractual services, noting that the police department is in the process of acquiring contractual license plate readers. Ms. Karp finds it helpful and prudent to relay information about the license plate readers early to the public. Ms. Sanford asked about the monies that were allocated by the Governor last year to municipal police departments. Mr. Johnson explained that approximately \$35,000 was received by the police department to cover overtime costs in response to the auto thefts issue. Ms. Sanford then asked if the portable toilets located in town parks are still needed now that facilities have opened again. Mr. Johnson explained that many facilities do not have restrooms, and with people being outside more, there is increased demand for portable toilets.

While there is a savings from the police department switching over to hybrid vehicles, the cost of fuel is up so significantly that the result is an overall increase in fuel expenditure. Mr. Johnson explained that they are monitoring the market every week to determine the best time to lock in prices. Aggregate consumption for utilities is below where it was 15 years ago.

Regarding capital outlay, the Town is still \$80,000 behind where it was in 2020 in buying power. Ms. Karp asked for a compilation of the big components in capital outlay. Mr. Johnson agreed to provide it. He then reviewed a list of three Capital Outlay items which could potentially be funded through ARPA monies. Mr. Johnson noted that all other components of the budget, which comprise 25 of the Town's 41 accounts, increase about \$88,000, representing a 0.19% increase in the budget.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the debt and transfers, noting that debt service is down \$134,000. The Capital Reserve Fund has been reduced from at one point \$6 million to \$5.25 million. There is a significant gap between that level of funding and infrastructure needs, so he increased the Capital Reserve Transfer from \$5.25 million to \$5.65 million. Until FY2016, the Town had a contingency of \$175,000. When the budget was reduced by \$1 million, he eliminated the contingency. However, this year, he heeded the request to renew the contingency account for \$75,000. From the current year to 2027, debt service declines by about \$3.4 million.

Mr. Johnson then reviewed revenues and transfers, noting that while intergovernmental revenue went down, taxes went up, offset by growth in the grand list. The mill rate went down following the Annual Town Meeting. He provided projections of the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance as a percent of future year revenues, which will decline over time. Ms. Karp asked if there are significant differences in the 16.7% versus 12% for the Unassigned Fund Balance. Ms. Twilley explained the factors behind the GFAO's calculation, which is that the Town must have two months of savings to cover all expenses. Thus, they divide 2 by 12, which yields 16.7.

Mr. Johnson explained that the mortality tables went into effect in 2021, which was a \$1.2 million increase in pension ADC to the Town. The transfer to the General Fund for opening cash was increased by \$400,000 to help moderate that. Due to another \$700,000 hit from other factors

in the current year budget, the \$975,000 stayed flat. He proposes starting the phased decrease to \$875,000 next year. Mr. Zeller asked what the realized savings are from operations. Mr. Johnson replied \$350,000. Mr. Johnson noted that the Grand List increases by 3.41%, with 1% for real estate, 1% for personal property, and 32% for motor vehicles, bringing about \$5.4 million in new tax revenue. This year, the mill rate increased 1.41% to 37.32, but in 2023, it is projected to go down 0.21% to 37.24. However, because the average motor vehicle tax will go up 32%, he is not sure if there will be an aggregate savings for taxpayers. Mr. Zeller asked how much the 0.21% is in dollars. Mr. Johnson stated that it is a little less than one-tenth of a mill, so about \$350,000.

Mr. Johnson commented that a 2.4% increase for Town Operations is tight. He showed a list of budget items that were considered but not proposed. Ms. Sanford asked which initiatives drove the increases in administration services and public safety. Mr. Johnson explained that fire service is driving the increase in public safety, largely driven by their capital outlay for needed replacements, as well as the move of the Fire Chief from part time to full time. The increase in administrative services is due to a combination of expenditures in data processing, capital outlay, and wage accounts. Ms. Sanford stated that the Town closed out the last budget with a very substantial surplus. Mr. Johnson explained that those monies are closed to the General Fund at year end. Some of that surplus came from one-time revenues, such as a \$1 million grant and other COVID-related savings, which are not expected to reiterate in the next year.

Mr. Johnson then reviewed the capital budget. 33 CIP projects are recommended this year, some of which could be funded through ARPA. He awaits clarification on whether using ARPA monies for the Naubuc School project would disqualify the Town from receiving the 33% state grant reimbursement.

Mr. McIntosh expressed concern about the budget schedule. The BOF has just over two weeks from when they were given the budget materials to when they must submit the budget proposal. The Town Council, meanwhile, has six weeks. He finds the schedule to be imbalanced, and asked that in the future, the BOF be given more than two weeks and the Council less than six weeks to review budget materials and come up with a recommendation. Mr. Zeller agreed, stating that he did not realize that the Annual Town Meeting was going to fall so close to today's meeting. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that it is a fair point. They would have liked to have given the budget to the Board at least a week before the Annual Town Meeting, but were impacted by factors such as COVID-19.

Mr. McIntosh asked whether there is an estimate on how much, if any, surplus there will be at the end of the year. Mr. Johnson stated that they forecast about \$350,000 or so, but he is not sure at the moment. Mr. McIntosh asked where the Town stands now regarding the state spending cap of 2.5%. Right now, Mr. Johnson explained that they are above the 2.5% cap on increase in municipal expenditures. In his opinion, the cap should be on the tax increase, not the expenditure increase. Ms. Karp remarked that there are significant exemptions to the 2.5% cap throughout the budget.

Mr. McIntosh stated that, on page 77, the violent crime rate is lower in 2021 than 2020; however, there seem to be more crimes at a lower rate in 2021 than in the prior year. Mr. Johnson will check with Police Chief Porter on the statistics. Mr. McIntosh asked, if the police department increases staffing, will that reduce overtime expenditures. Mr. Johnson explained that there is

always an interplay between staffing levels and overtime. The overtime budget does not approximate actual history, and it is influenced by grants they might receive throughout the year.

Mr. McIntosh commented that, apart from financial administration, none of the other 20+ divisions identify as a goal any savings, increasing efficiencies, or reducing the resources needed to do their jobs. Mr. Johnson contended that the Town budget has been kept low because staff have been efficient, though they may not have done a good job of explaining or conveying that. Mr. McIntosh finds that the Town Manager has done an extraordinary job of keeping costs down. He asked what techniques he has used to motivate staff to seek out the most efficient and effective ways of using resources. Mr. Johnson stated that the heads of all the departments and divisions are very hard working, highly professional, and take pride in doing things efficiently.

On page 69, Ms. Sanford is unclear what the increases are for, as voter registration has received CARES Act money. Ms. Twilley explained that the Town received COVID-19 funds approximately two years ago for the presidential election. There was no assumption that the funding would continue, but there is an assumption that absentee ballots would continue, which would require more part time wage costs.

Ms. Karp asked about ARPA funds being used to replace the boiler at Gideon Welles School. Mr. Johnson stated that is correct. He showed several projects that could potentially receive allocations from ARPA, including the Gideon Welles boiler and rooftop units.

Lastly, Mr. Johnson briefly reviewed financial projections. He will print it out for easier viewing and greater discussion at the Board's next meeting.

3. Adjournment

Motion by: Mr. McIntosh

Seconded by: Mr. Lynn

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance moves to adjourn their meeting of February 1, 2022, at 6:30 p.m.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {6-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

For anyone seeking more information about this meeting, a video on demand is available at www.glastonbury-ct.gov/video; click on Public Broadcast Video On Demand.

**GLASTONBURY BOARD OF FINANCE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2022**

The Glastonbury Board of Finance, along with Finance Director, Julie Twilley, and Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, held a special meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with the option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

Roll Call

Members

Mr. Constantine "Gus" Constantine, Chairman
Ms. Jennifer Sanford, Vice Chairman {participated via video conferencing}
Mr. James McIntosh
Ms. Susan Karp
Mr. Robert Lynn {participated via video conferencing}
Mr. James Zeller

1. Public Comment Session: Comments pertaining to the call.

Ms. Karp expressed that she participates in fundraising from residents and businesses for the STEAM lab, but she is not involved in any of the funding decisions by the BOE. The Board did not find any conflict that would impede her participation in the meeting.

2. Education Budget Reviews:

BOE Chairman Doug Foyle explained that their budget increase of 3.25% is less than half of the annualized inflation rate of 7%. Superintendent Alan Bookman reviewed the 6 drivers impacting the budget this year: three new clinicians for the Student Support Centers, which support students' mental health; 18 new paraprofessionals for special education accounts; rising heat and fuel rates for utilities; increased costs in technology software and online applications; salary increases; and rising inflation. Dr. Bookman explained that this is the biggest budget reduction he has seen from the BOE, who cut his proposed increase of 3.8% to the current 3.25%.

Ms. Karp asked about the BOE's approach to the reduction. Dr. Foyle stated that there were two nights of workshops and one night of making reductions. They wanted to give students what they need to succeed next year. By April, they hope to be able to put some of the funds back into the supply accounts and reduce the Self Insurance Reserve Fund draw. Ms. Karp asked if the current assumption is that the reserve will stay at the same level or is there a built-in planned reduction. Dr. Foyle stated that there is a built-in planned reduction. Next year, there should be a reduction of \$900,000 in the reserve fund. He asked if the BOF would like them to be more aggressive on that. Their target is to draw it down from \$12 million to \$6 million without creating a hole in the budget. Dr. Bookman noted that there will be a budget workshop on this soon.

Ms. Karp asked to go through the activity in the 1% fund. Dr. Bookman explained that federal money was used to construct the STEAM lab. However, the remaining \$450,000 to complete the project will be paid out of the 1% fund. The fund will also cover the asbestos removal project at Naubuc School and the technology/security costs for the GHS field house. The clinicians for the student support centers, the special education paraprofessionals, and the special education teacher at Hopewell School will all be funded from the 1% fund this year. This is because they did not have enough funds in the current budget to transfer in for all the new hires. Next year, funding will come out of the budget itself, not the 1% fund.

Mr. Zeller expressed concern about the new hires showing up in the 1% fund, instead of the operational budget. Dr. Foyle stated that those people will be accounted for in the final operational budget in August. Mr. Zeller asked which accounts they reduced before going to the 1% fund. Dr. Bookman explained that they did not reduce any accounts. They paid for it out of the operating budget and then the 1% fund will reimburse that. Mr. Zeller is worried that they are creating a budget cliff. Dr. Bookman stated that they are paying for it now and are budgeting for it next year. Dr. Foyle added that these are exceptional expenditures based on the pandemic. It is not how they are going to operate the 1% fund going forward.

Ms. Sanford asked why the federal dollars received for COVID-19 funding were not used for this. Dr. Foyle explained that the only discretionary item was the STEAM lab, which the BOE felt was the best use for those funds. It would have otherwise been a CIP item, so they relieved the Town's budget by using federal monies. Ms. Sanford asked about the context of the savings which were transferred into the 1% fund. Dr. Bookman explained that, prior to the pandemic, some of the money not spent throughout the year would be made available in the 1% fund to address projects such as sidewalk maintenance. Ms. Sanford asked how there could have been savings when operations in FY 2021 were \$800,000 over budget. Dr. Foyle explained that, since the pandemic, they spend a lot more to operate schools. Ms. Sanford asked where the federal money is listed. Dr. Foyle stated that all revenues are booked on page 13.

Ms. Karp remarked that both the LINKS program and the Early Learning Center are self-sustaining and income-generating, which is something to be proud of. She asked if the 1% fund for Eastbury School will address the water issues there. Dr. Bookman replied no, none of the money is targeted for that purpose. The water situation is not a safety issue, and it affects the entire neighborhood, not just the school. The 1% fund is set aside for boilers and roofs at Eastbury. They have also set aside \$50,000 for maintenance from the LINKS funding. Mr. Zeller asked for a preliminary estimate for repairing the water issue. Dr. Bookman noted that Mr. Johnson will provide that information when he knows it. It was clarified that bottled water is provided for use at Eastbury School.

Ms. Karp asked about enrollment projections. Dr. Bookman stated that it is exactly as expected.

Bucking the trend of the last few years, now the lower grades are trending up while the upper grades trend down. There will be no effects on teachers at the middle school. Ms. Karp asked how the student support centers are set up within the schools and how they work with Youth and Family Services. Dr. Bookman stated that the support center clinician in the high school previously worked for Youth and Family Services, so there is great coordination. Even once the pandemic ends, this mental health support for the students will not go away. Ms. Karp asked about the elementary level. Dr. Bookman stated that the greater need in the elementary schools has been the paraprofessionals. Dr. Foyle added that the BOE has communicated to the administration that if there is a need in the elementary schools, they can extend the service there.

Ms. Karp asked if the software is a one-time cost or an annual cost. Dr. Bookman replied, it is an annual cost. Ms. Sanford asked what percentage of the increase is due to apps. Dr. Bookman stated that it is a combination of the software and the iPads. Ms. Sanford asked if they have data on the metrics for the technologies purchased. Dr. Bookman stated yes, they can provide that information. Ms. Sanford asked how much has been raised privately for the STEAM lab. Ms. Karp stated that, to date, they have raised about \$76,000. Ms. Sanford asked for a full account of what has been expended on the STEAM project since inception. Mr. Zeller calculated it to be just shy of \$3.6 million. Dr. Bookman stated that that calculation is about \$300,000 too high. Ms. Sanford is uncomfortable with pursuing these projects outside of the budget process. Dr. Foyle believes that this is not a choice between pursuing the STEAM lab or the mental health centers. The Town can and should do both.

Mr. Zeller remarked that the STEAM lab was initially presented as an \$800,000 project which has now become \$3.6 million. He is concerned about the way in which the project was vetted. He believes that all the boards would have supported it through the CIP, which would have been a more measured process. Mr. Zeller then spoke to the per pupil expenditure. He finds the comparison of Gold Coast towns with Hartford area towns to be problematic and unrealistic. He asked that, next year, it be narrowed down to just towns in the Hartford area. Dr. Foyle explained that Glastonbury falls right in the middle of their peers: West Hartford, Avon, Farmington, and Simsbury. Among the 21 schools in the list, Glastonbury is in the middle third.

Dr. Bookman stated that it has been a very unusual time for food services. The federal government provided funding during the pandemic to cover free meals for students. However, he does not believe that they will continue to do so next year. Ms. Sanford asked if there are transfers out when there are surpluses. Dr. Bookman explained that they support the health costs for food services personnel. By law, they could carry over a three-month operating balance of up to \$600,000. Mr. Zeller asked when they last raised prices on meals. Dr. Bookman stated that their school food prices are among the highest of the districts in the area, so they did not want to raise them further.

Mr. McIntosh believes that this BOE lacks the expertise, resources, staff, and time to do their job as outlined by the Town Charter. He suggested that all goals be spelled out summarily, not just the strategic goals listed on page 1, because it is difficult to measure performance without knowing what the goals are. He stated that the Town Charter requires the BOE to submit a budget for their receipts and expenditures, not just the budget to be funded by the town. He finds it concerning that budget expenditures total \$120 million while public perception is that it is only \$117 million. Dr. Bookman explained that they have heeded Mr. McIntosh's comments from prior years to include the full expenditure number in the budget. However, they do not want the public to mistakenly think that the BOE is asking for \$120 million from taxpayers.

Mr. McIntosh inquired about the exorbitant increases in the cost for high school graduation. Dr. Foyle clarified that the \$22,000 expenditure in 2020 was inordinately low because there was no in-person graduation. Last year, the cost was over \$78,000 because graduation was in-person, with enhanced social distancing measures put in place to safeguard against COVID-19. Mr. McIntosh noted that Hopewell School seems to have too many students while Buttonball Lane has too few students, even though the districts abut each other. He asked if any consideration has been made to change the district lines to balance that out. Dr. Foyle stated yes. However, due to the structure of the school, Buttonball Lane cannot hold too many students.

Mr. McIntosh thinks that government in all its functions is a form of monopoly enterprise. The BOE's budgets lack quantifiable goals and get increasingly layered each year. Once objective standards are met, the BOE seldomly, if ever, removes the expenditures which are no longer needed. He believes that this is not a failure of the BOE or staff, but of structure. State and local governments have built a system whereby the BOE, the BOF, and the Town Council cannot effectively regulate proposed expenditures. He worries that they will continue to fail to regulate as education continues to be the highest increasing cost in the community.

Dr. Foyle agreed that it is hard to quantify the output of an educated student. However, Glastonbury schools produce successful students. The market informs them that they are doing a good job because many choose to live in Glastonbury for its educational system. Ms. Karp has viewed the budget process from every angle: as a council member, as a BOE member, and now as a member of the BOF. While she acknowledged that there are opportunities to innovate and increase efficiency, she finds the process to be fair and thorough. Perhaps the best metric or measure for the success of the process is the success of Glastonbury.

