

BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Tuesday, September 15, 2026

In-Person and via Zoom Teleconference

SELECTMEN PRESENT: Jon Savino, Mark Whitten and Jim Cannon

ALSO PRESENT: Kurt Brace, Town Attorney Matt Ritter, Jim Grasso, Mickey Danyluk, and Members of the Public

ATTENDING REMOTELY: Jo (no last name provided), Paul Wrabel and Members of the Public

CALL TO ORDER:

First Selectman Jon Savino called the meeting to order at 5:59 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The Pledge of Allegiance was observed.

ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC INPUT:

In Person:

Kurt (no last name provided), Elm Street – was upset about being “flipped off” by a board member and noted that he is very respectful to the Board and expects it in return. He also commented on the need to take advantage of the Homestead Exemption.

Via Zoom:

Jo (no last name provided), Green Manor Terrace – stated that he has emailed the board regarding “hawkers” coming around to people’s homes, but has received no response. He stated that they are coming to homes that have “no solicitation” signs and his understanding is that they have to stop at 4:30 p.m. according to the ordinance. He questioned why solicitors or hawkers have to the right to inconvenience residents on a constant basis. They ignore “no solicitation signs” and do not show ids when requested. His understanding is that the Police Chief approves this and questioned whether he is checking the solicitors and telling them the rules. He told the Board they are representatives and need to handle the situation.

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2026 MEETING MINUTES:

Selectman Whitten moved to approve the Minutes of September 1, 2026. Selectman Cannon seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Selectman Savino noted that he received correspondence from Kevin Knapp which will be included in the minutes. **(Schedule B attached)**

FINANCE REPORTS AND REQUESTS:

a. Funding Waivers and Approvals

None

b. Financial Reports/Budget Reports/Audit Update

Selectman Savino noted that the audit is done and they are waiting for the quality review. After that they will be going on to the '24/'25 audit.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. Main Street Update (WL Commons)

Selectman Savino noted that he received a letter from CTDOT stating the ribbon cutting for the new train station will be October 13th. The ribbon cuttings for historic train station and Brownfield will be the same day. The ribbon cutting for the historic train station will be at 9:00 a.m. followed by the new train station and finally the Brownfield. He noted that Trinity (Brownfield developers) will have a tent with snacks. He added that in the letter it was stated that the first train will be coming into the new station on October 18th.

b. Buildings Update -Train Station

Selectman Savino noted Trinity is in the process of the Brownfield cleaning.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. Senior Center Naming Request – Mickey Danyluk

Mickey Danyluk noted that in May he filed a petition for a Town Meeting to maintain historic continuity of the name Dr. Ettore F. Carniglia on the entity/operations/activities of the Town's new Senior Center. **(Schedule C attached)** He reiterated that they are only asking that the name remain on the entity, operations and activities of the Town's Senior Center. Also, he had asked for a Town Meeting, but it has come to his attention that this could be resolved by a resolution of the Board of Selectmen because it is a continuation of what was. He went on to read a portion of a letter to the Board of Selectman penned by Philip R. Devlin. **(Schedule D attached)**

He further stated that Dr. Carniglia's memorabilia has been moved to the new center, they want it to be housed there, and they want this to be sacred to his memory.

Following questions from the Board, Mr. Danyluk stated that they not looking to dedicate the building, but rather just continue the operations, entity and activities of the Town's Senior Center on the stationery and the newsletter.

The Board decided to table the matter so they could speak with the Senior Center Director and move it forward.

Jim Grasso, Governor Ella Grasso's son, was present and Selectman Savino noted that after the ribbon cutting of the historic train station, he wanted to do a reenactment of Governor Grasso's trip to Hartford to be sworn in as Governor from that station and possibly have Mr. Grasso speak to which he responded that he would be uncomfortable speaking at the event.

TAX REFUNDS:

Selectman Cannon moved to approve the prior year refund in the amount of \$345.00 and the current year refund in the amount of \$216.34 for total refund of \$561.34 as of September 15, 2026. Selectman Whitten seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried. (Schedule A attached)

APPOINTMENTS, RE-APPOINTMENTS, RESIGNATIONS:

None

PUBLIC INPUT:

In Person:

Name and address not provided – commented that at the last meeting, she did provide her name and address which was not noted in the minutes. Following that:

Selectman Whitten moved to make an amendment to his previous motion to adjust the minutes to reflect a correction of the (inaudible) name and address in the Minutes. Selectman Cannon seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.*

****Footnote: In reviewing the video recording of the September 1, 2026 meeting, it is noted that the speaker did not provide her name and address.***

Kurt Brace, Elm Street – commented that no minutes have been posted to the Historic Commission for going on 3 years. He also commented on the Homestead Exemption.

