

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2021**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

1. Roll Call.

Council Members

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman
Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman
Dr. Stewart Beckett III
Ms. Mary LaChance
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll
Mr. Whit C. Osgood
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Ms. Lillian Tanski

a. Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Mr. Cavanaugh

2. Public Comment.

Ms. Carroll read the written comment, which was submitted too late to be read at the previous Town meeting.

Jessica Jarvis of 1270 Main Street, asked if a third option has been explored which shifts the proposed sidewalk location to the east side of Main Street, with two crosswalks added for safety. She noted that in her 12 years living in Glastonbury, there have been at least five traffic incidents in that area.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for attendees to comment. There were no volunteers.

3. Special Reports.

a. Report on October 1, 2020 Grand List.

Mr. Johnson explained that the Town Assessor, Nicole Lintereur, recently issued her report and assigned the Grand List, which ended up being higher than their forecast, at 0.93%. Dr. Beckett asked if the housing market will stabilize, following COVID-19. Ms. Lintereur stated that the residential market should continue to go up for a while, given how low interest rates are, but the commercial market looks like it will be steady but not improving tremendously.

4. Old Business. *None*

5. New Business.

a. Action on funding request for Commission on Racial Justice and Equity – survey/research.

Ms. Carroll explained that they have had recommendations to interview two firms who both offer a research plan to guide the recommendations of the Commission going forward. They had two strong presentations but preferred the approach and cost by Great Blue, which is a Glastonbury firm. With an estimated cost of roughly \$40-\$45,000, the firm agreed to provide \$30,000 of that pro bono. Mr. Johnson added that the general cost proposal to complete the survey work is roughly \$15,000 but the funding proposal is for \$20,000 to allow for some flexibility. This action would not require a supplemental allocation.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$20,000 appropriation from the Professional Services account to fund research by Great Blue for work in the name of the Commission on Racial Justice and Equity.

Discussion: Mr. Osgood asked, as a favor to the Council, that should the Commission spend the extra \$5,000 in contingency, they will return to the Council to explain how the money was spent. Ms. Carroll agreed to do so.

Result: Motion was passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

b. Discussion concerning unit-based process for disposal of municipal solid waste.

Mr. Johnson explained that the Connecticut Coalition for Sustainable Materials Management (CCSMM) identified ways to reduce the solid waste stream through recycling, organics, and other opportunities. He noted that Mr. Osgood had asked a question about unit-based solid waste, which might be mandated or required down the road. It is a pay-as-you-go system, which is more equitable because the more one throws out, the more they pay. Glastonbury has done a good job of reducing annual waste tonnage at the transfer station. Until about 2010, Mr. Johnson and Mike Bisi had developed a proposal on how a unit-based paper bag system would work, but the protocol did not move forward.

Mr. Osgood asked if there would not be substantial savings, if the Town were to pursue this system just for the transfer station. Mr. Johnson stated that there will be some savings, around \$14,000, but the Council has to determine the cost-benefit analysis of the action. Dr. Beckett remarked that this is a chance for Glastonbury to pursue community sustainability rather than a major financial savings. Mr. Gullotta stated that the people who have stickers are doing a remarkable job recycling. Glastonbury has a system that works well and there is very good compliance in the community. Mr. Osgood remarked that they have had some issues with the recycling center near Highland Market. He asked Mr. Johnson to put it on the agenda for discussion at their next meeting. Mr. Johnson agreed to do so.

c. Discussion concerning Glastonbury Historic Districts.

Mr. Johnson explained that there is a process to designate an area as a historic district. The first step is for either the Chair or the Council to ask the Historic District Commission to evaluate the potential for new districts. Two-thirds of the property owners in the recommended area(s) have to support the matter; otherwise, the process is halted. Ms. Tanski asked if they have received any feedback from members of the public about the establishment of historic districts. Mr. Johnson has not, but Mr. Gullotta has had several phone calls from the public inquiring about how to start the process. Mr. Niland expressed that the best way of preserving the historical character of Town is through this process, so he supports sending action to the Historic District Commission. Mr. Cavanaugh requested that they also ask the Commission to review the Village Districts statute. Mr. Johnson agreed to put both actions on the next meeting agenda.

Mr. Gullotta explained that he had a discussion with the Glastonbury Historical Society, who are prepared to help the Historic District Commission with their study by hiring grant-funded staff members. Ms. Tanski cautioned that the Council be very careful about which area(s) they target for selection because they must take into consideration residents' real estate. Mr. Gullotta stated that he and Mr. Cavanaugh took such an approach when they decided what to recommend to the Council. Mr. Johnson stated that he is awaiting feedback on whether or not residents voting against becoming a part of the historic district can opt out. He will provide that information at the Council's next meeting.