Dr. Foyle then reviewed the capital budget. The BOE's top priority CIP item is the Naubuc School project to redesign the second floor, which consists of an open classroom design that was constructed in 1969. Across the country, it was decided that the open classroom system is inefficient for education. The project has been a priority for the BOE since 2009. Design specification was approved by the BOE at the end of the summer, and they are comfortable with

the \$3.2 million estimate, with a \$100,000 contingency set aside. Should the project end up costing more than \$3.2 million, the BOE will not return to the Council to ask for more funding. Mr. Zeller has concerns that the bids might run higher than the \$3.2 million estimate because of the current state of inflation. If that happens, he asked where the BOE will find the extra money, especially since the 1% fund is now empty. Dr. Foyle stated that they trust the experts who gave them the estimate. He does not know where they will find the additional funds, but he assured that the BOE will figure it out. Mr. Zeller asked if the school's first floor also shares the same open space layout. Dr. Bookman stated yes, except the first floor is more manageable, with far fewer classrooms combined together than on the second floor.

Mr. McIntosh finds it appropriate to question the estimates. He asked whether there has been a discernible difference in the quality of education in graduates of Naubuc School when they get to Gideon Welles. Dr. Foyle explained that it is not so much that the output is different as they have to devote more resources to get the same result. It is also more challenging for students with special needs. Dr. Bookman added that the distractions are too great, which he thinks negatively influences student learning. Lots of variables come into play, so it is hard to measure quantifiably. Should there be a cost overrun, Mr. Constantine expressed that he is open to allocating additional money to the BOE to ensure that the project gets completed.

3. Adjournment

Motion by: Mr. McIntosh

Seconded by: Ms. Karp

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance moves to adjourn their meeting of February 2, 2022, at 6:30 p.m.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {6-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

For anyone seeking more information about this meeting, a video on demand is available at www.glastonbury-ct.gov/video; click on Public Broadcast Video On Demand..

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

December 31, 2021

TO: Board of Finance & Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager
 FROM: *JBT* Julie Twilley, Director of Finance & Administrative Services
 RE: Pension Investment Review – **December 2021**

BOF 2/16/22 Item # 3

As of December 31, 2021 the pension asset value is \$219,565,161, a net increase of \$12,115,037 from July 1, 2021. Through the month of December, the fund experienced an unrealized loss of \$1,960,360, which is indicative of the current market and there were realized gains of \$5,811,287. Investment income through December totaled \$2,241,424.

July 1, 2020 Balance	\$ 207,450,125
Revenues:	
Employer Contributions	\$ 10,762,848
Employee Contributions	\$ 1,078,341
Total Contributions	\$ 11,841,189
Investment Income	\$ 2,241,424
Realized Gains/Losses	\$ 5,811,287
Unrealized Gains/Losses	\$ (1,960,360)
Total Revenues	\$ 17,933,540
Expenditures:	
Benefit Payments	\$ 5,740,000
Administrative Fees	\$ 15,304
Investment Management Fees	\$ 63,200
Total Expenditures	\$ 5,818,504
Net Increase/Decrease	\$ 12,115,037
Ending Balance December 31, 2021	\$ 219,565,161

Assuming a 6.25% long-term return on the plan's investments, the July 1, 2021 Unfunded Accrued Liability is \$70.1 million and the corresponding funded ratio is 72.2%. The Town's policy for paying off the unfunded liability is such that there are 12 years remaining in our amortization schedule.

cc: Narae McManus, Controller
 Karen Bonfiglio, Finance Manager, Glastonbury Public Schools



Town of Glastonbury Retirement Income and New Hires Plan Monthly Performance Update - January 2022

This report is intended for the exclusive use of clients or prospective clients of Fiducient Advisors. The information contained herein is intended for the recipient, is confidential and may not be disseminated or distributed to any other person without prior approval. Any dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited. Information has been obtained from a variety of sources believed to be reliable though not independently verified. Any forecasts represent future expectations and actual returns; volatilities and correlations will differ from forecasts. This report does not represent a specific investment recommendation. Please consult with your advisor, attorney and accountant, as appropriate, regarding specific advice.

Past performance does not indicate future performance and there is possibility of a loss.

Asset Allocation

As of January 31, 2022

	Asset Allocation (\$)	Asset Allocation (%)	Target Allocation (%)	Differences (%)
Total Plan	208,784,275	100.0	100.0	0.0
Short Term Liquidity	3,352,819	1.6	0.5	1.1
Allspring Government Money Market	3,352,819	1.6	0.5	1.1
Fixed Income	62,011,764	29.7	32.5	-2.8
Metropolitan West Total Return Bond Pl	26,053,925	12.5	13.8	-1.3
BlackRock Total Return Fund K	26,263,209	12.6	13.8	-1.2
PGIM Global Total Return R6	9,694,630	4.6	5.0	-0.4
Domestic Equity	85,527,793	41.0	40.0	1.0
Vanguard Institutional Index Fund Instl	62,920,300	30.1	28.0	2.1
Jackson Square SMID-Cap Growth IS	8,761,889	4.2	6.0	-1.8
Earnest Partners SMID Cap Value CIT	13,845,604	6.6	6.0	0.6
International Equity	33,470,811	16.0	16.0	0.0
Causeway International Value Instl	11,811,134	5.7	5.5	0.2
Vanguard International Growth Adm	10,192,408	4.9	5.5	-0.6
Templeton Instl Foreign Smaller Companies Fund Adv	4,240,513	2.0	2.0	0.0
Cape Ann Global Developing Markets	7,226,756	3.5	3.0	0.5
Real Estate	13,969,391	6.7	6.0	0.7
Barings Core Property Fund LP	13,969,391	6.7	6.0	0.7
Inflation Protection	10,451,696	5.0	5.0	0.0
Vanguard Short-Term Inflation Protection Adm	5,141,402	2.5	2.5	0.0
Parametric Commodity Strategy Instl	2,551,478	1.2	1.3	0.0
iShares Gold Trust	2,758,816	1.3	1.3	0.1

Investments with a zero balance were held in the plan during the reporting period and will be removed once they no longer impact plan performance.
Asset Allocation weightings may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Town of Glastonbury, CT Pension

Performance Update As Of January 31, 2022

Portfolio Performance

	Value	Performance(%)									
		1 Month	Jul-2021 To Jan-2022	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	10 Years	Since Inception *	Aug-2011 To Jan-2022	Inception Date
Total Plan	208,784,275	-3.7	-1.0	6.9	12.0	9.6	7.9	8.3	7.3	7.8	01/01/2003
<i>Blended Benchmark</i>		<i>-3.6</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>11.5</i>	<i>9.4</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>7.9</i>	<i>7.6</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>01/01/2003</i>

Calendar Year Performance

	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Total Plan	10.8	16.8	18.8	-6.1	15.9	7.1	-1.8
<i>Blended Benchmark</i>	<i>12.1</i>	<i>13.7</i>	<i>18.8</i>	<i>-5.3</i>	<i>14.9</i>	<i>7.4</i>	<i>-1.5</i>

Allocation Mandate

Apr-2021

	Weight (%)
90 Day U.S. Treasury Bill	0.50
Blmbg. U.S. Aggregate Index	27.50
Bloomberg Global Aggregate	5.00
Russell 3000 Index	40.00
MSCI AC World ex USA (Net)	16.00
NCREIF Fund Index - ODCE (net)	6.00
Glatonbury Short Term Inflation Protection Benchmark	5.00

The Since Inception performance figure includes performance of prior consultant. Fiducient Advisors performance inception date is 8/1/2011.
The allocation mandate represents the current benchmark composition for the portfolio. Please keep in mind that the investment objective may have changed over time.

Manager Performance Overview

As of January 31, 2022

	1 Month	Jul-2021 To Jan-2022	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	10 Years	Since Inception	Aug-2011 To Jan-2022	Inception Date
Total Plan	-3.7	-1.0	6.9	12.0	9.6	8.3	7.3	7.8	01/01/2003
<i>Blended Benchmark</i>	-3.6	0.8	8.5	11.5	9.4	7.9	7.6	7.5	
Allspring Government Money Market	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.5	08/01/2011
<i>90 Day U.S. Treasury Bill</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	
Fixed Income	-2.3	-2.8	-3.2	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.6	3.0	01/01/2010
<i>Fixed Income Benchmark</i>	-2.1	-2.3	-3.4	3.3	3.0	2.2	3.3	2.4	
Metropolitan West Total Return Bond PI	-2.0 (52)	-2.0 (39)	-2.6 (57)	4.5 (46)	3.6 (46)	3.8 (19)	3.9 (22)	3.9 (22)	08/01/2011
<i>Blmbg. U.S. Aggregate Index</i>	-2.2	-2.1	-3.0	3.7	3.1	2.6	2.9	2.9	
IM U.S. Broad Market Core+ Fixed Income (MF) Median	-2.0	-2.1	-2.4	4.4	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.4	
BlackRock Total Return Fund K	-2.4 (88)	-2.3 (70)	-2.5 (55)	4.6 (41)	3.7 (40)	N/A	3.2 (38)	N/A	06/01/2015
<i>Blmbg. U.S. Aggregate Index</i>	-2.2	-2.1	-3.0	3.7	3.1	2.6	2.7	2.9	
IM U.S. Broad Market Core+ Fixed Income (MF) Median	-2.0	-2.1	-2.4	4.4	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.4	
PGIM Global Total Return R6	-3.0 (98)	-4.8 (92)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-1.8 (59)	N/A	04/01/2021
<i>Bloomberg Global Aggregate</i>	-2.0	-3.6	-5.8	2.4	2.7	1.4	-2.3	1.4	
IM Global Fixed Income (MF) Median	-1.8	-2.9	-3.8	3.0	2.8	2.0	-1.5	1.9	
Domestic Equity	-6.4	-0.3	14.2	19.6	15.8	14.8	14.3	14.1	01/01/2010
<i>Domestic Equity Benchmark</i>	-5.9	2.7	18.8	19.9	16.1	15.0	14.4	14.5	
Vanguard Institutional Index Fund Instl	-5.2 (53)	5.9 (26)	23.2 (31)	20.7 (23)	16.8 (21)	15.4 (14)	14.9 (11)	14.9 (11)	08/01/2011
<i>S&P 500 Index</i>	-5.2	5.9	23.3	20.7	16.8	15.4	14.9	14.9	
IM U.S. Large Cap Core Equity (MF) Median	-5.0	4.5	21.7	18.9	15.3	14.1	13.4	13.4	
Jackson Square SMID-Cap Growth IS	-18.0 (92)	-31.5 (100)	-30.4 (97)	N/A	N/A	N/A	-3.5 (95)	N/A	10/01/2020
<i>Russell 2500 Growth Index</i>	-13.2	-16.1	-11.3	14.9	13.8	13.3	10.9	12.6	
IM U.S. SMID Cap Growth Equity (MF) Median	-13.3	-13.9	-7.5	16.1	14.9	13.2	13.1	12.4	
Earnest Partners SMID Cap Value CIT	-3.5 (41)	1.4 (58)	21.0 (67)	N/A	N/A	N/A	38.5 (44)	N/A	10/01/2020
<i>Russell 2500 Index</i>	-8.3	-7.4	5.8	14.2	11.5	12.4	27.4	11.8	
IM U.S. SMID Cap Value Equity (MF) Median	-3.7	2.0	22.4	12.8	8.8	10.9	38.0	10.2	

Returns for periods less than one year are not annualized. Returns are net of fees unless otherwise noted.

Manager Performance Overview

As of January 31, 2022

	1 Month	Jul-2021 To Jan-2022	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	10 Years	Since Inception	Aug-2011 To Jan-2022	Inception Date
International Equity	-3.1	-7.0	1.3	13.5	11.0	7.9	6.6	6.6	01/01/2010
<i>MSCI AC World ex USA (Net)</i>	-3.7	-4.9	3.6	9.1	8.0	6.2	5.3	4.8	
Vanguard International Growth Adm	-9.2 (87)	-15.3 (100)	-13.5 (100)	20.4 (1)	17.2 (1)	12.0 (1)	10.3 (1)	10.3 (1)	08/01/2011
<i>MSCI AC World ex USA Growth (Net)</i>	-8.1	-9.3	-4.0	11.8	10.3	7.5	6.0	6.0	
IM International Large Cap Growth Equity (MF) Median	-5.7	-4.6	2.6	12.6	10.0	7.6	6.0	6.0	
Causeway International Value Instl	2.2 (12)	2.2 (64)	14.6 (77)	9.6 (45)	N/A	N/A	4.7 (25)	N/A	04/01/2018
<i>MSCI EAFE Value Index (Net)</i>	1.0	1.2	12.9	5.9	5.1	5.4	2.6	4.0	
IM International Large Cap Value Equity (MF) Median	0.3	2.9	16.6	8.9	6.2	5.4	4.0	3.9	
Templeton Instl Foreign Smaller Companies Fund Adv	-5.6 (62)	-7.4 (90)	3.8 (94)	9.2 (51)	8.1 (44)	7.6 (51)	6.0 (52)	6.0 (52)	08/01/2011
<i>MSCI AC World ex USA Small Cap (Net)</i>	-6.2	-5.7	6.1	11.1	9.0	7.8	6.1	6.1	
IM International SMID Cap Core Equity (MF) Median	-5.2	-4.7	9.2	9.4	6.9	7.6	6.0	6.0	
Cape Ann Global Developing Markets	-0.5 (32)	-7.7 (27)	4.7 (14)	6.5 (75)	N/A	N/A	8.5 (64)	N/A	12/01/2018
<i>MSCI Emerging Markets (Net) Index</i>	-1.9	-11.0	-7.2	7.2	8.3	4.2	8.7	3.0	
IM Emerging Markets Equity (MF) Median	-1.6	-10.6	-6.0	8.1	8.1	4.3	9.5	3.1	
Real Estate	0.0	13.3	18.9	7.9	7.3	8.5	8.8	7.5	01/01/2010
<i>NCREIF Fund Index - ODCE (net)</i>	0.0	14.6	21.0	8.2	7.7	9.4	10.3	9.6	
Barings Core Property Fund LP	0.0	13.3	18.9	7.9	7.3	N/A	8.4	N/A	07/01/2012
<i>NCREIF Fund Index - ODCE (net)</i>	0.0	14.6	21.0	8.2	7.7	9.4	9.3	9.6	
Inflation Protection	3.6	7.7	12.2	8.6	2.9	-0.4	0.6	N/A	10/01/2011
<i>Short Term Inflation Protection Benchmark</i>	1.6	5.0	9.5	7.6	3.8	0.5	1.2	-0.2	
Vanguard Short-Term Inflation Protection Adm	-0.5 (3)	1.9 (24)	4.1 (18)	4.6 (91)	3.0 (87)	N/A	2.0 (83)	N/A	10/01/2013
<i>Bloomberg US TIPS 0-5 Year Index</i>	-0.6	1.9	4.2	4.6	3.1	1.7	2.1	1.7	
IM U.S. TIPS (MF) Median	-1.8	1.6	3.0	6.3	4.0	2.1	2.7	2.3	

Returns for periods less than one year are not annualized. Returns are net of fees unless otherwise noted.

Manager Performance Overview

As of January 31, 2022

	1 Month	Jul-2021 To Jan-2022	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	10 Years	Since Inception	Aug-2011 To Jan-2022	Inception Date
Parametric Commodity Strategy Instl	6.7 (74)	14.2 (49)	35.0 (67)	N/A	N/A	N/A	23.0 (6)	N/A	12/01/2019
<i>Bloomberg Commodity Index Total Return</i>	8.8	14.1	34.7	11.0	5.4	-2.3	17.1	-3.3	
IM Commodities General (MF) Median	7.8	14.1	36.5	12.0	6.0	-1.6	18.7	-2.6	
iShares Gold Trust (IAU)	-1.4 (43)	1.6 (21)	-3.9 (24)	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.3 (43)	N/A	08/01/2019
<i>LBMA Gold Price PM</i>	-1.4	1.8	-3.7	10.6	8.1	0.3	9.5	0.9	
IM Commodities Precious Metals (MF) Median	-1.4	-3.5	-7.2	9.9	5.8	-2.1	9.2	-2.0	

The inception date expressed on the Manager Performance Overview page(s) represents the first day of the first full month following the purchase of the investment. Performance figures shown at the fund level begin on this inception date. Your performance may differ slightly if the fund was purchased during the previous month. Actual performance is captured at the total plan level.

Investment returns are derived from custodian valuations and may deviate slightly from fund level returns displayed in other pages in your report which can result in minor differences in universe rankings. Mutual fund performance may differ from the current share class historical performance due to share class exchanges. ETF returns by convention can be different from the product return.