Name not provided, 477 Denslow Street – stated that there is a Historical Commission and a Historical Society. She noted that she doesn't think the Historical Commission is active. She stated that the Historical Society is more private, it's not public. The Historical Commission is a Town entity.

Mickey Danyluk, 53 Grove Street – wanted to remind the Board that all minutes of all Commissions and Boards are filed in the Town Clerk's Office – they are there for the public to view. He also noted that the Historical Commission is active and maintaining the Town's heritage.

Via Zoom:

Paul Wrabel, 33 Pershing Road – spoke in support of Mickey Danyluk's petition.

Selectman Whitten moved to go into Executive Session (with Town Attorney Matt Ritter at 6:28 p.m.) Selectman Cannon seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSION WITH TOWN ATTORNEY MATTHEW RITTER:

- ***US District Court Hartford J. Sales v Town of Windsor Locks et al***

Selectman Whitten moved to come out of Executive Session (at 6:59 p.m.) Selectman Cannon seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

ACTION ON MATTER DISCUSSED IN EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Selectman Whitten noted that no action or vote was taken. The matter will be addressed at a future meeting.

SELECTMEN'S COMMENTS:

Selectman Whitten noted that the Board should follow up with the Chief about the comments regarding solicitations.

Selectman Savino seconded Selectman Whitten's suggestion regarding speaking with the Chief about solicitation issues. He further apologized for not following up on the resident's email regarding this issue.

Regarding the comment on disrespect, he noted he addressed that at the last Board of Selectmen meeting.

He stated that Mickey explained the issue brought forth regarding the Historical Commission.

Lastly, he read a notice regarding increased funding for Main Street and other roadway projects moving forward. **(Schedule E attached)** He noted that the Town is looking into other funding for the Town.

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:08 p.m. was made by Selectman Savino. Selectman Cannon seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted

Cathy Ziemian

Recording Secretary

Schedule A

Refund Request September 15, 2026

[illegible]

 Outlook

UPDATE ?

From Kevin G Knapp <kevinknapp25@gmail.com>

Date Mon 9/14/2026 9:12 AM

To Jon Savino <jsavino@WLOCKS.com>; James Tarbell <jtarbell@wlocks.com>

EXTERNAL EMAIL - This email was sent by a person from outside your organization.

I am requesting an immediate written update regarding the complaints and requests for action I have previously submitted concerning the Windsor Locks Police Department.

I have repeatedly asked the Police Commission and the First Selectman to exercise their respective oversight responsibilities under the Town Charter and applicable law regarding allegations of police misconduct, retaliation, excessive force, failure to intervene, withheld evidence, and violations of my constitutional rights.

Despite the seriousness of these allegations and the amount of documentation I have provided, I have not received a meaningful explanation of what investigative or corrective action has been taken.

This has now been ongoing for nearly two years.

My concerns have included repeated alleged retaliation, interference with my First Amendment rights, questionable arrests and police reports, failures to investigate complaints, failure to intervene during alleged uses of force, and the continued withholding of body-camera footage and other evidence relating to incidents involving me.

I am especially concerned that continued inaction by officials who have been placed on notice may contribute to the appearance of a cover-up or allow alleged retaliation and misconduct to continue unchecked.

I am therefore requesting a written response identifying:

1. What action the Police Commission has taken regarding my complaints.
2. Whether any independent investigation has been opened.
3. Whether the Chief of Police or involved officers have been questioned regarding my allegations.
4. What action the First Selectman has taken within the authority provided by the Town Charter.
5. Whether any of my complaints were referred to an outside agency, State's Attorney, POSTC, Inspector General, or other independent investigative authority.
6. What steps have been taken to preserve body-camera footage, communications, reports, and other evidence.
7. Why I have not received a substantive resolution despite repeated complaints and supporting evidence.

Government officials cannot simply ignore serious allegations because they are uncomfortable or involve members of their own police department. Oversight exists specifically for situations where the conduct of public officials is being questioned.

I am asking both the Police Commission and the First Selectman to clearly state, in writing, what has been done and what will be done going forward.

If no meaningful action has been taken, I request an explanation as to why.

I am continuing to preserve all communications and records relating to these matters and will provide them to the appropriate state and federal oversight authorities as necessary.

Please provide a written response and status update as soon as possible.

I have escalated this to state level oversight as ypu both refuse to do the jobs you were elected for

Respectfully,

Kevin George Knapp Decorated U.S. Army Combat Veteran

Urgent Request for Independent
Investigation – WLPD and
Connecticut DOC Use of Force,
Failure to Intervene, and Withheld
Video Evidence



September 14, 2026 09:02

From kevin knapp

Hide

To Elliot.Prescott@ct.gov


Cc post.fieldservices@ct.gov

Correction.Ombuds@ct.gov

foi@ct.gov

Ct Justice

Sent from my Galaxy



FW: Re: 9/4/26 FOIA

From Kevin G Knapp <kevinknapp25@gmail.com>

Date Thu 9/10/2026 4:36 PM

To James Tarbell <jtarbell@wlocks.com>; Jon Savino <jsavino@wlocks.com>

EXTERNAL EMAIL - This email was sent by a person from outside your organization.