6. Consent Calendar. *None*

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson explained that, regarding the Main Street/Route 17 new sidewalks, there was a question on whether there could be some traffic calming there, but since it is a state road, that would be up to the DOT. The Council agreed to have Mr. Johnson send along the request to the DOT for consideration. Mr. Johnson stated that Mr. Osgood had asked a question about the Cedar Ridge water line, for which was installed about 483 linear feet for \$164,000. The Kimberly Lane/Dayton Road and Raymond Road were a little closer to \$500 per linear foot. At the Capital workshop, Mr. Johnson was asked a question about language that the Council could enact to reserve the right to borrow for a particular project, so he included a protocol that exists for that. Unfortunately, the \$600,000 grant from Community Connectivity for the Bell Street project was not approved. There is a communication tower proposed off of Sequin Drive, for which the Council can hold a public hearing. He will put it on the next meeting agenda.

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified that when he suggested bonding, he did not mean that he wanted to reduce the Capital Transfer. Mr. Osgood noted that West Hartford bonded to fund their pension up to 100%. He asked if the Board of Finance has thought about that. Mr. Johnson explained that West Hartford's pension obligation is \$360 million. They use the same actuaries Glastonbury does. Milliman has prepared a model for Glastonbury, which he will discuss with the Board of Finance this week. Mr. Gullotta believes that Glastonbury's current plan for meeting its obligations is a prudent one. He then asked what the crew team and rentals will be. Mr. Johnson

stated that he can provide the Council a report at their next meeting.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report.

- **Appointment of Council liaison to Negotiating Team – School Administrator's contract.**

By consensus, the Council agreed to appoint Mr. Niland to the Negotiating Team.

b. MDC. None

c. CRCOG. None

9. Communications.

- a. Letter from Centerline Communications regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 2108 Main Street.**

10. Minutes.

- a. Minutes of January 20, 2021 Special Meeting (CIP Workshop).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

- b. Minutes of January 26, 2021 Regular Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

- c. Minutes of January 27, 2021 Annual Town Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations. None

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

Result: The Council unanimously moved to recess until the public hearing at 8:00 P.M. {9-0-0}.

PUBLIC HEARING:

NO 1: ACTION ON APPROPRIATION AND TRANSFER OF \$360,000 FROM CAPITAL RESERVE – UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE TO CAPITAL PROJECTS – GHS FIELDHOUSE.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$360,000 appropriation and transfer from the Capital Reserve – Unassigned Fund Balance to Capital Projects – GHS Fieldhouse, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated February 5, 2021 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained that there were 15 bids on the project, and they are \$360,000 shy of awarding the contract to complete the project by August 2021.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for public comment. There were no comments.

Dr. Beckett stated that they have tried to get the price lowered for a long time, but it did not happen, so they just need to do this now. He proposed an amendment to formally attach Mr. Johnson's report, which has language that the project could potentially be bonded and that the Capital Reserve Fund could potentially be reimbursed. The intent is to incorporate tonight's funding proposal as well as the previous funding, for the entire project cost.

Amendment by: Dr. Beckett

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

Disc: Ms. Carroll asked to not delay this action. She struggles with the idea of retroactively bonding something and shifting the burden to future residents. The Board of Finance approved the appropriation, so it is not appropriate to bond, in this case. Ms. LaChance agreed, adding that they have already set aside the money, so she does not understand why they would go out to bond. Mr. Niland concurred, stating that bonding will drive up the cost. Mr. Osgood clarified that the amendment does not say that they will go out to bond, but that they have the ability to bond.

Ms. Tanski stated that there is a way to think about bonding that does express the distribution of cost and value of a building. This kind of project would have been ideal to bond because it is a 50-year use project. However, due to the need to get this project funded, and given that the money has already been set aside, bonding for this project does not make sense. She concluded that the Council does recognize the value of bonding for the future benefit of the Town when it comes to land acquisition.

Mr. Niland stated that they have some big-ticket items coming up that will need to be bonded, so he does not want to take up bonding space for something that they can pay for right now. Mr. McChesney stated that he is personally averse to debt. For this particular project, the payments have been structured in a responsible way, paid for over a few years, so he is uneasy with looking to retroactively bond.

Result: Amendment failed with all but Dr. Beckett, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Mr. Osgood voting against {3-6-0}.

Disc: Mr. Osgood stated that they should send the project back and ask for a design that is more affordable for the Town. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed, saying that this has become a runaway train. Mr. Niland agreed that the project is overpriced, but it needs to be done now. Mr. McChesney and Ms. Tanski agreed with Mr. Niland.

Result: Motion passed with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Osgood voting against {7-2-0}.

12. Executive Session.
a. Potential land acquisition.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition at 8:35 P.M.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

Present for the Executive Session item were council members, Mr. Tom Gullotta, Chairman, Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman, Dr. Beckett, Ms. Deb Carroll, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Ms. Lillian Tanski, and Mr. Whit Osgood, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 8:55 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 8:56 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta
Chairman