Barings Core Property Fund is valued as of last quarterly available valuation.

Asset Allocation - New Hires Plan

As of January 31, 2022

	Asset Allocation (\$)	Asset Allocation (%)	Target Allocation (%)	Differences (%)
Total Plan	1,833,821	100.0	100.0	0.0
Short Term Liquidity	74,128	4.0	0.0	4.0
Allspring Government Money Market	74,128	4.0	0.0	4.0
Fixed Income	1,076,816	58.7	60.0	-1.3
Vanguard Total Bond Market Index Adm	1,076,816	58.7	60.0	-1.3
Domestic Equity	418,024	22.8	25.0	-2.2
Vanguard Total Stock Market Index Adm	418,024	22.8	25.0	-2.2
International Equity	264,853	14.4	15.0	-0.6
Vanguard Total International Stock Index Adm	264,853	14.4	15.0	-0.6

Investments with a zero balance were held in the portfolio during the reporting period and will be removed once they no longer impact portfolio performance. Asset Allocation weightings may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Town of Glastonbury, CT New Hires Plan

Performance Update As Of January 31, 2022

Portfolio Performance

	Value	Performance(%)						Inception Date
		1 Month	Jul-2021 To Jan-2022	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	Since Inception	
Total Plan	1,833,821	-3.1	-1.2	3.5	9.1	6.8	6.2	12/01/2015
<i>New Hires Blended Benchmark</i>		<i>-3.4</i>	<i>-1.2</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>7.1</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>12/01/2015</i>

Calendar Year Performance

	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Total Plan	6.2	13.8	15.0	-3.4	7.6	4.1	N/A
<i>New Hires Blended Benchmark</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>11.6</i>	<i>15.7</i>	<i>-3.8</i>	<i>11.4</i>	<i>5.2</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Allocation Mandate

	Weight (%)
Jun-2020	
Blmbg. U.S. Aggregate Index	60.00
CRSP US Total Market Spliced Index	25.00
FTSE Global All Cap ex US Spliced Index	15.00

The allocation mandate represents the current benchmark composition for the portfolio. Please keep in mind that the investment objective may have changed over time.

Manager Performance Overview - New Hires Plan

As of January 31, 2022

	1 Month	Jul-2021 To Jan-2022	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	Since Inception	Inception Date
Total Plan	-3.1	-1.2	3.5	9.1	6.8	N/A	6.2	12/01/2015
<i>New Hires Blended Benchmark</i>	-3.4	-1.2	3.3	8.5	7.1	N/A	6.6	
<i>New Hires Secondary Benchmark</i>	-2.5	-1.3	1.8	6.6	5.6	N/A	5.2	
Allspring Government Money Market	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.0	N/A	0.8	12/01/2015
<i>90 Day U.S. Treasury Bill</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	N/A	1.0	
Fixed Income	-2.2	-2.1	-3.0	3.7	3.0	N/A	2.9	12/01/2015
<i>Blmbg. U.S. Aggregate Index</i>	-2.2	-2.1	-3.0	3.7	3.1	N/A	2.9	
Vanguard Total Bond Market Index Adm	-2.2 (68)	-2.1 (44)	-3.0 (65)	3.7 (68)	3.0 (61)	N/A	2.9 (64)	12/01/2015
<i>Blmbg. U.S. Aggregate Index</i>	-2.2	-2.1	-3.0	3.7	3.1	N/A	2.9	
IM U.S. Broad Market Core Fixed Income (MF) Median	-2.1	-2.2	-2.8	4.0	3.2	N/A	3.1	
Domestic Equity	-6.0	2.5	18.5	19.8	16.1	N/A	15.0	12/01/2015
<i>CRSP US Total Market Spliced Index</i>	-6.0	2.5	18.5	19.9	16.1	N/A	15.0	
Vanguard Total Stock Market Index Adm	-6.0 (57)	2.5 (48)	18.5 (53)	19.8 (21)	16.1 (16)	N/A	15.0 (10)	12/01/2015
<i>CRSP US Total Market Spliced Index</i>	-6.0	2.5	18.5	19.9	16.1	N/A	15.0	
IM U.S. Multi-Cap Core Equity (MF) Median	-5.9	2.3	18.6	17.2	13.9	N/A	12.8	
International Equity	-2.8	-3.8	5.7	9.9	8.4	N/A	7.9	12/01/2015
<i>FTSE Global All Cap ex US Spliced Index</i>	-4.0	-4.7	4.4	9.6	8.3	N/A	7.8	
Vanguard Total International Stock Index Adm	-2.8 (55)	-3.8 (73)	5.7 (66)	9.9 (53)	8.4 (29)	N/A	7.9 (9)	12/01/2015
<i>FTSE Global All Cap ex US Spliced Index</i>	-4.0	-4.7	4.4	9.6	8.3	N/A	7.8	
IM International Large Cap Core Equity (MF) Median	-2.4	-1.9	8.2	9.9	7.4	N/A	6.3	

The inception date expressed on the Manager Performance Overview page(s) represents the first day of the first full month following the purchase of the investment. Performance figures shown at the fund level begin on this inception date. Your performance may differ slightly if the fund was purchased during the previous month. Actual performance is captured at the total plan level.

Investment returns are derived from custodian valuations and may deviate slightly from fund level returns displayed in other pages in your report which can result in minor differences in universe rankings. Mutual fund performance may differ from the current share class's historical performance due to share class exchanges.

The Secondary Benchmark consists of 20% 90 Day US Treasury Bill, 50% Bloomberg Barclays US Aggregate, 15% Russell 3000 Index, and 15% MSCI AC World ex USA (Net).

Returns for periods less than one year are not annualized. Returns are net of fees unless otherwise noted.

Definitions & Disclosures

Please note: Due to rounding methodologies of various data providers, certain returns in this report might differ slightly when compared to other sources

REGULATORY DISCLOSURES

Offer of ADV Part 2A: Rule 204-3 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 requires that we make an annual offer to clients to send them, without charge, a written disclosure statement meeting the requirements of such rule. We will be glad to send a copy of our ADV Part 2A to you upon your written request to compliance@fiducient.com.

ASSET CLASS REPRESENTATIONS

All material and information is intended for Fiducient Advisors L.L.C. business only. Any use or public dissemination outside firm business is prohibited. Information is obtained from a variety of sources which are believed though not guaranteed to be accurate. Any forecast represents future expectations and actual returns, volatilities and correlations will differ from forecasts. Past performance does not indicate future performance. This presentation does not represent a specific investment recommendation. Please consult with your advisor, attorney and accountant, as appropriate, regarding specific advice.

When referencing asset class returns or statistics, the following indices are used to represent those asset classes, unless otherwise notes. Each index is unmanaged and investors can not actually invest directly into an index:

TIPS: Bloomberg Barclays Global Inflation-Linked: U.S. TIPS Total Return Index Unhedged

Municipals 5-Year: Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond 5 Year (4-6) Total Return Index Unhedged USD

Core Bond: Bloomberg Barclays US Agg Total Return Value Unhedged USD

High Yield Municipals: Bloomberg Barclays Muni High Yield Total Return Index Value Unhedged USD

High Yield: Bloomberg Barclays US Corporate High Yield Total Return Index Value Unhedged USD

Foreign Bond: Bloomberg Barclays Global Aggregate ex-USD Total Return Index Value USD (50/50 blend of hedged and unhedged)

EM Debt (unhedged): J.P. Morgan GBI-EM Global Diversified Composite Unhedged USD

U.S. Large Cap: S&P 500 Total Return Index

U.S. Small Cap: Russell 2000 Total Return Index

International Developed: MSCI EAFE Net Total Return USD Index

Emerging Markets: MSCI Emerging Markets Net Total Return USD Index

World: MSCI ACWI Net Total Return USD Index

U.S. Equity REITs: FTSE Nareit Equity REITs Total Return Index USD

S&P Real Assets: S&P Real Assets Total Return Index

Commodities: Bloomberg Commodity Total Return Index

Hedge Funds: Hedge Fund Research HFRI Fund of Funds Composite Index

Balanced: 3% TIPS, 33% Core Bond, 4% High Yield, 2% Foreign Bond, 2% EM Debt (unhedged), 18% U.S. Large Cap, 6% U.S. Small Cap, 16% International, 8% Emerging Markets, 5% U.S. Equity REITs, 3% Commodities

U.S.: MSCI USA Net Total Return USD Index

China: MSCI CHINA Net Total Return USD Index

Japan: MSCI Japan Net Total Return USD Index

Germany: MSCI Germany Net Total Return USD Index

India: MSCI India Net Total Return USD Index

United Kingdom: MSCI UK Net Total Return USD Index

France: MSCI France Net Total Return USD Index

Italy: MSCI Italy Net Total Return USD Index

Brazil: MSCI Brazil Net Total Return USD Index

Canada: MSCI Canada Net Total Return USD Index

INDEX DEFINITIONS

- **Citigroup 3 Month T-Bill** measures monthly return equivalents of yield averages that are not marked to market. The Three-Month Treasury Bill Indexes consist of the last three three-month Treasury bill issues.
- **Ryan 3 Yr. GIC** is an arithmetic mean of market rates of \$1 million Guaranteed Interest Contracts held for three years.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Treasury U.S. T-Bills-1-3 Month Index** includes aged U.S. Treasury bills, notes and bonds with a remaining maturity from 1 up to (but not including) 3 months. It excludes zero coupon strips.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Capital US Treasury Inflation Protected Securities Index** consists of Inflation-Protection securities issued by the U.S. Treasury.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Muni Index** is a rules-based, market-value-weighted index engineered for the long-term tax-exempt bond market. Bonds must be rated investment-grade by at least two ratings agencies.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Muni 1 Year Index** is the 1-year (1-2) component of the Municipal Bond index.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Muni 3 Year Index** is the 3-year (2-4) component of the Municipal Bond index.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Muni 5 Year Index** is the 5-year (4-6) component of the Municipal Bond index.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Muni 7 Year Index** is the 7-year (6-8) component of the Municipal Bond index.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Intermediate U.S. Gov't/Credit** is the Intermediate component of the U.S. Government/Credit index, which includes securities in the Government and Credit Indices. The Government Index includes treasuries and agencies, while the credit index includes publicly issued U.S. corporate and foreign debentures and secured notes that meet specified maturity, liquidity, and quality requirements.

- **Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Index** covers the U.S. investment grade fixed rate bond market, with index components for government and corporate securities, mortgage pass-through securities, and asset-backed securities.
- **Bloomberg Barclays Global Aggregate ex. USD Indices** represent a broad-based measure of the global investment-grade fixed income markets. The two major components of this index are the Pan-European Aggregate and the Asian-Pacific Aggregate Indices. The index also includes Eurodollar and Euro-Yen corporate bonds and Canadian government, agency and corporate securities.
- **Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Corporate High Yield Index** covers the universe of fixed rate, non-investment grade debt. Eurobonds and debt issues from countries designated as emerging markets (sovereign rating of Baa1/BBB+/BBB+ and below using the middle of Moody's, S&P, and Fitch) are excluded, but Canadian and global bonds (SEC registered) of issuers in non-EMG countries are included.
- **JP Morgan Government Bond Index-Emerging Market (GBI-EM) Index** is a comprehensive, global local emerging markets index, and consists of regularly traded, liquid fixed-rate, domestic currency government bonds to which international investors can gain exposure.
- **The S&P 500** is a capitalization-weighted index of 500 stocks designed to measure performance of the broad domestic economy through changes in the aggregate market value of 500 stocks representing all major industries.
- **The Dow Jones Industrial Index** is a price-weighted average of 30 blue-chip stocks that are generally the leaders in their industry.
- **The NASDAQ** is a broad-based capitalization-weighted index of stocks in all three NASDAQ tiers: Global Select, Global Market and Capital Market.
- **Russell 3000** is a market-cap-weighted index which consists of roughly 3,000 of the largest companies in the U.S. as determined by market capitalization. It represents nearly 98% of the investable U.S. equity market.
- **Russell 1000** consists of the largest 1000 companies in the Russell 3000 Index.
- **Russell 1000 Growth** measures the performance of those Russell 1000 companies with higher P/B ratios and higher forecasted growth values.
- **Russell 1000 Value** measures the performance of those Russell 1000 companies with lower P/B ratios and lower forecasted growth values.
- **Russell Mid Cap** measures the performance of the 800 smallest companies in the Russell 1000 Index.
- **Russell Mid Cap Growth** measures the performance of those Russell Mid Cap companies with higher P/B ratios and higher forecasted growth values.
- **Russell Mid Cap Value** measures the performance of those Russell Mid Cap companies with lower P/B ratios and lower forecasted growth values.
- **Russell 2000** consists of the 2,000 smallest U.S. companies in the Russell 3000 index.
- **Russell 2000 Growth** measures the performance of the Russell 2000 companies with higher P/B ratios and higher forecasted growth values.
- **Russell 2000 Value** measures the performance of those Russell 2000 companies with lower P/B ratios and lower forecasted growth values.
- **Russell 2500** consists of the 2,500 smallest U.S. companies in the Russell 3000 index.
- **Russell 2500 Growth** measures the performance of the Russell 2500 companies with higher P/B ratios and higher forecasted growth values.
- **Russell 2500 Value** measures the performance of those Russell 2500 companies with lower P/B ratios and lower forecasted growth values.
- **MSCI World** captures large and mid-cap representation across 23 Developed Markets countries. With 1,645 constituents, the index covers approximately 85% of the free float-adjusted market capitalization in each country.
- **MSCI ACWI (All Country World Index) ex. U.S. Index** captures large and mid-cap representation across 22 of 23 Developed Markets countries (excluding the United States) and 23 Emerging Markets countries. With 1,859 constituents, the index covers approximately 85% of the global equity opportunity set outside the US.
- **MSCI ACWI (All Country World Index) ex. U.S. Small Cap Index** captures small cap representation across 22 of 23 Developed Markets countries (excluding the US) and 23 Emerging Markets countries. With 4,368 constituents, the index covers approximately 14% of the global equity opportunity set outside the US.
- **MSCI EAFE** is an equity index which captures large and mid-cap representation across Developed Markets countries around the world, excluding the US and Canada. With 930 constituents, the index covers approximately 85% of the free float-adjusted market capitalization in each country.
- **MSCI EAFE Value** captures large and mid-cap securities exhibiting overall value style characteristics across Developed Markets countries around the world, excluding the US and Canada. The value investment style characteristics for index construction are defined using three variables: book value to price, 12-month forward earnings to price and dividend yield. With 507 constituents, the index targets 50% coverage of the free float-adjusted market capitalization of the MSCI EAFE Index.
- **MSCI EAFE Growth** captures large and mid-cap securities exhibiting overall growth style characteristics across Developed Markets countries around the world, excluding the US and Canada. The growth investment style characteristics for index construction are defined using five variables: long-term forward EPS growth rate, short-term forward EPS growth rate, current internal growth rate and long-term historical EPS growth trend and long-term historical sales per share growth trend. With 542 constituents, the index targets 50% coverage of the free float-adjusted market capitalization of the MSCI EAFE Index.
- **MSCI Emerging Markets** captures large and mid-cap representation across 23 Emerging Markets countries. With 836 constituents, the index covers approximately 85% of the free-float adjusted market capitalization in each country.
- **Consumer Price Index** is a measure of prices paid by consumers for a market basket of consumer goods and services. The yearly (or monthly) growth rates represent the inflation rate.
- **FTSE NAREIT Equity REITs Index** contains all Equity REITs not designed as Timber REITs or Infrastructure REITs.
- **S&P Developed World Property** defines and measures the investable universe of publicly traded property companies domiciled in developed markets. The companies in the index are engaged in real estate related activities, such as property ownership, management, development, rental and investment.
- **S&P Developed World Property x U.S.** defines and measures the investable universe of publicly traded property companies domiciled in developed countries outside of the U.S. The companies included are engaged in real estate related activities, such as property ownership, management, development, rental and investment.
- **Fund Specific Broad Real Asset Benchmarks:**
 - **DWS Real Assets:** 30%: Dow Jones Brookfield Infrastructure Index, 30%: FTSE EPRA/NAREIT Developed Index, 15%: Bloomberg Commodity Index, 15%: S&P Global Natural Resources Index, 10%: Barclays U.S. Treasury Inflation Notes Total Return Index
 - **PIMCO Inflation Response Multi Asset Fund:** 45% Barclays U.S. TIPS, 20% Bloomberg Commodity Index, 15% JP Morgan Emerging Local Markets Plus, 10% Dow Jones Select REIT, 10% Bloomberg Gold Subindex Total Return
 - **Principal Diversified Real Assets:** 35% BBgBarc U.S. Treasury TIPS Index, 20% S&P Global Infrastructure Index NTR, 20% S&P Global Natural Resources Index NTR, 15% Bloomberg Commodity Index, and 10% FTSE EPRA/NAREIT Developed Index NTR
 - **Wellington Diversified Inflation H:** 50% MSCI ACWI Commodity Producers Index, 25% Bloomberg Commodity Index, and 25% Bloomberg Barclays US TIPS 1 – 10 Year Index
- **Bloomberg Commodity Index** is calculated on an excess return basis and reflects commodity futures price movements. The index rebalances annually weighted 2/3 by trading volume and 1/3 by world production and weight-caps are applied at the commodity, sector and group level for diversification.
- **HFRI Fund Weighted Composite Index** is a global, equal-weighted index of over 2,000 single-manager funds that report to HFR Database. Constituent funds report monthly net of all fees performance in US Dollar and have a minimum of \$50 Million under management or a twelve (12) month track record of active performance. The HFRI Fund Weighted Composite Index does not include Funds of Hedge Funds.
- **The Alerian MLP Index** is the leading gauge of energy Master Limited Partnerships (MLPs). The float adjusted, capitalization-weighted index, whose constituents represent approximately 85% of total float-adjusted market capitalization, is disseminated real-time on a price-return basis (AMZ) and on a total-return basis.
- **The Adjusted Alerian MLP Index** is commensurate with 65% of the monthly returns of the Alerian MLP Index to incorporate the effect of deferred tax liabilities incurred by MLP entities.
- **Cambridge Associates U.S. Private Equity Index** is based on data compiled from more than 1,200 institutional-quality buyout, growth equity, private equity energy, and mezzanine funds formed between 1986 and 2015.