Chairman Tarbell, Members of the Windsor Locks Police Commission, First Selectman Savino, Selectman Whitten, and Town Officials:

This email constitutes a FORMAL DEMAND FOR ACTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE.

As of September 10, 2026, 136 days have elapsed since April 27, 2026, and I still have not received the body-camera footage I requested concerning the police incidents of that date.

I also have not received the body-camera footage from the separate incident involving complaints made by Yanna concerning my efforts to have her leave my home.

At this point, I am no longer interested in excuses, finger-pointing, unexplained delay, or having my complaints routed back through the very Police Department and personnel whose conduct I am challenging.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES §29-6d

Connecticut law imposes specific requirements concerning body-worn cameras.

Under Conn. Gen. Stat. §29-6d, police officers generally are required to use body-worn recording equipment while interacting with the public in their law-enforcement capacity, subject to the statutory exceptions.

To the extent that the April 27 recordings captured the alleged uses of force that I have repeatedly complained about, §29-6d contains specific expedited disclosure provisions concerning recordings of alleged use-of-force incidents, including an outside 144-hour period under the circumstances identified by that statute.

I am now at DAY 136.

That is not 144 hours.

That is more than 3,200 hours.

For requested recordings governed instead by Connecticut's Freedom of Information Act, I am demanding prompt production or a written identification of every specific statutory exemption being relied upon.

If you contend that any recording is exempt, identify the SPECIFIC STATUTE, subsection, factual basis for the exemption, and whether every nonexempt portion can immediately be produced through redaction.

"THE POLICE WON'T RELEASE IT" IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE LEGAL EXPLANATION.

APRIL 27 — FIVE-ON-ONE FORCE WHILE I WAS HANDCUFFED

I want this allegation addressed directly.

I allege that on April 27 I was already restrained and handcuffed when approximately five officers participated in or were present during an encounter in which I was subjected to force severe enough that I lost consciousness.

I further allege that after I lost consciousness and had been subjected to that level of force, I was refused the medical attention I requested.

If the unedited body-camera footage confirms what I have repeatedly reported, this is not a trivial procedural complaint.

It is not a personality dispute.

It is not something that can be buried inside an internal police report.

It is an allegation involving potentially catastrophic and unlawful force against an already restrained person, followed by an alleged denial of medical care.

I am demanding that an INDEPENDENT agency review the complete evidence and determine whether the conduct supports criminal investigation for attempted murder, felony assault, reckless endangerment, deprivation of constitutional rights, failure to intervene, failure to report, conspiracy, or any other applicable state or federal offense.

I am specifically NOT asking the Windsor Locks Police Department to decide for itself whether the Windsor Locks Police Department committed wrongdoing.

The evidence should be provided to an independent investigative authority.

ATTEMPTED-MURDER CONCERNS MUST BE INVESTIGATED — NOT DISMISSED

Connecticut law requires specific proof before any person can be convicted of attempted murder, and I understand that charging decisions belong to prosecutors.

But that does not prevent me from demanding an investigation.

Under Conn. Gen. Stat. §§53a-49 and 53a-54a, investigators would have to examine, among other things, intent and whether the conduct constituted a substantial step toward intentionally causing death.

I am demanding that those elements be objectively examined against the evidence.

When an allegation involves multiple officers allegedly using severe force against one handcuffed individual until he loses consciousness and then allegedly refusing requested medical treatment, I

expect independent investigators—not the accused department—to determine what criminal statutes may apply.

Release the footage.

Let independent investigators see what happened.

Let the evidence determine the appropriate charges.

CONNECTICUT'S DUTY TO INTERVENE IS NOT OPTIONAL

There is another statute that cannot simply be ignored.

Conn. Gen. Stat. §7-282e requires a police officer who, while acting in a law-enforcement capacity, witnesses another police officer using force that the witnessing officer objectively knows is unreasonable, excessive, or illegal to intervene and attempt to stop it.

Connecticut law goes even further: an officer who unlawfully fails to intervene under those circumstances may be prosecuted and punished for the same acts pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. §53a-8.

Therefore, if the body-camera footage establishes that officers stood by while another officer used force they objectively knew was unreasonable, excessive, or illegal, their conduct must also be independently investigated.

"WE WERE JUST THERE" IS NOT A DEFENSE TO A STATUTORY DUTY TO INTERVENE.

COVERING UP WRONGDOING CREATES ITS OWN LEGAL EXPOSURE

I am now formally putting every recipient of this communication on notice.

I am not claiming that merely receiving this email automatically makes anyone an accessory to a crime.