- **Cambridge Associates U.S. Venture Capital Index** is based on data compiled from over 1,600 institutional-quality venture capital funds formed between 1986 and 2015.
- **Vanguard Spliced Bloomberg Barclays US1-5Yr Gov/Cr Flt Adj Index:** Bloomberg Barclays U.S. 1–5 Year Government/Credit Bond Index through December 31, 2009; Bloomberg Barclays U.S. 1–5 Year Government/Credit Float Adjusted Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Bloomberg Barclays US5-10Yr Gov/Cr Flt Adj Index:** Bloomberg Barclays U.S. 5–10 Year Government/Credit Bond Index through December 31, 2009; Bloomberg Barclays U.S. 5–10 Year Government/Credit Float Adjusted Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Bloomberg Barclays US Agg Flt Adj Index:** Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index through December 31, 2009; Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Float Adjusted Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Bloomberg Barclays US Long Gov/Cr Flt Adj Index:** Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Long Government/Credit Bond Index through December 31, 2009; Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Long Government/Credit Float Adjusted Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Balanced Composite Index:** Made up of two unmanaged benchmarks, weighted 60% Dow Jones U.S. Total Stock Market Index (formerly the Dow Jones Wilshire 5000 Index) and 40% Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index through May 31, 2005; 60% MSCI US Broad Market Index and 40% Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index through December 31, 2009; 60% MSCI US Broad Market Index and 40% Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Float Adjusted Index through January 14, 2013; and 60% CRSP US Total Market Index and 40% Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Aggregate Float Adjusted Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Intermediate-Term Tax-Exempt Index:** Bloomberg Barclays 1–15 Year Municipal Bond Index.
- **Vanguard Spliced Extended Market Index:** Dow Jones Wilshire 4500 Index through June 17, 2005; S&P Transitional Completion Index through September 16, 2005; S&P Completion Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Value Index:** S&P 500 Value Index (formerly the S&P 500/Barra Value Index) through May 16, 2003; MSCI US Prime Market Value Index through April 16, 2013; CRSP US Large Cap Value Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Large Cap Index:** Consists of MSCI US Prime Market 750 Index through January 30, 2013, and the CRSP US Large Cap Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Growth Index:** S&P 500 Growth Index (formerly the S&P 500/Barra Growth Index) through May 16, 2003; MSCI US Prime Market Growth Index through April 16, 2013; CRSP US Large Cap Growth Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Mid Cap Value Index:** MSCI US Mid Cap Value Index through April 16, 2013; CRSP US Mid Cap Value Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Mid Cap Index:** S&P MidCap 400 Index through May 16, 2003; the MSCI US Mid Cap 450 Index through January 30, 2013; and the CRSP US Mid Cap Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Mid Cap Growth Index:** MSCI US Mid Cap Growth Index through April 16, 2013; CRSP US Mid Cap Growth Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Total Stock Market Index:** Dow Jones U.S. Total Stock Market Index (formerly known as the Dow Jones Wilshire 5000 Index) through April 22, 2005; MSCI US Broad Market Index through June 2, 2013; and CRSP US Total Market Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Small Cap Value Index:** SmallCap 600 Value Index (formerly the S&P SmallCap 600/Barra Value Index) through May 16, 2003; MSCI US Small Cap Value Index through April 16, 2013; CRSP US Small Cap Value Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Small Cap Index:** Russell 2000 Index through May 16, 2003; the MSCI US Small Cap 1750 Index through January 30, 2013; and the CRSP US Small Cap Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Small Cap Growth Index:** S&P SmallCap 600 Growth Index (formerly the S&P SmallCap 600/Barra Value Index) through May 16, 2003; MSCI US Small Cap Growth Index through April 16, 2013; CRSP US Small Cap Growth Index thereafter.
- **Vanguard Spliced Total International Stock Index:** Consists of the Total International Composite Index through August 31, 2006; the MSCI EAFE + Emerging Markets Index through December 15, 2010; the MSCI ACWI ex USA IMI Index through June 2, 2013; and FTSE Global All Cap ex US Index thereafter. Benchmark returns are adjusted for withholding taxes.
- **Vanguard Spliced Developed Markets Index:** MSCI EAFE Index through May 28, 2013; FTSE Developed ex North America Index through December 20, 2015; FTSE Developed All Cap ex US Transition Index through May 31, 2016; FTSE Developed All Cap ex US Index thereafter. Benchmark returns are adjusted for withholding taxes.
- **Vanguard Spliced Emerging Markets Index:** Select Emerging Markets Index through August 23, 2006; MSCI Emerging Markets Index through January 9, 2013; FTSE Emerging Transition Index through June 27, 2013; FTSE Emerging Index through November 1, 2015; and FTSE Emerging Markets All Cap China A Transition Index thereafter. Benchmark returns are adjusted for withholding taxes.
- **Vanguard REIT Spliced Index:** MSCI US REIT Index adjusted to include a 2% cash position (Lipper Money Market Average) through April 30, 2009; MSCI US REIT Index through January 31, 2018; MSCI US Investable Market Real Estate 25/50 Transition Index through July 24, 2018; MSCI US Investable Market Real Estate 25/50 Index thereafter.

Additional:

- Equity sector returns are calculated by Russell and MSCI for domestic and international markets, respectively. MSCI sector definitions correspond to the MSCI GICS® classification (Global Industry Classification System); Russell uses its own sector and industry classifications.
- MSCI country returns are calculated by MSCI and are free float-adjusted market capitalization indices that are designed to measure equity market performance in each specific country.
- Currency returns are calculated using Bloomberg's historical spot rate indices and are calculated using the U.S. dollar as the base currency.
- The Index of Leading Economic Indicators, calculated by The Conference Board, is used as a barometer of economic activity over a range of three to six months. The index is used to determine the direction and stability of the economy. The composite index of leading indicators, which is derived from 10 leading indicators, helps to signal turning points in the economy and forecast economic cycles. The leading indicators are the following: average weekly hours, average weekly initial claims, manufacturers' new orders, both consumer and non-defense capital goods, vendor performance, building permits, stock prices, money supply (M2), the interest rate spread and the index of consumer expectations.
- S&P Target Date Indexes are constructed using a survey method of current target date investments with \$100 million or more in assets under management. Allocations for each vintage are comprised of exchange-traded funds that represent respective asset classes used in target date portfolios. The indexes are designed to represent a market consensus glide path.

DEFINITION OF KEY STATISTICS AND TERMS

- **Returns:** A percentage figure used when reporting historical average compounded rate of investment return. All returns are annualized if the period for which they are calculated exceeds one year.
- **Universe Comparison:** The universe compares the fund's returns to a group of other investment portfolios with similar investment strategies. The returns for the fund, the index and the universe percentiles are displayed. A percentile ranking of 1 is the best, while a percentile ranking of 100 is the worst. For example, a ranking of 50 indicates the fund outperformed half of the universe. A ranking of 25 indicates the fund was in the top 25% of the universe, outperforming 75%.
- **Returns In Up/Down Markets:** This measures how the fund performed in both up and down markets. The methodology is to segregate the performance for each time period into the quarters in which the market, as defined by the index, was positive and negative. Quarters with negative index returns are treated as down markets, and quarters with positive index returns are treated as up markets. Thus, in a 3 year or 12 quarter period, there might be 4 down quarters and 8 up quarters. A simple arithmetic average of returns is calculated for the fund and the index based on the up quarters. A simple arithmetic average of returns is calculated for the fund and the index based on the down quarters. The up market capture ratio is the ratio of the fund's return in up markets to the index. The down market capture ratio is the ratio of the fund's return in down markets to the index. Ideally, the fund would have a greater up market capture ratio than down market capture ratio.

- **Standard Deviation:** Standard deviation is a statistical measure of the range of performance within which the total returns of a fund fall. When a fund has a high standard deviation, the range of performance is very wide, meaning there is a greater volatility. Approximately 68% of the time, the total return of any given fund will differ from the average total return by no more than plus or minus the standard deviation figure. Ninety-five percent of the time, a fund's total return will be within a range of plus or minus two times the standard deviation from the average total return. If the quarterly or monthly returns are all the same the standard deviation will be zero. The more they vary from one another, the higher the standard deviation. Standard deviation can be misleading as a risk indicator for funds with high total returns because large positive deviations will increase the standard deviation without a corresponding increase in the risk of the fund. While positive volatility is welcome, negative is not.
- **R-Squared:** This reflects the percentage of a fund's movements that are explained by movements in its benchmark index. An R-squared of 100 means that all movements of a fund are completely explained by movements in the index. Conversely, a low R-squared indicates very few of the fund's movements are explained by movements in the benchmark index. R-squared can also be used to ascertain the significance of a particular beta. Generally, a higher R-squared will indicate a more reliable beta figure. If the R-squared is lower, then the beta is less relevant to the fund's performance. A measure of diversification, R-squared indicates the extent to which fluctuations in portfolio returns are explained by market. An R-squared = 0.70 implies that 70% of the fluctuation in a portfolio's return is explained by the fluctuation in the market. In this instance, overweighting or underweighting of industry groups or individual securities is responsible for 30% of the fund's movement.
- **Beta:** This is a measure of a fund's market risk. The beta of the market is 1.00. Accordingly, a fund with a 1.10 beta is expected to perform 10% better than the market in up markets and 10% worse than the market in down markets. It is important to note, however, a low fund beta does not imply the fund has a low level of volatility; rather, a low beta means only that the fund's market-related risk is low. Because beta analyzes the market risk of a fund by showing how responsive the fund is to the market, its usefulness depends on the degree to which the markets determine the fund's total risk (indicated by R-squared).
- **Alpha:** The Alpha is the nonsystematic return, or the return that can't be attributed to the market. It can be thought of as how the manager performed if the market's return was zero. A positive alpha implies the manager added value to the return of the portfolio over that of the market. A negative alpha implies the manager did not contribute any value over the performance of the market.
- **Sharpe Ratio:** The Sharpe ratio is the excess return per unit of total risk as measured by standard deviation. Higher numbers are better, indicating more return for the level of risk experienced. The ratio is a fund's return minus the risk-free rate of return (30-day T-Bill rate) divided by the fund's standard deviation. The higher the Sharpe ratio, the more reward you are receiving per unit of total risk. This measure can be used to rank the performance of mutual funds or other portfolios.
- **Treynor Ratio:** The Treynor ratio measures returns earned in excess of that which could have been earned on a riskless investment per each unit of market risk. The ratio relates excess return over the risk-free rate to the additional risk taken; however, systematic risk is used instead of total risk. The Treynor ratio is similar to the Sharpe ratio, except in the fact that it uses the beta to evaluate the returns rather than the standard deviation of portfolio returns. High values mean better return for risk taken.
- **Tracking Error:** Tracking error measures the volatility of the difference in annual returns between the manager and the index. This value is calculated by measuring the standard deviation of the difference between the manager and index returns. For example, a tracking error of +/- 5 would mean there is about a 68% chance (1 standard deviation event) that the manager's returns will fall within +/- 5% of the benchmark's annual return.
- **Information Ratio:** The information ratio is a measure of the consistency of excess return. This value is determined by taking the annualized excess return over a benchmark (style benchmark by default) and dividing it by the standard deviation of excess return.
- **Consistency:** Consistency shows the percent of the periods the fund has beaten the index and the percent of the periods the index has beat the fund. A high average for the fund (e.g., over 50) is desirable, indicating the fund has beaten the index frequently.
- **Downside Risk:** Downside risk is a measure similar to standard deviation but focuses only on the negative movements of the return series. It is calculated by taking the standard deviation of the negative quarterly set of returns. The higher the factor, the riskier the product.
- **M-Squared:** M-squared, or the Modigliani risk-adjusted performance measure is used to characterize how well a portfolio's return rewards an investor for the amount of risk taken, relative to that of some benchmark portfolio and to the risk-free rate.

DEFINITION OF KEY PRIVATE EQUITY TERMS

- **PIC (Paid in Capital):** The amount of committed capital that has been transferred from the limited partner to the general partner.
- **TVPI (Total Value to Paid in Capital):** Money returned to limited partners plus the fund's unrealized investments, divided by money paid-in to the partnership. The TVPI should equal RVPI plus DPI.
- **DPI (Distribution to Paid In Capital):** Money returned (distributions) to limited partners divided by money paid in to the partnership. Also called cash-on-cash multiple.
- **RVPI (Residual Value to Paid In Capital):** The value of a fund's unrealized investments divided by money paid-in to the partnership.
- **Internal rate of return (IRR):** This is the most appropriate performance benchmark for private equity investments. It is a time-weighted return expressed as a percentage. IRR uses the present sum of cash drawdowns (money invested), the present value of distributions (money returned from investments) and the current value of unrealized investments and applies a discount.
- **Commitment:** Every investor in a private equity fund commits to investing a specified sum of money in the fund partnership over a specified period of time. The fund records this as the limited partnership's capital commitment. The sum of capital commitments is equal to the size of the fund.
- **Capital Distribution:** These are the returns that an investor in a private equity fund receives. It is the income and capital realized from investments less expenses and liabilities. Once a limited partner has had their cost of investment returned, further distributions are actual profit. The partnership agreement determines the timing of distributions to the limited partner. It will also determine how profits are divided among the limited partners and general partner.
- **Carried Interest:** The share of profits that the fund manager is due once it has returned the cost of investment to investors. Carried interest is normally expressed as a percentage of the total profits of the fund.
- **Co-Investment:** Co-Investments are minority investments made alongside a private equity investor in an LBO, a recapitalization, or an expansion capital transaction. It is a passive, non-controlling investment, as the private equity firm involved will typically exercise control and perform monitoring functions.
- **General Partner (GP):** This can refer to the top-ranking partners at a private equity firm as well as the firm managing the private equity fund.
- **GP Commitments:** It is normal practice for the GP managing a private equity fund to also make a financial commitment to the fund on the same basis as the LPs in the fund, and this is seen as an important factor driving the alignment of GP and LP interests. The historic benchmark for GP commitments has been 1% of the total fund size, but this is by no means universal, and many GPs commit significantly larger amounts. Furthermore, there has been a marked trend towards GPs making larger commitments to their funds over recent years.
- **Leveraged Buy-Out (LBO):** The acquisition of a company using debt and equity finance.
- **Limited Partner (LP):** Institutions or high-net-worth individuals/sophisticated investors that contribute capital to a private equity fund.
- **Public Market Equivalent (PME):** Performance measure used to evaluate performance relative to the market. It is calculated as the ratio of the discounted value of the LP's inflows divided by the discounted value of outflows, with the discounting performed using realized market returns.
- **Primaries:** An original investment vehicle that invests directly into a company or asset.

VALUATION POLICY

Fiducient Advisors does not engage an independent third-party pricing service to value securities. Our reports are generated using the security prices provided by custodians used by our clients. Our custodial pricing hierarchy is available upon request. If a client holds a security not reported by the first custodian within the hierarchy, the valuation is generated from the next custodian within the hierarchy, and so forth. Each custodian uses pricing services from outside vendors, where the vendors may generate nominally different prices. Therefore, this report can reflect minor valuation differences from those contained in a custodian's report. In rare instances where Fiducient Advisors overrides a custodial price, prices are taken from Bloomberg.