I am saying something much more precise:

FROM THIS POINT FORWARD, NOBODY CAN CREDIBLY CLAIM THEY WERE UNAWARE OF THESE ALLEGATIONS OR THE EXISTENCE OF POTENTIALLY CRITICAL VIDEO EVIDENCE.

Anyone who knowingly participates in concealing evidence, destroying evidence, altering evidence, fabricating records, coordinating knowingly false accounts, obstructing an investigation, intimidating witnesses, retaliating against complainants, or intentionally assisting criminal conduct should expect his or her own actions to be examined independently under every applicable state and federal law.

Conn. Gen. Stat. §53a-8 provides criminal liability where a person, possessing the required mental state, intentionally aids another person in committing criminal conduct.

Connecticut law also separately prohibits tampering with or fabricating physical evidence.

Nobody gets immunity because the person they are protecting wears a badge.

Nobody gets immunity because they sit on a commission.

Nobody gets immunity because they hold elected office.

Nobody gets immunity because admitting the truth would be embarrassing to the Town.

If evidence establishes criminal conduct, intentionally helping commit it is not "supporting the Police Department."

And intentionally concealing, destroying, falsifying, or manipulating evidence is not "protecting the Town."

It is potential evidence of additional wrongdoing that should itself be investigated.

THE POLICE COMMISSION — THIS IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

The Windsor Locks Police Commission cannot pretend that it has no authority over what occurs inside the Police Department.

The governing Windsor Locks provisions give the Police Commission general management and supervision over the Police Department and significant authority regarding departmental rules and discipline.

That authority comes with responsibility.

The Commission exists to provide civilian oversight.

It is not supposed to function as an extension of the Police Chief's command structure.

When serious allegations are repeatedly brought directly before commissioners, including allegations involving excessive force, retaliation, constitutional violations, false reports, failure to investigate complaints, and withholding of body-camera evidence, ignoring those complaints is not meaningful oversight.

FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS DO NOT DISAPPEAR IN WINDSOR LOCKS

I have video evidence that I contend captures Sgt. Jeffrey Lampson making statements demonstrating that he did not care whether my conduct was lawful and that a "line in the sand" needed to be drawn while officials were being "protected."

If my conduct was lawful and constitutionally protected, THAT SHOULD HAVE ENDED THE DISCUSSION.

Police officers do not have authority to decide that lawful constitutional conduct suddenly becomes criminal because they dislike the speaker, dislike the message, dislike profanity, or want to protect a particular government official.

The United States Constitution outranks the Windsor Locks Police Department.

The First Amendment outranks the Police Chief.

The First Amendment outranks the Board of Selectmen.

And the First Amendment outranks Robert's Rules of Order.

The United States Supreme Court has recognized broad constitutional protection for verbal criticism and challenge directed toward police officers.

Likewise, saying "fuck you" does not automatically transform protected speech into disorderly conduct.

Connecticut courts analyze alleged "fighting words" in context. There is no automatic rule that profanity alone establishes disorderly conduct simply because a police officer or government official finds the language offensive.

Government officials are expected to tolerate criticism that private citizens may find uncomfortable.

PUBLIC INPUT AND ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER

Robert's Rules of Order governs parliamentary procedure.

It is NOT criminal law.

It does NOT create probable cause.

It does NOT supersede the First Amendment.

It does NOT empower a board to convert criticism, disagreement, political opposition, or profanity into a crime.

A board may enforce legitimate, reasonable and viewpoint-neutral rules concerning time, subject matter and orderly conduct during a limited public forum.

What it may not constitutionally do is selectively enforce those rules to silence a particular viewpoint or retaliate against a speaker for criticizing government officials.

You cannot use Robert's Rules as a constitutional escape hatch.

THE MARK WHITTEN INCIDENT MUST BE INDEPENDENTLY REVIEWED

I have also repeatedly raised the incident involving Mark Whitten.

I allege that Mr. Whitten left his seat, approached me, made unwanted physical body contact that forced me backward, and communicated a threat.

I further allege that subsequent accounts provided concerning that incident materially misrepresented what actually occurred.

The VIDEO should determine what happened.

Not political connections.

Not friendships.

Not someone's title.

Not a coordinated narrative created afterward.

If the video demonstrates that Mr. Whitten approached me and initiated unwanted physical contact, investigators should objectively determine whether that conduct satisfies the elements of assault, threatening, disorderly conduct, or another applicable offense.

Likewise, every statement subsequently provided by Mr. Whitten and the members of the Board should be compared against the recording.

If someone knowingly made a materially false sworn statement, that issue should also be referred to an independent investigative authority for review under the applicable false-statement or perjury statutes.

I further allege that Sgt. Gustaffson pursued an arrest warrant connected to my speech while failing to fairly account for evidence favorable to me.

That conduct should also be independently examined.