REPORTING POLICY

This report is intended for the exclusive use of the client listed within the report. Content is privileged and confidential. Any dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited. Information has been obtained from a variety of sources believed to be reliable though not independently verified. Any forecast represents median expectations and actual returns, volatilities and correlations will differ from forecasts. Please note each client has customized investment objectives and constraints and the investment strategy for each portfolio is based on a client-specific asset allocation model. Past performance does not indicate future performance and there is a possibility of a loss. Performance calculated net of investment fees. Certain portfolios presented may be gross of Fiducient Advisors' fees and actual performance would be reduced by investment advisory fees. This report does not represent a specific investment recommendation. Please consult with your advisor, attorney, and accountant, as appropriate, regarding specific advice.

Custodian reports are the reports that govern the account. There will be different account values between Fiducient Advisors' reports and the custodian reports based on whether the report utilizes trade date or settlement date to calculate value. Additionally, difference between values contained on reports may be caused by different accrued income values. Any forecasts represent future expectations and actual returns, volatilities and correlations will differ from forecasts. This report does not represent a specific investment recommendation. Please consult with your advisor, attorney, and accountant, as appropriate, regarding specific advice. Past performance does not indicate future performance and there is a possibility of a loss.

Manager performance for mutual funds and ETFs is based on NAV and provided by Lipper. Performance for non-mutual fund or ETF investments is based on the returns provided by managers, calculations based on a manager statement, or calculations based on a statement or data from the client's custodian. Unless specified otherwise, all returns are net of individual manager fees, represent total returns and are annualized for periods greater than one year. The deduction of fees produces a compounding effect that reduces the total rate of return over time. As an example, the effect of investment management fees on the total value of a client's portfolio assuming (a) quarterly fee assessment, (b) \$1,000,000 investment, (c) portfolio return of 8% a year, and (d) 0.50% annual investment advisory fee would be \$5,228 in the first year, and cumulative effects of \$30,342 over five years and \$73,826 over ten years. Additional information on advisory fees charged by Fiducient Advisors are described in Part 2 of the Form ADV.

OTHER

By regulation, closed-end funds utilizing debt for leverage must report their interest expense, as well as their income tax expense, as part of their total expense ratio. To make for a useful comparison between closed-end funds and both open-end funds and exchange-traded funds, adjusted expense ratios excluding interest and income tax expenses are utilized for closed-end funds within this report. See disclosure on closed-end fund fact sheets for information regarding the total expense ratio of each closed-end fund.

Please advise us of any changes in your objectives or circumstances.

CUSTODIAN STATEMENTS

Please remember to review the periodic statements you receive from you custodian. If you do not receive periodic statements from your custodian or notice issues with the activity reported in those statements, please contact Fiducient Advisors or your custodian immediately.

Town of Glastonbury

Administrative Services
Accounting Division

January 28, 2021

To: Board of Finance
Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager

From: Narae L. McManus, Controller

Subject: Monthly Investment Status

Pooled Investments

The Town's pooled cash investment balances at December 31, 2021 were \$91,673,352. As of month-end, the investment balances for all funds combined were as follows:

Type of Investment	Amount	Rate	
STIF	\$12,920,021	0.10	
Citizens Bank	1,224,665	0.10	
Northern Capital Investment Account	11,780,254	0.15-3.40	Est. current accrued interest \$13,114
Northern Capital Sewer Funds	9,503,618	0.20-3.15	Est. current accrued interest \$9,592
People's United Investments	24,691,798	0.12	
Liberty Bank Investments	21,050,125	0.15	
TD Bank Investments	2,497,939	0.10	
Liberty CD	<u>8,004,932</u>	0.20	Matures 5/27/22
Total	<u>\$91,673,352</u>		

General Fund Earnings

- The General Fund portion of pooled investments at December 31 was \$62.1 million.
- As of December 31, the General Fund has realized investment earnings of \$67,509.
- As of December 31, Sewer Sinking funds totaling \$9,451,000 were invested in fully-insured CDs with terms varying from 6 months to seven years, with current-year realized investment earnings of \$41,349.

Comparative information concerning General Fund earnings follows.

Fiscal Year	Budget	Realized Investment Earnings July-December	Percent of Budget
2021	\$838,000	96,671	11.54 %
2022	195,000	67,509	34.62

cc: Julie B. Twilley, Director of Finance

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES - Financial Administration

BOF 2/16/22
Item # 5

February 8, 2022

TO: Board of Finance and
Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager

FROM: *QBT* Julie Twilley, Director of Finance & Administrative Services

RE: Financial Summary for the Seven Months Ended January 31, 2022 (FY 2021/22)

Note that some variances to budget and prior year are a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Expenditure Summary:

Note that the attached report does not include approximately \$1.8m of Town Wages paid during the month of January. The implementation of the new payroll provider is on-going. Once completed, those wages will be included in the attached report. The summary provided below has been adjusted to include the \$1.8m of Town Wage expenditures paid in January.

Through January 31, 2022, encumbrances total \$55.9m and expenditures total \$94.7m. Combined, this represents 87% of the Town's revised general fund budget of \$173.5m. This compares to \$53.9m and \$92.2m respectively, or 85%, for the same period in the prior year.

The expenditure increase of \$2.5m is driven by the Town (+\$0.8m) and BOE (+\$2.3m), offset by a reduction in Debt/Transfers of \$0.6m. The increase is largely attributable to the annual Pension contribution. This year's pension contribution of \$10.76m is \$0.9m higher (\$0.7m Town / \$0.2m BOE) than the prior year's annual contribution. Note that the assumed long-term rate of return on investments was reduced from 6.5% to 6.25% in FY2021/2022 and the amortization period is 12 years (as of July 1, 2021 Actuarial Valuation). Also contributing to the increase in expenditures by the Town and BOE is summer programming that was held in 2021, but not in 2020, as well as general wage increases. The reduction in Debt/Transfers is driven by the reduction in the Capital Transfer from \$5.75m in FY2021 to \$5.25m in FY2022.

Below is an Expenditure & Transfer summary report through January 31, 2022.

FINANCIAL COMPARISONS

The below comparison includes Education encumbrance amounts not reflected in the Town's system Reports.

Fiscal Year	Amend/Budget	Expended	Encumbered	Comit %
<u>2020/2021</u>				
Town	\$ 45,784,716	\$26,598,831	\$ 9,765,326	79%
Education	111,754,046	55,831,517	39,924,564	86%
Debt/Transfers	14,331,799	9,765,470	4,173,977	97%
<u>2021/2022</u>				
Town	\$ 46,761,394	\$27,364,821	\$ 10,238,847	80%
Education	113,549,684	58,163,790	42,209,718	88%
Debt/Transfers	13,206,742	9,199,286	3,474,660	96%

Expenditure comparisons of the three major Town Departments (Admin. Services, Public Safety and Physical Services) is not available as the implementation of the new payroll provider is currently underway. This detail will be provided in the February Financial Summary.

cc: Karen Bonfiglio, Finance Manager; Narae McManus, Controller

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
CURRENT YEAR EXPENDITURES BY DIVISION
FY 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 31 2022

FUND 010 - GENERAL FUND

Description	2022 ORIGINAL BUDGET	2022 REVISED BUDGET	FY2022 THRU JANUARY	2022 ENCUMB	AVAILABLE BALANCE	2022 % USED
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
TOWN COUNCIL	149,007	150,232	106,285	11,981	31,966	78.7%
CUSTOMER SERVICE	63,659	63,659	26,856	498	36,306	43.0%
TOWN MANAGER	710,745	759,108	420,884	224,894	113,330	85.1%
HUMAN RESOURCES	702,268	702,268	327,107	158,273	216,888	69.1%
FACILITIES MAINTENANCE	1,936,856	1,968,489	987,332	430,962	550,194	72.0%
TOTAL GENERAL GOVERNMENT	3,562,535	3,643,756	1,868,464	826,607	948,684	74.0%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT						
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	700,343	761,543	502,667	250,539	8,338	98.9%
BUILDING INSPECTION	633,127	669,747	405,492	265,871	(1,615)	100.2%
FIRE MARSHAL	376,333	376,333	193,211	101,517	81,604	78.3%
HEALTH	796,843	796,843	438,999	227,754	130,091	83.7%
TOTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	2,506,646	2,604,466	1,540,368	845,681	218,417	91.6%
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES						
FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	746,119	773,765	434,653	258,585	80,527	89.6%
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	916,190	991,126	595,123	240,294	155,709	84.3%
ACCOUNTING	506,666	486,666	264,782	154,451	67,434	86.1%
PROPERTY ASSESSMENT	650,837	650,837	369,466	173,156	108,215	83.4%
REVENUE COLLECTION	517,508	517,508	279,362	165,311	72,835	85.9%
TOWN CLERK	547,806	546,306	303,707	174,978	67,621	87.6%
VOTER REGISTRATION	176,863	176,863	83,302	705	92,856	47.5%
LEGAL SERVICES	300,000	300,000	112,280	-	187,720	37.4%
PROBATE SERVICES	24,800	24,800	7,327	12,029	5,443	78.1%
INSURANCE/PENSIONS	1,968,268	1,952,018	1,458,865	120,338	372,816	80.9%
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	6,355,057	6,419,889	3,908,867	1,299,846	1,211,176	81.1%
PUBLIC SAFETY						
POLICE	14,659,602	14,820,076	8,730,456	3,833,778	2,255,842	84.8%
VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE	2,500	2,500	1,188	-	1,312	47.5%
FIRE	1,319,854	1,325,389	624,545	188,770	512,074	61.4%
CIVIL PREPAREDNESS	32,762	32,762	15,093	530	17,139	47.7%
TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY	16,014,718	16,180,727	9,371,282	4,023,078	2,786,367	82.8%
PHYSICAL SERVICES						
ENGINEERING	1,792,824	1,794,835	1,017,759	561,110	215,965	88.0%
HIGHWAY	4,428,930	4,428,930	1,964,419	1,402,757	1,061,754	76.0%
FLEET MAINTENANCE	1,224,959	1,224,959	548,576	352,235	324,148	73.5%
TOTAL PHYSICAL SERVICES	7,446,713	7,448,724	3,530,755	2,316,102	1,601,867	78.5%

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
CURRENT YEAR EXPENDITURES BY DIVISION
FY 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 31 2022

FUND 010 - GENERAL FUND

Description	2022 ORIGINAL BUDGET	2022 REVISED BUDGET	FY2022 THRU JANUARY	2022 ENCUMB	AVAILABLE BALANCE	2022 % USED
SANITATION						
REFUSE DISPOSAL	906,340	993,672	499,043	263,924	230,705	76.8%
TOTAL SANITATION	906,340	993,672	499,043	263,924	230,705	76.8%
HUMAN SERVICES						
CONTRIBUTORY GRANTS	34,077	34,077	34,077	-	-	100.0%
YOUTH/FAMILY SERVICES	1,576,528	1,576,528	869,760	449,499	257,270	83.7%
SENIOR & COMMUNITY SERVICES	1,529,020	1,540,724	732,342	323,349	485,032	68.5%
TOTAL HUMAN SERVICES	3,139,625	3,151,329	1,636,179	772,848	742,302	76.4%
LEISURE/CULTURE						
PARKS/RECREATION	4,284,254	4,432,707	2,221,884	1,188,525	1,022,299	76.9%
WELLES TURNER LIBRARY	1,869,016	1,871,125	1,020,682	454,535	395,909	78.8%
SOUTH GLASTONBURY LIBRARY	7,500	7,500	7,500	-	-	100.0%
EAST GLASTONBURY LIBRARY	7,500	7,500	7,500	-	-	100.0%
TOTAL LEISURE/CULTURE	6,168,270	6,318,832	3,257,565	1,643,059	1,418,207	77.6%
OTHER:Debt & Transfers						
DEBT SERVICE	7,036,742	7,036,742	3,030,623	3,474,660	531,459	92.4%
TRANSFERS	6,037,000	6,170,000	6,168,663	-	1,337	100.0%
TOTAL OTHER:Debt & Transfers	13,073,742	13,206,742	9,199,286	3,474,660	532,796	96.0%
EDUCATION						
EDUCATION	113,549,684	115,919,582	58,274,286	750	57,644,546	50.3%
TOTAL EDUCATION	113,549,684	115,919,582	58,274,286	750	57,644,546	50.3%
TOTAL 010 - GENERAL FUND	172,723,330	175,887,718	93,086,096	15,466,554	67,335,068	61.7%

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES - Financial Administration

February 8, 2022

TO: Board of Finance
FROM: *qst* Julie Twilley, Director of Finance & Administrative Services
RE: Capital Projects Fund Expenditures Report
For the Period Ended January 31, 2022 (FY 2021/2022)

The funding presented on this statement has been authorized by referendum, the annual Capital Improvement Program and additional appropriations from the Capital Reserve Fund balance as noted below. The Capital Program designation includes funding resources of the Capital Reserve Fund, Sewer Assessments Fund, or Sewer Operating Fund and grants. In some cases, funding resources may also be provided from General Fund fund balance.

Current appropriated funding for all Capital projects as indicated on the January 31, 2022 report is **\$91.3m**.

Expenditures for current projects since inception through January 31, 2022 total **\$71.5m**. Encumbrances outstanding total **\$3.2m**. The most significant encumbrances are for Welles Turner Library Renovation (\$1.2m), GHS Fieldhouse (\$0.9m), Splash Pad (\$0.2m), Multi-School Locker Replacement (\$0.2m) and Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation (\$0.2m).

Capital expenditures through the month of January totaled **\$6.6m** and were for the Welles Turner Library Renovation, Road Overlay, GHS Field House, Heavy Equipment, Town Aid Roads, Smith Middle School Gym Floor and other capital projects.

Attachment

Cc: Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager
Narae McManus, Controller
Karen Bonfiglio, Business Manager, Board of Education

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
FY 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 31 2022

Description	REVISED BUDGET	EXPENDITURES INCEPTION TO DATE	FY2022 THRU JANUARY	2022 ENCUMB	AVAILABLE BALANCE
FUND 301 - CAPITAL RESERVE PROJECTS					
GenGovt/Public Safety (31006)					
51827 Town Buildings Security	700,000	565,256	22,250	21,045	113,699
51828 Facilities Study	70,000	-	-	-	70,000
51833 Disaster Prep/Recovery Resourc	1,134,000	883,866	-	-	250,134
51835 Fire Co Renovations/Code Compl	510,960	293,641	5,955	5,540	211,778
51836 Self Containd Breath Apparatus	520,000	520,788	-	-	(788)
51849 Public Safety Communications	1,270,000	397,516	-	-	872,484
51854 Police Building Windows	142,500	88,301	-	55,852	(1,653)
51854 Police Building Windows (Pol Bthrm Ren)	110,000	99,249	-	1,065	9,686
51855 Fiber Optic Network-School/Twn	1,192,000	1,124,420	7,311	-	67,580
51873 Land Acquisition	1,261,639	1,209,568	39,000	-	52,071
51875 Town Facilities Shop/Storage	1,195,000	1,165,381	117,921	1,500	28,119
51888 Property Revaluation	1,981,500	1,609,836	28,214	8,166	363,498
51892 Document Management System	460,000	376,207	44,845	68,010	15,783
51912 Tn Hall Improvements	1,718,849	1,714,150	-	-	4,699
51914 Townwide Roof Replacement	830,000	672,858	-	-	157,142
51915 Clean Renewable Energy In	1,487,044	1,372,246	44,158	9,656	105,142
51918 Design Guidelines	125,000	-	-	-	125,000
Total GenGovt/Public Safety	14,708,492	12,093,283	309,654	170,835	2,444,374
PhyServices Sanitation (31007)					
52828 Main Street Reconstruction	1,860,600	-	-	-	1,860,600
52829 Gateway Corp Park Bicyc Pedst	940,700	-	-	-	940,700
52830 Bridge Replacement/Rehabil	5,150,000	4,651,192	64,799	189,742	309,066
52831 Undergrd Fuel Strg Tank Replac	375,000	-	-	-	375,000
52847 Douglas/Sycamore Str Alignment	235,000	28,811	-	1,089	205,100
52848 Main Street Sidewalks Phase 3	1,420,000	653,094	22,780	15,281	751,625
52871 Parking/Access Drive Improvmt	1,000,000	825,045	228,155	-	174,955
52872 Hebron Avenue Resurfacing	1,276,806	1,134,807	61,812	-	141,999
52879 Sidewalk Construction Townwide ()	5,477	5,477	-	-	-
52879 Sidewalk Construction Townwide ()	494,045	-	-	-	494,045
52881 Cedar Ridge Public Water	250,000	250,000	-	-	-
52882 Sidewalk Repair and Maintenanc	600,000	580,734	231,091	-	19,266
52883 Townwide Drainage Solutions	300,000	212,164	95,005	995	86,841
52884 Town Center Streetscape Improv	206,186	-	-	-	206,186
52886 Old Maids Lane-Public Water	175,000	-	-	-	175,000
52946 Road Overlay ()	1,387,096	1,387,096	-	-	-
52946 Road Overlay ()	1,609,639	1,260,836	1,260,836	117,557	231,246
52949 Gen Bicycle/pedestrian Imprvmt	164,262	-	-	-	164,262
52951 Heavy Equipment	649,021	628,553	464,851	-	20,468
52958 Glastonbury Blvd Paving	2,200,000	1,978,565	85,077	8,815	212,620

**TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
FY 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 31 2022**

Description	REVISED BUDGET	EXPENDITURES INCEPTION TO DATE	FY2022 THRU JANUARY	2022 ENCUMB	AVAILABLE BALANCE
52959 Traffic Calming	100,000	-	-	-	100,000
52960 Renovation andSite Restoration	1,573,189	1,576,344	-	-	(3,155)
52960 Renovation andSite Restoration (Slocumb Dam)	275,000	232,901	10,900	-	42,099
52963 Hebron Ave/House St Improvemen	1,975,000	1,610,474	94,608	2,843	361,684
52964 Public Water Service - Uranium	50,000	28,450	1,910	6,550	15,000
52965 Mill St Bridge Replacement	180,000	-	-	-	180,000
Total PhyServices Sanitation	24,452,020	17,044,542	2,621,824	342,871	7,064,607
Culture/Parks &Recreation (31008)					
53825 Addison Park Renovations	295,000	29,382	20,000	3,830	261,789
53832 Aquatics Facility	125,000	112,896	-	-	12,104
53837 Minnechaug Golf Improvements	512,500	391,294	1,692	50	121,156
53838 Library Exterior Renovations	94,624	-	-	-	94,624
53839 Multi-Use Trail	1,228,000	1,098,520	54,752	14,965	114,515
53841 Splash Pad	550,013	350,850	155,038	192,432	6,731
53842 PICKLEBALL COURTS	80,000	4,800	4,800	1,200	74,000
53843 Riverfront Park and Boathouse	90,000	20,463	20,463	16,575	52,962
53853 Mower 16' Rotary Mower Rplcmnt	113,415	113,415	-	-	-
53856 Parks Facility Renov/Expansion	1,067,500	1,006,331	-	23,391	37,778
53856 Parks Facility Renov/Expansion ()	-	925	-	-	(925)
53857 Riverfront Park Extension	803,973	777,023	-	-	26,950
53860 Library Upgrade/Redesign	412,000	247,561	-	-	164,439
53874 Tree Management	503,205	416,467	172,980	71,519	15,218
53875 Cider Mill	80,000	39,926	-	-	40,074
53920 Open Space Access	540,000	337,861	-	1,000	201,139
53921 Winter Hill	235,000	133,573	17,805	6,250	95,177
Total Culture/Parks &Recreation	6,730,230	5,081,288	447,531	331,212	1,317,730
Education (31009)					
55836 HVAC/Boilers (CAP RES-GID WEL)	1,414,178	1,392,276	-	20,450	1,452
55839 Energy Audit--All Schools	260,500	241,303	-	-	19,197
55847 GHS Fieldhouse	2,328,004	1,607,918	877,958	860,658	(140,572)
55860 GHS Kitchen Upgrades	1,675,000	1,649,688	-	-	25,312
55863 GHS Parking and Access Drives	365,000	365,616	-	-	(616)
55868 Smith Middle School Gym Floor	621,664	621,343	311,680	-	321
55870 School Roofs	50,000	14,788	-	-	35,212
55871 Multi-School Locker Replacemnt	460,000	27	27	231,773	228,200
55872 Gideon Welles Design-Roof Repl	50,000	3,150	3,150	32,200	14,650
55873 EDU-Feasibility Analysis/Cost	100,000	-	-	-	100,000
Total Education	7,324,346	5,896,110	1,192,815	1,145,081	283,155
TOTAL 301 - CAPITAL RESERVE PROJECTS	53,215,088	40,115,223	4,571,824	1,989,999	11,109,866
FUND 302 - SEWER SINKING PROJECTS					

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
FY 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 31 2022

Description	REVISED BUDGET	EXPENDITURES INCEPTION TO DATE	FY2022 THRU JANUARY	2022 ENCUMB	AVAILABLE BALANCE
PhySer Sewer Sinking (32007)					
52887 Eastbury Pump Statn Generator	75,000	-	-	-	75,000
52888 WPC Emergency Power	202,500	154,104	-	-	48,396
52889 WPC Energy Conservation Prog	315,000	92,247	-	12,021	210,731
52893 Cider Mill Pump Station	1,791,000	1,670,692	-	-	120,308
52937 Sewer System Force Main Evalua	150,000	-	-	-	150,000
Total PhySer Sewer Sinking	2,533,500	1,917,043	-	12,021	604,435
TOTAL 302 - SEWER SINKING PROJECTS	2,533,500	1,917,043	-	12,021	604,435
FUND 303 - LAND ACQUISITION					
Land / Open Space (33157)					
78830 Land 2017	4,000,000	3,805,247	-	-	194,753
78831 Land 2020	3,000,000	-	-	-	3,000,000
Total Land / Open Space	7,000,000	3,805,247	-	-	3,194,753
TOTAL 303 - LAND ACQUISITION	7,000,000	3,805,247	-	-	3,194,753
FUND 304 - TOWN AID					
PhySer Conn Grant (33207)					
52942 Town Aid Improved Rds ()	207,928	207,928	-	-	-
52942 Town Aid Improved Rds ()	866,886	304,630	304,630	31,794	530,462
52943 Town Aid Unimproved Rds ()	5,510	5,510	-	-	-
52943 Town Aid Unimproved Rds ()	25,314	-	-	-	25,314
Total PhySer Conn Grant	1,105,638	518,068	304,630	31,794	555,776
TOTAL 304 - TOWN AID	1,105,638	518,068	304,630	31,794	555,776
FUND 314 - RIVERFRONT PARK					
Riverfront Park - Phase I (34560)					
66805 Administrative	147,738	147,737	-	-	1
66810 Engineering	121,418	121,417	-	-	1
66824 Machinery & Equipment	196,373	196,373	-	-	-
66825 Construction	3,784,471	3,784,470	-	-	1
66829 Contingency	-	-	-	-	-
Total Riverfront Park - Phase I	4,250,000	4,249,998	-	-	2
RIVERFRONT PARK - PHASE II (34561)					
66805 Administrative	18,000	17,962	-	-	38
66810 Engineering	863,500	844,120	-	74	19,306
66825 Construction	14,680,000	14,712,305	-	-	(32,305)
66829 Contingency	48,500	30,833	-	-	17,668
Total RIVERFRONT PARK - PHASE II	15,610,000	15,605,220	-	74	4,706
TOTAL 314 - RIVERFRONT PARK	19,860,000	19,855,218	-	74	4,708

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
FY 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 31 2022

Description	REVISED BUDGET	EXPENDITURES INCEPTION TO DATE	FY2022 THRU JANUARY	2022 ENCUMB	AVAILABLE BALANCE
FUND 316 - GATEWAY PROJECT					
Gateway Corporate Park (35357)					
52845 Gateway Corp. Park	888,541	869,410	-	-	19,131
Total Gateway Corporate Park	888,541	869,410	-	-	19,131
TOTAL 316 - GATEWAY PROJECT	888,541	869,410	-	-	19,131
FUND 318 - LIBRARY RENOVATION					
Welles Turner Library Renov (34509)					
66805 Administrative	110,515	119,971	57,654	11,203	(20,659)
66810 Engineering	500,000	460,895	41,590	31,731	7,374
66824 Machinery & Equipment	550,000	12,328	12,328	517,344	20,328
66825 Construction	5,000,000	3,797,822	1,617,308	636,098	566,079
66829 Contingency	350,000	-	-	-	350,000
Total Welles Turner Library Renov	6,510,515	4,391,016	1,728,879	1,196,377	923,121
TOTAL 318 - LIBRARY RENOVATION	6,510,515	4,391,016	1,728,879	1,196,377	923,121
FUND 319 - BULKY WASTE CLOSURE FUND					
BULKY WASTE CLOSURE FUND (34519)					
66829 Contingency	160,000	-	-	-	160,000
Total BULKY WASTE CLOSURE FUND	160,000	-	-	-	160,000
TOTAL 319 - BULKY WASTE CLOSURE FUND	160,000	-	-	-	160,000
GRAND TOTAL	91,273,282	71,471,225	6,605,332	3,230,266	16,571,791

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

TO: Board of Finance
Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager

BOF 2/16/22
Item # 7

FROM: ^{JBT} Julie Twilley, Director of Finance & Administrative Services

DATE: February 3, 2022

SUBJECT: Self Insurance Reserve Update January 2022

The attached report summarizes the Self Insurance Reserve fund through January 31, 2022. The total reserve is \$14,994,749 allocated \$3,350,131 and \$11,644,618 between Town and Board of Education, respectively. As of January the fund is experiencing a \$515,994 gain for the fiscal year.

As of January, all reimbursements from CT Prime for FY2021 large loss claims have been received.

There are 6 large loss claims which are defined as any claims that exceed \$50,000. BOE has 5 while the Town has 1 large loss claims. No claims have exceeded the individual Stop Loss limit. The Individual Stop Loss limit is \$200,000 for BOE and \$150,000 for the Town.

Enc.

cc: Dr. Alan Bookman, Superintendent
Karen Bonfiglio, Business Manager

SELF INSURANCE RESERVE FUND

YTD Balances As of: January 31, 2022

	Town	Education	Total
Contributions			
Employer	\$2,950,468	\$6,894,325	\$9,844,793
Employee	701,876	1,824,877	2,526,753
Stop Loss Reimbursement	63,056	90,043	153,099
Total Revenues	\$3,715,400	\$8,809,245	\$12,524,645
Expenditures			
Anthem			
ASO Fees	\$71,134	\$270,771	\$341,905
Claims	2,146,710	7,711,713	9,858,423
	\$2,217,844	\$7,982,485	\$10,200,328
CTCare			
ASO Fees	-	-	-
Claims	24,052	239,412	263,464
	24,051.96	\$239,412	\$263,464
Delta Dental			
ASO Fees	\$9,965	-	\$9,965
Claims	107,232	-	107,232
	\$117,197	-	\$117,197
Bank Fees/PCORI Fee	\$1,168	\$3,815	\$4,983
CT Prime	354,364	1,000,815	\$1,355,179
OneDigital Consultant Fees	13,500	54,000	67,500
	\$369,033	\$1,058,630	\$1,427,663
Total Expenditures	\$2,728,125	\$9,280,527	\$12,008,652
Current Year Revenues Less Expenses	\$987,275	(\$471,281)	\$515,994
Reserve July 1, 2021	\$2,362,857	\$12,115,899	\$14,478,755
Reserve at end of month	\$3,350,131	\$11,644,618	\$14,994,749

	Town		BOE		Total
Reserve at end of month	\$ 3,350,131	\$	11,644,618	\$	14,994,749
Recommended Minimum Reserve ^A	\$ 1,239,554	\$	4,125,707	\$	5,365,261
Variance Over/(Under) Reserved	\$ 2,110,577	\$	7,518,911	\$	9,629,488

A. As of February 2022. The next update will be provided in May 2022.

**TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS**

FUND	GENERAL FUND
SOURCE OF FUNDS	GENERAL FUND – INTRA DEPARTMENT
ACTION REQUIRED	TOWN MANAGER

REASON FOR TRANSFER

Additional funds are required for annual audit fees. This transfer will reallocate Professional Service funds from the Town Manager department to the Town Council department.

TRANSFER FROM	ACCOUNT CODE	AMOUNT
GENERAL FUND		
Town Manager – Professional Services	01113-43660	\$3,000

TRANSFER TO	ACCOUNT CODE	AMOUNT
GENERAL FUND		
Town Council – Professional Services	01111-43660	\$3,000

Date 1-27-2022 Town Manager 

**TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS**

FUND	SEWER OPERATING FUND
SOURCE OF FUNDS	SEWER SINKING FUND
ACTION REQUIRED	TOWN MANAGER, BOARD OF FINANCE & TOWN COUNCIL

REASON FOR TRANSFER

Funds are for the construction cost for the installation of 140 lf of 8" sanitary sewer main and two (2) sewer laterals to provide future sanitary sewer service to #235 and #242 Addison Road.

TRANSFER FROM	ACCOUNT CODE	AMOUNT
SEWER SINKING FUND		
Sewer Sinking – Unassigned Fund Balance	60100-09241	\$30,000

TRANSFER TO	ACCOUNT CODE	AMOUNT
SEWER OPERATING FUND		
SOP Expenditures – Road/Sewer Projects	27521-44750	\$30,000

Date <u>2-11-2022</u>	Town Manager
Date	Board of Finance

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS

FUND	SEWER OPERATING FUND
SOURCE OF FUNDS	SEWER SINKING FUND
ACTION REQUIRED	TOWN MANAGER, BOARD OF FINANCE & TOWN COUNCIL

REASON FOR TRANSFER

Funds are for developer reimbursement for the installation of 6-inch pvc sanitary sewer laterals and 1-1/4" pvc force main laterals for future sanitary sewer service for the existing houses on Bell Street as stipulated within Developer's Permit-Agreement #227, Special Condition #4 for the project known as "Stallion Ridge Subdivision".

TRANSFER FROM	ACCOUNT CODE	AMOUNT
SEWER SINKING FUND		
Sewer Sinking – Unassigned Fund Balance	60100-09241	\$45,000

TRANSFER TO	ACCOUNT CODE	AMOUNT
SEWER OPERATING FUND		
SOP Expenditures – Road/Sewer Projects	27521-44750	\$45,000

Date 2-11-2022

Town Manager

Date _____

Board of Finance

**PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT
GRAND LIST REPORT – OCTOBER 1, 2021**

The 2021 Grand List was completed and signed on January 28, 2022. The total net taxable assessed value of \$4,459,844,490 is an increase of 3.41% over the 2020 Grand List. The grand list as filed by the Assessor is subject to adjustment by the Board of Assessment Appeals resulting from their March hearings, appeals brought to the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, and other lawful changes. A summary of the dollar and percentage changes from the 2020 to 2021 Grand List by major property class is listed below:

NET ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>\$ CHANGE</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
REAL ESTATE	\$3,790,109,620	3,828,104,140	37,994,520	1.00%
PERSONAL PROPERTY	191,885,050	193,857,400	1,972,350	1.03%
MOTOR VEHICLE	330,913,851	437,882,950	106,969,099	32.33%
TOTALS	\$4,312,908,521	\$4,459,844,490	\$146,935,969	3.41%

The 3.41% increase of the 2021 taxable grand list greatly exceeds the steady pattern of growth in the list since 2007. This unprecedented gain in the tax base, in a non-revaluation year, is an anomaly and the 2021 Grand list is a reflection of the lack of normalcy in current market conditions.

In 2021 the area real estate market continued its upward trajectory. Coalesced effects of the pandemic and continued inventory shortages added to the already heightened demand for quality properties. Annual growth in the number of residential sales in Glastonbury increased from 527 to 655 (26%) over the previous GL year. In addition, the average sales price increased from \$379,853 to \$419,816 (10.5%), capping a robust improvement in year-over-year growth. These results are similar to comparable towns and are attributed to the ongoing effects of COVID 19: limited supply, favorable demographics (aging millennials), and historically low interest rates.

Key indicators of sustained growth included new house permits and the number of home renovations and additions. New home construction remained steady with about 50 new homes created last year. The continued success of two recently completed developments buoyed the market, while several small projects and one emerging mid-sized project offered sustained continuity of local housing supply and demand. Building permits issued for residential additions and alterations remained robust as residents continue to invest in their homes. Residential development projects underway include: a 29 lot subdivision on Bell St, a 7 lot subdivision on Main St, in addition to the typical handful of 1 and 2 lot cuts.

The local commercial market remained steady, albeit somewhat reserved, as compared to the pre-pandemic market. Fewer commercial projects were initiated this year due to an uncertain business outlook. However, several projects were completed including: a new 20,000 sq. ft. office property at 340 Hebron Ave, an Amazon distribution center on Eastern Blvd, a repurposed 11,700 sq. ft. shared office building on Griswold St., and a 30,000 sq. ft. gym on Main St.