A BADGE DOES NOT MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT TRUE.

AN ELECTED TITLE DOES NOT MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT TRUE.

A POLICE REPORT DOES NOT OVERRIDE VIDEO EVIDENCE.

MY FORMAL DEMANDS

1. Immediately preserve ALL body-camera footage, dashboard-camera footage, dispatch recordings, CAD records, 911 recordings, radio transmissions, police reports, supplemental reports, photographs, videos, warrant affidavits, emails, text messages, internal communications, access logs, audit logs, export histories and metadata concerning April 27 and every related investigation.
2. Preserve and produce the recordings concerning Yanna's complaints involving my residence.
3. Immediately produce the April 27 body-camera footage or provide a recording-by-recording written explanation identifying the specific statutory authority relied upon for withholding it.
4. Identify every officer present during every alleged use of force against me on April 27.
5. Identify which officers used physical force and which officers witnessed it.
6. Identify whether any officer filed the report required by Conn. Gen. Stat. §7-282e concerning unreasonable, excessive or illegal force.
7. Identify whether the Department conducted a use-of-force review and provide all records concerning that review to the extent required by law.
8. Preserve and produce all medical-request documentation, EMS communications, detention records and recordings relating to my requests for medical care.
9. Refer my allegations concerning the April 27 force and denial of medical attention to an investigative entity independent of the Windsor Locks Police Department.
10. Open a documented Police Commission review concerning the conduct of the Chief and the officers I have identified, including Sgt. Lampson and Sgt. Gustaffson.
11. Preserve and independently review the recordings and statements concerning Mark Whitten.
12. Determine whether the video evidence is consistent with the statements subsequently submitted by Town officials and board members.

13. Preserve every communication concerning me between Police Department employees, elected officials, commissioners, prosecutors, Capitol Police or other agencies.
14. Provide me with a written response identifying the custodian of each requested recording, whether each recording exists, whether it has been viewed, exported, copied or redacted, the asserted basis for withholding it, and the anticipated production date.

THIS TOWN HAS BEEN PLACED ON NOTICE.

The Police Commission has been placed on notice.

The Board of Selectmen has been placed on notice.

The First Selectman's Office has been placed on notice.

The Police Chief has been placed on notice.

The officers involved have been placed on notice.

I am a 100% disabled combat veteran, but more importantly, I am an American citizen entitled to exactly the same constitutional protections as everyone else.

I will not accept a different set of rules because I criticize government officials.

I will not accept retaliation because I challenge police conduct.

I will not accept police officers deciding that lawful speech becomes unlawful because they dislike the words coming out of my mouth.

And I will not accept potentially critical video evidence remaining hidden while government officials rely upon written narratives that the recordings themselves can either confirm or destroy.

No Police Chief's ego is greater than the Constitution.

No Police Commission can vote away the First Amendment.

No Robert's Rules provision supersedes federal constitutional law.

No government title provides immunity for knowingly unlawful conduct.

No police report changes what an unedited camera recorded.

And no amount of delay makes evidence disappear.

If the officers acted lawfully, RELEASE THE FOOTAGE.

If the reports are accurate, RELEASE THE FOOTAGE.

If the Town has nothing to conceal, RELEASE THE FOOTAGE.

And if the recordings instead establish that a handcuffed man was subjected to unlawful force, rendered unconscious, denied requested medical care, and surrounded by officers who failed to intervene, then those facts need to be investigated by authorities independent of the Windsor Locks Police Department.

I am demanding preservation, production, independent investigation and accountability.

I expect a substantive written response.

Kevin George Knapp Jr.

----- Original message -----

From: Kevin Knapp <kevinknapp25@gmail.com>

Date: 9/9/26 17:48 (GMT-05:00)

To: "Sgt. James Gustafson Jr." <JGustafsonJr@windsorlockspolice.com>

Cc: "Lieutenant. Paul Cherniack" <PCherniack@windsorlockspolice.com>, WL Records
<Records@windsorlockspolice.com>

Subject: Re: 9/4/26 FOIA

Connecticut General Statutes § 29-6d establishes strict disclosure requirements for qualifying body-worn camera footage involving the use of force. Where the statute applies, the law provides specific disclosure deadlines and, under the circumstances permitted by the statute, does not allow disclosure to be delayed beyond 144 hours.

It has now been more than 130 days.

Every significant encounter I have had with the Windsor Locks Police Department has generated video, body-camera footage, reports, communications, or other evidence capable of establishing what actually occurred. I intend to pursue that evidence through every lawful avenue available to me.

I have repeatedly raised serious complaints concerning violations of my constitutional and civil rights, excessive force, failures to investigate, inaccurate or false statements, retaliation, and what I believe is coordinated misconduct involving multiple individuals. The continued failure to meaningfully and impartially investigate my complaints raises serious concerns regarding accountability, ethics, transparency, and objective policing.

I will not minimize what I believe was done to me, nor will I abandon my efforts to obtain the complete record. Where the evidence supports civil liability or criminal wrongdoing, I intend to pursue every lawful remedy available in court and before the appropriate state and federal authorities.

There will be no intimidation, delay, or institutional loyalty that changes that.

I wish you the best moving forward. The evidence will ultimately determine who is accountable, and I fully intend to see this process through.

I hope you have the same level of resolve as I do but we both know you are a bunch of corrupt cowards

Kevin G Knapp

On Wed, Sep 9, 2026, 17:32 Sgt. James Gustafson Jr. <JGustafsonJr@windsorlockspolice.com> wrote:
Good Afternoon Kevin,

The Windsor Locks Police Department is in receipt of your FOIA request from 9/4/2026.

Sincerely,

Sgt James Gustafson
Windsor Locks Police

RECEIVED

MAY 11 REC'D

TOWN OF WINDSOR LOCKS
PETITION FOR TOWN MEETING

We, the undersigned persons, qualified to vote at town meetings under Connecticut General Statute 7-6 in the Town of Windsor Locks, hereby present this petition pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes 7-1(a) and 7-9 that the following item(s) be submitted to a Special Town Meeting:

Introduce, discuss and act upon a resolution to maintain the historic continuity of the name "Dr. Ettore F. Carniglia" on the entity/operations/activities of the Town's senior center

We further certify, under penalties of false statement, that the addresses set forth after our respective signatures are true and correct and that we, each of us, are eligible to vote on the question(s).

WARNING: ALL SIGNATURES MUST BE IN INDELIBLE INK

SIGNATURE	PRINTED NAME	BIRTH DATE	STREET ADDRESS
1. Ruth M. Carr	RUTH MCCART	4/20/41	207 Sutton Dr.
2. Kathleen Montemarlo	KATHLEEN Montemarlo	9/26/44	18 Roxbury Dr.
3. Deborah Kolosoffsky	Deborah Kolosoffsky	6/26/52	74 Stevens St.
4. Dave Vaccaro	DAVE VACCARO	4/4/49	68 WEBB ST.
5. David Paurin	David Paurin	11/5/29	31 Roberts St.
6. Michael Winters	Michael Winters	6/29/52	7 Lindley St.
7. Gary Fairbrother	GARY FAIRBROTHER	8-30-46	GREEN HANCOCK CT
8. Kristin Francis	Kristin Francis	4-25-23	31 Stevens St.
9. Robert Pearce	Robert Pearce	1-10-1954	18 Whitten St.
10. Brian Baron	BRIAN BARON	7-9-52	148 Grove St.
11. Ann Pomeroi	Ann Pomeroi	01/15/1938	378 Elm St.
12. Ann Levy	Ann Levy	03/23/1949	20 SHERWIN LN
13. Gina Mair	Gina Mair	9-21-1975	72 Maple Ave.
14. Rosa Borraacci	ROSA BORRAACCI	4/6/388	20 James St.
15. John Donahue	JOHN DONAHUE	3/29/47	391 S. Elm St.
16. Linda Donahue	Linda Donahue	3-27-50	391 S. Elm St.
17. Ismael Montemarlo	ISMAEL MONTMARLO	5-29-46	50 Grove St.
18. Sandra Sandone	Sandra Sandone	1-6-45	459 North St.
19. Joseph Sandone	JOSEPH SANDONE	6-6-41	459 NORTH ST.
20. Gary P. Norman	Gary P. Norman	01-28-51	170 GROVE ST.
21. Gloria Malec	GLORIA MALEC	05-13-56	9 Middle Dr. W.L.
22. Joseph Plavick	Joseph Plavick	17/7/91	156 Scentis St.
23. Ed Malec	Ed Malec	8/1/20/54	9 Middle Dr. W.L.
24. Alyssa Malec	ALYSSA MALEC	09/01/1997	156 Scentis St.
25. Mickey Danyluk	Mickey Danyluk	10/13/1956	53 Grove Street

I, Mickey Danyluk, the circulator of this Petition Page, residing at 53 Grove Street Windsor Locks, CT, do hereby certify under penalties of false statement that my address is as stated; that I am an elector in the Town of Windsor Locks that each person whose name appears on this page signed the same in person in my presence; that either I know each such signer personally or that each signer satisfactorily identified himself/herself to me; and that all of the signatures on this page were obtained not earlier than six months prior to the filing of said petition.

Mickey Danyluk Mickey Danyluk May 11, 2026
SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

CIRCULATOR'S STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY OF SIGNATURES

Must be completed, by Circulator and by Acknowledging Officer, after obtaining all signatures on this page and before filing it with the Town Clerk.