New commercial projects underway include: an 18 unit office condo complex on Addison Rd, a new bank building at 117 New London Tpke, and an addition to an apartment complex on House St. Projects on hold include: an 11,000 sq. ft. restaurant/retail building in the Shoppes on Main complex and a 7,600 sq. ft. retail/apartment building on Hebron Ave. In summary, the commercial rental market remained stable and occupancy rates remained relatively high.

While the personal property sector saw a virtually flat increase of 1%, the forty accounts that showed the largest growth combined to add an additional \$12.5 million. Twelve of those forty were businesses new to our list; a good indication of continued reinvestment in our community. The median business personal property account assessment increased by \$480 to \$8390. As new commercial projects come online we anticipate growth in the personal property sector to return to typical levels.

The unprecedented 32% increase in the motor vehicle list is a direct result of the weak supply and strong demand for both new and used vehicles. The average vehicle assessment increased significantly for both new (22%) and used (30%) vehicles. Vehicle values have been increasing over the past decade enabled by relatively low interest rates, this coupled with the supply issue produced the scenario playing out in every town in Connecticut as well as on the national level.

Attached are various documents that illustrate the information above and the historical grand list comparisons.

**TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
2021 GRAND LIST**

	TOTAL RECORDS	GROSS ASSESSMENT	EXEMPTIONS	NET ASSESSMENT
REAL ESTATE	13,972	\$ 3,831,966,690	\$ 3,862,550	\$ 3,828,104,140
PERSONAL PROPERTY	2,053	\$ 221,225,530	\$ 27,368,130	\$ 193,857,400
MOTOR VEHICLES	31,370	\$ 439,650,360	\$ 1,767,410	\$ 437,882,950
TOTAL TAXABLE	47,395	\$ 4,492,842,580	\$ 32,998,090	\$ 4,459,844,490
TAX EXEMPT REAL ESTATE	593	\$ 265,507,080	\$ 265,507,080	-

I, Nicole Lintereur, Assessor of the Town of Glastonbury, do solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that I believe that all the lists, and the abstract of said town for the year 2021, are made and perfected according to law; so help me God or upon penalty of perjury.

Nicole Lintereur CCMA II

Subscribed and sworn this 28th day of January 2022.

**TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
OCTOBER 1, 2021
TOP TEN TAXPAYERS**

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>NET ASSESSMENT</u>
1. Connecticut Light and Power Co Location: Various	Personal & Real Property Public Utility	\$ 60,242,390
2. Shops at Somerset Square LLC Location: 120-170 Glastonbury Blvd	Real Property Retail/Office Center Somerset Square	\$ 28,746,980
3. New London Turnpike Apartments Investors LLC Location: 911 New London Tpke	Personal & Real Property Apartments The Tannery	\$ 27,983,680
4. SCT Glastonbury LLC Location: 200 Glastonbury Blvd	Real Property Office Building	\$ 18,736,700
5. Glastonbury Developers LLC Location: 1-10 Glastonbury Pl	Personal & Real Property Apartments Glastonbury Place	\$ 18,610,940
6. Connecticut Natural Gas Corp Location: Various	Personal & Real Property Public Utility	\$ 18,039,140
7. Glastonbury MZL LLC Location: 215 Glastonbury Blvd	Real Property Stop & Shop/Restaurant Barnes & Noble/Retail	\$ 17,850,000
8. SHP V Glastonbury LLC Location: 281 Western Blvd	Personal & Real Property Assisted Living Center Hearth at Glastonbury	\$ 16,775,080
9. Siebar Glastonbury LLC Location: 95 Glastonbury Blvd & N/1D Glastonbury Blvd	Real Property Office Building	\$ 15,933,200
10. Brixmor Residual Shoppes at Fox Run LLC Location: 55 Welles St	Real Property Retail/Office Center Shoppes at Fox Run	\$ 15,604,700

**TOWN OF GLASTONBURY
TOP TEN TAXPAYERS
NET GRAND LIST COMPARISON**

2021 RANK	2021 GRAND LIST	2019 RANK	2020 GRAND LIST
1	Connecticut Light & Power Co 60,242,390	1	Connecticut Light & Power Co 58,599,080
2	Shops At Somerset Square LLC 28,746,980	2	Shops At Somerset Square LLC 28,696,520
3	New London Turnpike Apts Investors LLC 27,983,680	3	New London Turnpike Apts Investors LLC 27,997,330
4	SCT Glastonbury LLC 18,736,700	4	SCT Glastonbury LLC 18,736,700
5	Glastonbury Developers LLC 18,610,940	5	Glastonbury Developers LLC 18,619,780
6	Connecticut Natural Gas Corp. 18,039,140	6	Glastonbury MZL LLC 17,850,000
7	Glastonbury MZL LLC 17,850,000	7	Connecticut Natural Gas Corp. 17,533,700
8	SHP V Glastonbury LLC 16,755,080	8	SHP V Glastonbury LLC 16,775,950
9	Siebar Glastonbury LLC 15,933,200	9	Siebar Glastonbury LLC 15,933,200
10	Brixmor Residual Shoppes at Fox Run LLC 15,604,700	10	Brixmor Residual Shoppes at Fox Run LLC 15,604,700
TOTAL NET ASSESSMENT - TOP 10 TAXPAYERS		TOTAL NET ASSESSMENT - TOP 10 TAXPAYERS	
	\$ 238,502,810		\$ 236,346,960
TOTAL NET TAXABLE GRAND LIST AS RECORDED		TOTAL NET TAXABLE GRAND LIST AS RECORDED	
	\$ 4,459,844,490		\$ 4,315,682,110
TOP 10 TAXPAYERS - % OF NET TAXABLE GRAND LIST		TOP 10 TAXPAYERS - % OF NET TAXABLE GRAND LIST	
	5.35%		5.48%

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY

NET GRAND LIST COMPARISON

GRAND LIST YEAR	FILING	NET REAL ESTATE	% CHANGE	NET MOTOR VEHICLES	% CHANGE	NET PERSONAL PROPERTY	% CHANGE	TOTAL NET GRAND LIST	% CHANGE
2021	GL	3,828,104,140	1.00%	437,882,950	32.33%	193,857,400	1.03%	4,459,844,490	3.41%
2020	M-13	3,790,109,620	0.74%	330,913,851	1.93%	191,885,050	1.69%	4,312,908,521	0.87%
2019	M-13	3,762,445,050	0.77%	324,656,425	4.48%	188,694,150	4.39%	4,275,795,625	1.20%
2018	M-13	3,733,568,732	0.89%	310,733,385	1.64%	180,757,180	4.64%	4,225,059,297	1.10%
2017	M-13	3,700,648,330	5.72%	305,704,967	1.55%	172,741,770	2.62%	4,179,095,067	5.28%
2016	M-13	3,500,283,250	0.78%	301,033,938	4.04%	168,338,990	10.25%	3,969,656,178	1.39%
2015	M-13	3,473,047,910	0.84%	289,339,179	1.81%	152,683,130	6.80%	3,915,070,219	1.13%
2014	M-13	3,444,157,270	0.97%	284,182,566	-0.40%	142,965,510	5.00%	3,871,305,346	1.01%
2013	M-13	3,411,096,980	0.41%	285,337,812	3.02%	136,154,620	1.31%	3,832,589,412	0.63%
2012	M-13	3,397,125,130	-10.47%	276,964,728	-0.91%	134,390,960	0.40%	3,808,546,358	-9.48%
2011	M-13	3,794,251,380	0.38%	279,506,755	6.53%	133,855,780	8.75%	4,207,613,915	1.01%
2010	M-13	3,779,949,600	0.69%	262,361,630	4.78%	123,087,850	1.23%	4,165,399,080	0.96%
2009	M-13	3,753,952,660	0.57%	250,386,760	1.82%	121,594,980	-3.37%	4,125,934,400	0.52%
2008	M-13	3,732,765,620	1.07%	245,906,870	-5.82%	125,837,230	5.49%	4,104,509,720	0.76%
2007	M-13	3,693,298,370	35.78%	261,102,670	1.70%	119,289,968	6.64%	4,073,691,008	31.89%
2006	M-13	2,720,006,360	1.97%	256,736,240	1.40%	111,864,380	1.45%	3,088,606,980	1.91%
2005	M-13	2,667,368,660	1.87%	253,184,290	4.06%	110,269,840	1.06%	3,030,822,790	2.02%
2004	M-13	2,618,328,700	1.48%	243,311,340	7.68%	109,115,670	4.51%	2,970,755,710	2.07%
2003	M-13	2,580,164,650	1.40%	225,949,140	-4.07%	104,406,400	3.11%	2,910,520,190	1.01%
2002	M-13	2,544,561,400	40.38%	235,536,360	3.82%	101,260,080	0.29%	2,881,357,840	34.62%
2001	M-13	1,812,588,970	2.53%	226,876,490	2.66%	100,969,940	4.21%	2,140,435,400	2.62%
2000	M-13	1,767,852,680	2.34%	220,997,560	6.15%	96,895,020	7.49%	2,085,745,260	2.96%
1999	M-13	1,727,455,190	2.68%	208,187,320	11.48%	90,141,310	6.58%	2,025,783,820	3.69%

-M-13 Filing is the Grand List as reported to the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management after the completion of the Board of Assessment Appeals
 -GL filing is made prior to the meetings of the Board of Assessment Appeals

- **Bold indicates year of revaluation**

TOWN OF GLASTONBURY

NET ASSESSMENT COMPARISON BY SUB-CLASS

PERCENTAGE OF GRAND LIST

<u>GRAND LIST YEAR</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
RESIDENTIAL / PA490	73.6%	73.3%	72.8%	71.7%	71.6%	71.3%	71.2%	69.5%
COM / IND / PUBLIC UTILITY	15.3%	15.3%	15.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	16.3%
PP TOTAL	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	4.2%	4.3%	4.4%	4.4%	4.3%
MV TOTAL	7.4%	7.4%	7.6%	7.4%	7.4%	7.6%	7.7%	9.8%
GRAND TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sums in excess of 100% are due to rounding to 1 decimal place

PERSONAL PROPERTY GRAND LIST

Account and Assessment Information

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
TOTAL ACCOUNTS	2,197	2,223	2,200	2,106	2,053
DELETED ACCOUNTS	203	171	208	197	200
ADDED ACCOUNTS	143	194	178	102	142
MEDIAN ASSESSMENT	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$8,520	\$7,910	\$8,390
TOTAL NET ASSESSMENT	172,741,770	180,757,180	188,694,150	191,885,050	193,857,400
TOP TEN TOTAL ASSESSMENT	86,832,140	93,605,210	98,042,730	101,292,730	101,981,260
TOP 10 ACCOUNTS % OF TOTAL PP	50.27%	51.79%	51.96%	52.79%	52.61%
INCREASE OVER PREVIOUS YEAR	2.62%	4.64%	4.39%	1.69%	1.03%
ASSESSMENT INCREASE	4,402,780	8,015,410	7,936,970	3,190,900	1,972,350
FMV INCREASE \$	\$ 6,289,686	\$ 11,450,586	\$ 11,338,529	\$ 4,558,429	\$ 2,817,643

MOTOR VEHICLE GRAND LIST

NUMBER OF ASSESSED VEHICLES - ALL TYPES AND NEW MODEL YEARS

GRAND LIST	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
TOTAL MOTOR VEHICLES	31,814	31,725	32,091	31,855	31,568	32,011	32,035	32,161	32,497	31,307	31,370
CHANGE	(115)	(89)	366	(236)	(287)	443	24	126	336	(1,190)	63
PERCENTAGE CHANGE	-0.4%	-0.3%	1.2%	-0.7%	-0.9%	1.4%	0.1%	0.4%	1.0%	-3.7%	0.2%
NEW MODEL VEHICLES	1,852	2,101	2,352	2,093	2,189	2,208	2,202	2,028	1,966	1,500	1,830
CHANGE	34	249	251	(259)	96	19	(6)	(174)	(62)	(466)	330
PERCENTAGE CHANGE	1.9%	13.4%	11.9%	-11.0%	4.6%	0.9%	-0.3%	-7.9%	-3.1%	-23.7%	22.0%

AVERAGE ASSESSMENT INFORMATION - ALL AND NEW MODEL YEARS FOR PASSENGER VEHICLES

GRAND LIST	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
ALL MOTOR VEHICLES	\$ 8,840	\$ 8,755	\$ 8,995	\$ 9,944	\$ 9,224	\$ 9,448	\$ 10,646	\$ 10,780	\$ 11,060	\$ 11,760	\$ 15,507
CHANGE	\$ 575	\$ (85)	\$ 240	\$ 949	\$ (720)	\$ 224	\$ 1,198	\$ 134	\$ 280	\$ 700	\$ 3,747
PERCENTAGE CHANGE	7.0%	-1.0%	2.7%	10.6%	-7.2%	2.4%	12.7%	1.3%	2.6%	6.3%	31.9%
NEW MODEL VEHICLES	\$ 20,569	\$ 19,770	\$ 20,511	\$ 22,615	\$ 22,062	\$ 22,680	\$ 24,651	\$ 25,083	\$ 25,556	\$ 27,560	\$ 33,613
CHANGE	\$ 1,407	\$ (799)	\$ 741	\$ 2,104	\$ (553)	\$ 618	\$ 1,971	\$ 432	\$ 473	\$ 2,004	\$ 6,053
PERCENTAGE CHANGE	7.3%	-3.9%	3.7%	10.3%	-2.4%	2.8%	8.7%	1.8%	1.9%	7.8%	22.0%

MEDIAN VEHICLE MODEL YEAR AND AGE FOR PASSENGER VEHICLES

GRAND LIST	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
MEDIAN MODEL YEAR	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2012	2013
APPROXIMATE AGE	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8

**Board of Finance Proposed 2022/2023 Budget to Town Council
(As of February 16, 2022)**

BOF 2/16/22
Item #14

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION FOR THE GENERAL FUND 2022/2023 BUDGET

- A) BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Finance^(A) submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the proposed appropriation of \$ _____ **[\$47,227,695*]** for the 2022/2023 **Town Operating Budget**.
- B) BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Finance^(A) submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the proposed appropriation of \$ _____ **[\$117,237,381*]** for the 2022/2023 **Education Budget**.
- C) BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Finance^(A) submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the proposed appropriation of \$ _____ **[\$13,457,486*]** for the 2022/2023 **Debt & Transfers Budget**.
- D) BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Finance^(A) submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the proposed 2022/2023 **General Fund Revenues and Transfers** in the amount of \$ _____ **[\$177,922,562*]**.
- E) BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Finance^(A) submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the proposed 2022/2023 **Capital Improvement Program Budget** in the amount of \$ _____ **[\$8,885,317**]**.

Funding will be provided as follows:

Capital Reserve Fund	\$ _____	[\$8,119,100**]
Town Aid Road	\$ _____	[\$461,217**]
Sewer Sinking Fund	\$ _____	[\$305,000**]

- F) BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Finance^(A) submits to the Glastonbury Town Council the proposed Special Revenue Fund appropriations, revenues and transfers of \$ _____ **[\$3,298,217*]** for the 2022/2023 **Sewer Operating Fund**.

(A) Per Section 605 of the Town Charter.