I am the Circulator of this petition page and I make this statement pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 90, §7-9 & §7-9a of the General Statutes of Connecticut. My address is 53 Grove Street, in the town of Windsor Locks. Each person whose name appears on this petition signatures page signed the same in person in my presence. I either know each such signer or such signer satisfactorily identified himself or herself to me. The number of signatures on this petition signatures page is 25.

I hereby declare under the PENALTIES OF FALSE STATEMENT, that the statements made in the foregoing Circulator's Statement of Authenticity of Signatures are true.

Mickey Danyluk
Signature of Circulator

CERTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGING OFFICER

State of Connecticut)
)
County of Hartford)

ss: Windsor Locks
(city or town)

On this the 11th day of May, 2026, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared Mickey Danyluk, known to me (or satisfactorily proven) to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing Statement of Circulator and acknowledged that he/she/they executed the same for the purpose contained therein.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand.

My commission expires:

FEB 28th 2031 (date)
(Notary Public only)

town

Bar

Lisa L. Hadden

Judge of a court of record or family support
magistrate; clerk or deputy clerk of a court
having a seal; commissioner of deeds or

clerk; notary public; justice of the peace;
or attorney admitted to the Connecticut

LISA LYNN HADDEN
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF CONNECTICUT
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES FEB. 28, 2031

RECEIVED
4143

TOWN OF WINDSOR LOCKS
PETITION FOR TOWN MEETING

MAY 11 REC'D

We, the undersigned persons, qualified to vote at town meetings under Connecticut General Statute 7-6 in the Town of Windsor Locks, hereby present this petition pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes 7-11a and 7-9a that the following item(s) be submitted to a Special Town Meeting:

Introduce, discuss and act upon a resolution to maintain the historic continuity of the name "Dr. Ettore F. Carniglia" on the entity/operation/activities of the Town's senior center

We further certify, under penalties of false statement, that the addresses set forth after our respective signatures are true and correct and that we, each of us, are eligible to vote on the question(s).

WARNING: ALL SIGNATURES MUST BE IN INDELIBLE INK

SIGNATURE	PRINTED NAME	BIRTH DATE	STREET ADDRESS
1. <i>Janet R. Lomba</i>	Janet R. Lomba	4/14/55	144 Elm St. WL
2. <i>George A. Lombard</i>	GEORGE A. LOMBARD	8-21-1950	144 Elm St WL
3. <i>Stephanie Holtman</i>	STEPHANIE HOLTMAN	4/4/1968	49 GROVE ST W.L.
4. <i>Rebecca Mockaitis</i>	REBECCA MOCKAITIS	10/18/1961	42 Elm St
5. <i>Kevin Mockaitis</i>	Kevin Mockaitis	5/26/1965	42 Elm St
6. <i>Lynn Benis</i>	Lynn Benis	8/29/69	32 Cypress Rd
7. <i>Brett Mockaitis</i>	Brett Mockaitis	1/16/02	42 Elm St
8. <i>Joanne Munson</i>	Joanne Munson	7-26-1954	23 CRESTON Road
9. <i>Faith Guagliardi</i>	Faith Guagliardi	1-25-39	125 Elm St.
10. <i>Elaine Gigg</i>	Elaine Gigg	8-15-61	2 Buge Ave
11. <i>Fred Gigg</i>	Fred Gigg	2-28-53	2 Buge Ave.
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			

I, Mickey Danyluk, the circulator of this Petition Page, residing at 53 Grove Street Windsor Locks, CT, do hereby certify under penalties of false statement that my address is as stated; that I am an elector in the Town of Windsor Locks; that each person whose name appears on this page signed the same in person in my presence; that either I know each such signer personally or that each signer satisfactorily identified himself/herself to me; and that all of the signatures on this page were obtained not earlier than six months prior to the filing of said petition.

Mickey Danyluk
SIGNATURE

Mickey Danyluk
PRINTED NAME

May 11, 2026
DATE

CIRCULATOR'S STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY OF SIGNATURES

Must be completed, by Circulator and by Acknowledging Officer, after obtaining all signatures on this Page and before filing it with the Town Clerk.

I am the Circulator of this petition page and I make this statement pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 90, §7-9 & §7-9a of the General Statutes of Connecticut. My address is 53 Grove Street, in the town of Windsor Locks. Each person whose name appears on this petition signatures page signed the same in person in my presence. I either know each such signer or such signer satisfactorily identified himself or herself to me. The number of signatures on this petition signatures page is 11.

I hereby declare under the PENALTIES OF FALSE STATEMENT, that the statements made in the foregoing Circulator's Statement of Authenticity of Signatures are true.

Mickey Danylek
Signature of Circulator

CERTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGING OFFICER

State of Connecticut)
County of Hartford)

ss: Windsor Locks
(city or town)

On this the 11th day of May, 2020, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared Mickey Danylek, known to me (or satisfactorily proven) to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing Statement of Circulator and acknowledged that he/she/they executed the same for the purpose contained therein.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand.