**Per Legal Notice dated January 20, 2022 of Annual Town Meeting on January 27, 2022.*

***Per Annual CIP Workshop on January 20, 2022.*

General Fund Summary of Revenues and Appropriations/Expenditures

DESCRIPTION	2021 Actual	2022 Adopted	2023 Proposed	Increase (Decrease)	% Increase (Decrease)
REVENUES					
Taxes	158,107,350	160,940,802	165,939,073	4,998,271	3.1%
Licenses & Permits	1,705,759	1,313,100	1,369,645	56,545	4.3%
Intergovernmental	8,743,516	6,945,258	6,984,715	39,457	0.6%
Charges for Services	1,687,825	1,400,303	1,573,403	173,100	12.4%
Other*	1,920,334	1,148,867	1,180,726	31,859	2.8%
Use of Fund Balance	-	975,000	875,000	(100,000)	-10.3%
TOTAL REVENUES	172,164,785	172,723,330	177,922,562	5,199,232	3.0%
APPROPRIATIONS/EXPENDITURES					
TOWN					
General Government	3,323,186	3,562,535	3,636,574	74,039	2.1%
Community Development	2,120,715	2,506,646	2,508,734	2,088	0.1%
Administrative Services	7,559,554	6,355,057	6,541,079	186,022	2.9%
Public Safety	15,266,037	16,014,718	16,566,846	552,128	3.4%
Physical Services	7,162,189	7,446,713	7,545,639	98,926	1.3%
Sanitation	948,368	906,340	957,950	51,610	5.7%
Human Services	2,476,602	3,139,625	3,212,023	72,398	2.3%
Leisure & Culture	5,343,764	6,168,270	6,258,850	90,580	1.5%
TOTAL TOWN	44,200,417	46,099,904	47,227,695	1,127,791	2.4%
DEBT & TRANSFERS OUT	14,341,147	13,073,742	13,457,486	383,744	2.9%
EDUCATION	112,312,722	113,549,684	117,237,381	3,687,697	3.2%
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS/EXPENDITURES	170,854,286	172,723,330	177,922,562	5,199,232	3.0%

General Fund Summary of Revenues and Transfers

DESCRIPTION	2021 Actual	2022 Adopted	2023 Proposed	Increase (Decrease)	% Increase (Decrease)
TAXES					
Tax Revenues					
Current Levy	155,877,045	158,588,802	\$ 163,587,073	4,998,271	3.2%
Auto Supplemental	1,366,973	1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	-	0.0%
Delinquent Motor Vehicle Fees	11,462	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Prior Years	394,636	500,000	\$ 500,000	-	0.0%
Interest & Fees	454,317	350,000	\$ 350,000	-	0.0%
Miscellaneous Fees	2,917	2,000	\$ 2,000	-	0.0%
TOTAL TAXES	158,107,350	160,940,802	\$ 165,939,073	4,998,271	3.1%
LICENSES & PERMITS					
Licenses & Permits					
Building Inspection Fees	1,062,944	750,000	\$ 800,000	50,000	6.7%
Town Clerk Fees	93,151	83,000	\$ 91,000	8,000	9.6%
Physical Services Fees	15,225	11,000	\$ 18,500	7,500	68.2%
Refuse Permit Fees	369,184	360,000	\$ 350,000	(10,000)	-2.8%
Health	160,732	105,100	\$ 106,145	1,045	1.0%
Fire Marshal	4,522	4,000	\$ 4,000	-	0.0%
TOTAL LICENSES & PERMITS	1,705,759	1,313,100	\$ 1,369,645	56,545	4.3%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL					
HousAuth In-Lieu Tax					
Housing Auth Welles Vill	81,662	87,000	\$ 89,000	2,000	2.3%
Other Housing Projects	122,195	106,000	\$ 125,100	19,100	18.0%
	203,857	193,000	\$ 214,100	21,100	10.9%
St Conn In-Lieu Taxes					
St/CT Pilot	-	-	\$ 46,915	46,915	0.0%
Municipal Revenue Sharing	-	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Disability Exemption	2,165	2,400	\$ 2,700	300	12.5%
Veterans Exemption	9,398	9,600	\$ 9,000	(600)	-6.3%
St/CT Telephone Access	74,304	72,000	\$ 72,000	-	0.0%
State Stabilization Grant	385,930	385,930	\$ 385,930	-	0.0%
Miscellaneous State Grant	388,581	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
	860,377	469,930	\$ 516,545	46,615	9.9%
ST Educ Entitlements					
Magnet School Transportation	10,600	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
ECS Cost Sharing Grant	5,355,518	5,379,255	\$ 5,379,255	-	0.0%
Spec Educ Excess/Agency	1,404,218	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Vocational Agriculture	298,501	331,888	\$ 298,519	(33,369)	-10.1%
	7,068,837	5,711,143	\$ 5,677,774	(33,369)	-0.6%

General Fund Summary of Revenues and Transfers

DESCRIPTION	2021 Actual	2022 Adopted	2023 Proposed	Increase (Decrease)	% Increase (Decrease)
Admin Services					
ST/CT Historical Document Pres	7,500	7,500	\$ 7,500	-	0.0%
	7,500	7,500	\$ 7,500	-	0.0%
Public Safety					
Regional Dispatch Reimbursement	159,732	160,000	\$ 160,000	-	0.0%
Police Grants	307,613	240,475	\$ 245,475	5,000	2.1%
Civil Preparedness	-	12,110	\$ 12,110	-	0.0%
Volunteer Ambul Reimbursements	18,466	20,000	\$ 20,000	-	0.0%
	485,810	432,585	\$ 437,585	5,000	1.2%
Human Services					
Dial A Ride Grant	51,278	51,278	\$ 51,278	-	0.0%
Housing Auth Resident Services	33,836	47,990	\$ 47,990	-	0.0%
Youth & Family ST Grant	32,021	31,832	\$ 31,942	110	0.3%
	117,135	131,100	\$ 131,210	110	0.1%
TOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL	8,743,516	6,945,258	\$ 6,984,715	39,457	0.6%
CHARGES FOR SERVICES					
Charges for Services					
Planning & Zoning	17,514	12,000	\$ 14,000	2,000	16.7%
Town Clerk Recording Fees	352,729	180,900	\$ 269,900	89,000	49.2%
Town Clerk Conveyance Fee	933,896	616,400	\$ 700,000	83,600	13.6%
Educ/Community Serv Fees	-	20,000	\$ 30,000	10,000	50.0%
Solid Waste Tip Fees	257,273	235,000	\$ 235,000	-	0.0%
Sewer Inspection Fees	4,002	2,000	\$ 2,000	-	0.0%
Parks/Rec Swimming Fees	78,040	123,700	\$ 129,800	6,100	4.9%
Parks/Rec Program Fees	17,728	36,383	\$ 34,283	(2,100)	-5.8%
Subdivision OT Inspection	-	1,000	\$ 1,000	-	0.0%
Fire Watch Services	724	5,320	\$ 5,320	-	0.0%
Health Soil Tests	1,250	3,500	\$ 2,000	(1,500)	-42.9%
Senior Ser Programs	20,861	65,000	\$ 65,000	-	0.0%
Senior Nutrition Program	162	32,000	\$ 32,000	-	0.0%
Library Fines	2,496	30,000	\$ 25,000	(5,000)	-16.7%
Notary Services	210	5,100	\$ 5,100	-	0.0%
Passport Processing	940	32,000	\$ 23,000	(9,000)	-28.1%
TOTAL CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,687,825	1,400,303	\$ 1,573,403	173,100	12.4%

General Fund Summary of Revenues and Transfers

DESCRIPTION	2021 Actual	2022 Adopted	2023 Proposed	Increase (Decrease)	% Increase (Decrease)
OTHER REVENUES*					
Other Revenues					
Probate Court Reimbursements	2,480	2,480	\$ 2,480	-	0.0%
Interest on Investments	218,003	195,000	\$ 195,000	-	0.0%
Land Sales & Rentals	154,742	243,748	\$ 266,308	22,560	9.3%
Miscellaneous	1,018,130	32,500	\$ 32,500	-	0.0%
Educ Student Activities	460	200	\$ 200	-	0.0%
Educ Vo Ag Tuition	261,524	365,989	\$ 365,989	-	0.0%
Purchasing - Auction Sales	1,576	40,000	\$ 40,000	-	0.0%
PhyServ Refunds & Sales	1,296	3,500	\$ 3,500	-	0.0%
Refuse Recycling	84,093	42,300	\$ 48,600	6,300	14.9%
Claims Reimbursements	28,098	40,000	\$ 40,000	-	0.0%
Public Safety Police	88,083	54,000	\$ 68,000	14,000	25.9%
Health Insurance/Reimburs	26,838	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Youth & Family Services	3,065	33,400	\$ 33,400	-	0.0%
Library Trustee Account	48,234	40,000	\$ 40,000	-	0.0%
Clinical Fees	-	750	\$ 750	-	0.0%
Library Miscellaneous	1,148	16,000	\$ 10,000	(6,000)	-37.5%
Purchasing Card Rebates	7,266	14,000	\$ 9,000	(5,000)	-35.7%
Attorney Fees Reimbursed	35,295	25,000	\$ 25,000	-	0.0%
Utilities Reimbursed	3,619	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Unrealized Gain/(Loss) on Inventory	(94,400)	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
ICMA Administrative Allowance	30,783	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	1,920,334	1,148,867	\$ 1,180,726	31,859	2.8%
TRANSFERS IN					
Transfers In From					
General Fund	-	975,000	\$ 875,000	(100,000)	-10.3%
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN	-	975,000	\$ 875,000	(100,000)	-10.3%
GRAND TOTAL REVENUE AND TRANSFERS	\$172,164,785	\$172,723,330	\$ 177,922,562	\$5,199,232	3.0%

*Excludes refunding bond issuance related revenues.

General Fund: Summary of Expenditures and Transfers

DEPARTMENT	2021 Actual	2022 Adopted	2023 Proposed	Increase (Decrease)	% Increase (Decrease)
TOWN					
GENERAL GOVERNMENT					
TOWN COUNCIL	127,852	149,007	154,692	5,685	3.8%
TOWN MANAGER	704,901	710,745	714,047	3,302	0.5%
HUMAN RESOURCES	554,461	765,927	800,295	34,368	4.5%
FACILITIES MAINTENANCE	1,935,973	1,936,856	1,967,540	30,684	1.6%
TOTAL GENERAL GOVERNMENT	3,323,186	3,562,535	3,636,574	74,039	2.1%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT					
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	570,838	700,343	747,452	47,109	6.7%
BUILDING INSPECTION	527,866	633,127	593,540	(39,587)	-6.3%
FIRE MARSHAL	339,800	376,333	375,417	(916)	-0.2%
HEALTH	682,211	796,843	792,325	(4,518)	-0.6%
TOTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	2,120,715	2,506,646	2,508,734	2,088	0.1%
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES					
FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	1,652,887	1,662,309	1,826,459	164,150	9.9%
ACCOUNTING	397,772	506,666	515,607	8,941	1.8%
PROPERTY ASSESSMENT	606,971	650,837	662,127	11,290	1.7%
REVENUE COLLECTION	473,656	517,508	495,132	(22,376)	-4.3%
TOWN CLERK	622,326	547,806	592,610	44,804	8.2%
VOTER REGISTRATION	191,212	176,863	203,847	26,984	15.3%
LEGAL SERVICES	296,315	300,000	300,000	-	0.0%
PROBATE SERVICES	13,792	24,800	24,800	-	0.0%
INSURANCE/PENSIONS	3,304,623	1,968,268	1,920,497	(47,771)	-2.4%
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	7,559,554	6,355,057	6,541,079	186,022	2.9%
PUBLIC SAFETY					
POLICE	14,095,858	14,659,602	15,058,422	398,820	2.7%
VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE	17,510	2,500	3,175	675	27.0%
FIRE	1,120,586	1,319,854	1,473,759	153,905	11.7%
CIVIL PREPAREDNESS	32,084	32,762	31,490	(1,272)	-3.9%
TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY	15,266,037	16,014,718	16,566,846	552,128	3.4%
PHYSICAL SERVICES					
ENGINEERING	1,498,296	1,792,824	1,744,221	(48,603)	-2.7%
HIGHWAY	4,507,175	4,428,930	4,597,674	168,744	3.8%
FLEET MAINTENANCE	1,156,718	1,224,959	1,203,744	(21,215)	-1.7%
TOTAL PHYSICAL SERVICES	7,162,189	7,446,713	7,545,639	98,926	1.3%

General Fund: Summary of Expenditures and Transfers

DEPARTMENT	2021 Actual	2022 Adopted	2023 Proposed	Increase (Decrease)	% Increase (Decrease)
SANITATION					
REFUSE DISPOSAL	948,368	906,340	957,950	51,610	5.7%
TOTAL SANITATION	948,368	906,340	957,950	51,610	5.7%
HUMAN SERVICES					
HEALTH GRANTS	32,577	34,077	36,000	1,923	5.6%
YOUTH/FAMILY SERVICES	1,306,207	1,576,528	1,649,038	72,510	4.6%
SENIOR & COMMUNITY SERVICES	1,137,818	1,529,020	1,526,985	(2,035)	-0.1%
TOTAL HUMAN SERVICES	2,476,602	3,139,625	3,212,023	72,398	2.3%
LEISURE & CULTURE					
PARKS/RECREATION	3,740,555	4,284,254	4,351,497	67,243	1.6%
WELLES TURNER LIBRARY	1,588,209	1,869,016	1,892,353	23,337	1.2%
SOUTH GLASTONBURY LIBRARY	7,500	7,500	7,500	-	0.0%
EAST GLASTONBURY LIBRARY	7,500	7,500	7,500	-	0.0%
TOTAL LEISURE & CULTURE	5,343,764	6,168,270	6,258,850	90,580	1.5%
TOTAL TOWN	44,200,417	46,099,904	47,227,695	1,127,791	2.4%
DEBT SERVICE & TRANSFERS OUT					
DEBT SERVICE*	6,722,101	7,036,742	6,902,429	(134,313)	-1.9%
TRANSFERS OUT					
CAPITAL RESERVE FUND	5,929,500	5,250,000	5,650,000	400,000	7.6%
DOG FUND	45,000	45,000	45,000	-	0.0%
OPEB FUND	772,346	742,000	785,057	43,057	5.8%
SEWER OPERATING	175,000	-	-	-	0.0%
LAND ACQUISITION	147,200	-	-	-	0.0%
CONTINGENCY	-	-	75,000	75,000	0.0%
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND	550,000	-	-	-	0.0%
TOTAL TRANSFERS OUT	7,619,046	6,037,000	6,555,057	518,057	8.6%
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE & TRANSFERS OUT	14,341,147	13,073,742	13,457,486	383,744	2.9%
EDUCATION	112,312,722	113,549,684	117,237,381	3,687,697	3.2%
GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS	\$ 170,854,286	\$ 172,723,330	\$ 177,922,562	\$ 5,199,232	3.01%

*Excludes refunding bond issuance related expenditures.

Town Manager Recommended Projects 2022-2023
January 20, 2022

	aligns with objectives for...				
	Capital Reserve	ARPA	Sustainability	Economic Development	Livable Communities
Infrastructure and Major Equipment Care & Maintenance	\$ 5,041,000	\$ 1,425,000			
Town Hall / Academy – Renovations & Security Improvements	\$ 100,000				
System-wide municipal roof replacement	\$ 25,000				
Public Safety Communications	\$ 380,000				X
Police Site Renovations	\$ 40,000				
Animal Control Shelter	\$ 50,000	\$ 800,000			
Fire Station Renovations		\$ 475,000			
Fire Station Diesel Exhaust Mitigation System*	\$ 195,000				
Road Overlay	\$ 1,800,000			X	
Main Street Reconstruction*	\$ 216,000		X	X	X
Renovation & Site Restoration - Slocomb	\$ 40,000				
Traffic Signal Upgrades	\$ 450,000				
Heavy Equipment (Highway)	\$ 155,000				
Sidewalk Repair & Maintenance	\$ 250,000		X		X
Pavement Restoration and Overlay – Town and Education	\$ 250,000				X
Storm Drainage Improvements	\$ 100,000		X		
Tree Management	\$ 100,000		X		X
Public Parks/Age Friendly	\$ 80,000	\$ 150,000	X		X
Minnechaug Golf Course Improvements	\$ 150,000				X
Winter Hill Farm	\$ 175,000		X	X	X
Grange Pool - ADA Building & Accessibility Upgrades	\$ 145,000		X		X
Center Green Renovations	\$ 100,000		X	X	X
Town Property Conversion: Recreational Purposes (1361 Main)	\$ 40,000		X		X
Riverfront Park and Boathouse	\$ 150,000			X	X
Bulky Waste Closure Fund	\$ 50,000		X		
Ongoing Projects	\$ 428,100	\$ 425,000			
Property Revaluation	\$ 130,000				
Energy Efficiency & Sustainability	\$ 75,000	\$ 80,000	X		
Disaster & Emergency Preparedness/Readiness		\$ 200,000			X
Main Street Sidewalks – Phase 3	\$ 150,000		X	X	X
Gateway Corporate Park: Bike/Ped Improvements*	\$ 73,100		X	X	X
Pickleball courts		\$ 145,000			X
NEW Projects	\$ 2,650,000	\$ 2,030,000			
Williams Memorial	\$ 150,000	\$ 1,250,000			X
Naubuc School Open Space Classrooms*	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 700,000			
Riverfront Community Center (RCC) Upgrades - outdoor programming		\$ 80,000	X	X	X
Total	\$ 8,119,100	\$ 3,880,000			
Less pending/approved grants	\$1,514,100				
Total after grants	\$6,605,000	\$3,880,000			
Total Combined Projects	\$10,485,000				

*Pending/approved grants.

Other Projects - Sewer Sinking Fund and Town Aid

Sewer Sinking Fund

Water Pollution Control Roofs: \$230,000

Parker Terrace Station & Force Main Replacement \$ 75,000

Town Aid

Town Aid Road: \$461,217