My commission expires:

FEB 28th 2031 (date)
(Notary Public only)

town

Bar

Lisa L. Hadden

Judge of a court of record or family support
magistrate; clerk or deputy clerk of a court
having a seal; commissioner of deeds or

clerk; notary public; justice of the peace;
or attorney admitted to the Connecticut

LISA LYNN HADDEN
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF CONNECTICUT
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES FEB. 28, 2031

Letter to Windsor Locks Board of Selectmen 9/14/26**By Philip R. Devlin (biographer of Dr. Carniglia)**

In 2012, the director of the Carniglia Senior Center approached me about writing a biography of Dr. Carniglia. She said that in 2013 there was going to be a re-dedication of the senior center to Carney on its 35th anniversary, as his bronze bust was now going to be part of the collection. I was asked to speak at the re-dedication ceremony on January 10, 2013. Other speakers included the doctor's daughter, Margaret (Carniglia) Malec and his granddaughter, Janis Malec, as well as Dr. David Crombie, chief of surgery for many years at Hartford Hospital, who spoke at length about how much he admired Carney and about Carney's sterling reputation as a diagnostician. It was at that time that the town spent several hundreds of dollars on a beautiful display case to house Carney's memorabilia.

At no time did I ever see Dr. Carniglia's name on the building at 41 Oak Street. If the building had been dedicated to Dr. Carniglia, wouldn't his name appear on the building as the "Carniglia Building" or something like that? No, it was called during that 47-year span the "Windsor Locks Senior Center." It was the center itself that was originally dedicated in memory of Dr. Carniglia in 1978 and then re-dedicated to him in front of a big crowd on January 10, 2013, not the building! An address change should not affect the original dedication of the senior center.

There was nobody who ever lived who was more of an admirer of the doctor than Governor Ella T. Grasso. As governor, she spoke at the dedication ceremony on December 16, 1978. "Generations to come will know of Carney...because of this dedication," said Ella. Just imagine

what Ella would think of this great dishonor. We should remember that Carney was the very first Italian-American and

Catholic admitted to the staff of the Hartford Hospital in the mid-1930s. His acceptance there was groundbreaking.

Just as Carney's presence at Hartford Hospital was ground-breaking for a Catholic Italian-American, so too was Ella Grasso, a Catholic Italian-American woman a ground-breaking figure in the political realm as the first woman to be elected as a governor in the United States! And just who was the single most important person urging her on to do this. It was Dr. Carniglia whom she referred to as "my hero." Ella would be livid if she were alive today and learned that the new senior center has dishonored Carney in this way.

I thank the board for seeing to it that Dr. Carniglia's memorabilia has been placed in the new senior center where it belongs. Now please make the appropriate effort to make sure that his good name is restored to the name of the senior center.

Thank you.

Schedule E

SELECTMAN COMMENTS

1. The CT DOT has approved our request for a significant funding increase and scope modification for the Windsor Locks Downtown Route 159 Complete Streets Project in the amount of \$6.5 million dollars. This is a major milestone.
2. This funding increase represents a tremendous investment in the future of our downtown and reflects the Town's continued efforts to secure outside funding for important infrastructure improvements.
3. We were originally awarded \$3.5 million in 2018 through the Local Transportation Capital Improvement Program (LTCIP), which is administered by the Capitol Region Council of Governments - CRCOG (CRCOG) and funded by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CT DOT).
4. The original project proposed a roundabout installation, which was ultimately rejected by Windsor Locks residents. Since then, the Town has worked closely with our consultant designers at Fuss & O'Neill to develop a new design focused on improving roadway alignment, pedestrian safety, and the overall walkability of downtown.

As a result of the increased funding, the revised project will now incorporate:

- Proven traffic-calming measures to improve roadway safety.
- Additional drainage improvements.
- Granite curbing.
- Ornamental lighting to enhance roadway and pedestrian safety.
- Additional Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs).
- Increased on-street parking.

With construction costs rising significantly since 2018, the Town submitted a funding increase request to account for inflation and the expanded project scope.

The project is currently in the preliminary design phase. As design progresses, the Town will hold a Public Information Meeting (PIM) to formally present the plans and receive feedback from residents. Stay tuned for information about that meeting.

Main Street is just one of several roadway projects moving forward. Design work is also underway for the reconstruction of Spring Street, which is anticipated to proceed in two phases:

- Main Street to West Street
- Volunteer Drive to Route 75

Funding for the Volunteer Drive to Route 75 portion is also anticipated through LTCIP.

These projects demonstrate the importance of pursuing state, regional, and federal funding opportunities to make significant infrastructure investments possible. The Town continues to work diligently to identify and secure funding for additional roadway improvements throughout Windsor Locks.

This page is intentionally blank