

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 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
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll
Mr. White Osgood
Dr. Stewart Beckett III
Ms. Mary LaChance
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Ms. Lillian Tanski

a. Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Dr. Beckett

2. Public Comment.

Mr. Gullotta explained that the majority of the Council voted to have this meeting be Zoom only, due to public health concerns about meeting in-person. After discussion with the Town Attorney, the Chairman decided to move forward with a Zoom-only format for tonight.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments received:

Stephanie Johnson of 50 Smithbrook Terrace, stated that, at the August 31 Special Meeting, she was made aware that the Town Manager was given emergency powers regarding COVID-19 back in March. For a year's time, the Council has shown that it is able to meet either via Zoom or in-person, so the emergency powers are no longer necessary. She asked when they will expire, and what actions will be taken to remove them.

Lisa Thibodeaux of 414 Eastbury Road, strongly opposes the mailing of absentee ballots to every residential voter. Only 400 absentee ballots are received in a typical municipal election. Absentee ballots should only be sent if requested by a resident themselves. If the Council continues to spend in this fiscally irresponsible manner, she and other residents will 'fire them.'

Audrey Yellen Quinlan of 90 Candlelight Drive, agrees that it is a waste of money and paper to send out absentee ballots to every resident. She asked to send it out only to those who request it.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments from Zoom attendees.

Laura Cahill of 17 Montauk Way, is in favor of conducting the meeting via Zoom because Glastonbury remains in the red zone for average COVID-19 cases. The Democratic majority have proven to be the adults in the room, as reasonable public health policy is opposed by Republican councilmembers, specifically, Ms. Tanski. When science supports a return to in-person meetings, she will encourage that, but right now is not the time.

Jared Soper of 39 Fawn Run, stated that the Town Council and Staff can do a better job of informing residents and soliciting public opinions. One example is the moratorium which was held on marijuana businesses. The Council was not soliciting public opinion because if they did, they would have delayed the action. A second example is the land acquisition fund. The money that was approved for the fund was under a scenario that did not exist, or the criteria was changed after the money was approved. He requested that the Council work harder to be more transparent and more inclusive of public comments.

Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, supports absentee ballots for all residents. She also supports the Town Council meeting via Zoom. Erring on the side of caution is a very wise thing to do at this time.

Bruce Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, also supports absentee ballots. He noted that the Town was able to successfully conduct business via Zoom last year, so he is in favor of continued Zoom meetings for the Town Council meetings, for as long as Glastonbury is still in the red alert zone for COVID-19.

Jacqueline Weiss of 25 Lazy Valley Road, wants an update on the Town's COVID-19 infection rate, such as hospitalizations and deaths, as well as those who have had the virus and now have natural immunity. If Glastonbury is still in the red zone, then they should postpone or cancel the upcoming harvest festival. Children have to go to school. Councilmembers should be able to attend their own meetings in-person.

Stephen Michaels of 225 Grandview Drive, stated that there are over 5,000 students in town who are in schools today. He also asked why the Council cannot be in a room together with masks and social distancing. He also stated that the Council has done a fantastic job of making the absentee ballot information online. Most people in town have ordered from Amazon, which means that they can also download an application and get it themselves. Wasting \$20,000 on absentee ballot mailing is fiscally irresponsible.

Chris Haaf of 39 Strickland Street, stated that schools in town are open, so council members should do the same and go to Council Chambers. He also finds it frivolous to spend \$20,000 for mailing absentee ballots which could easily be downloaded online. He urged the Council to vote no on this waste of money.

Susan Karp of 32 Rampart Drive, thanked Mr. Gullotta for explaining the backstory behind tonight's meeting format. She stated that this meeting is not cancelled, and no one is locked out or prevented from speaking, so the process works. The virus is unpredictable, so any measure to

keep everyone safe is what they should be doing. She asked to stop the political pasturing and let the Council do their jobs. She supports a mechanism that will encourage everyone to vote safely.

Evelyn Eisenhardt of 46 Lenox Drive, also supports remote Council meetings and sending out mail-in ballots. These two issues are linked by inclusivity. Holding Council meetings by Zoom allows all residents to participate safely and easily. Mail-in voting eliminates anyone being disenfranchised for any reason and protects the right to vote, which she believes is a great way to spend taxpayer money.

Beth Hillson of Cedar Ridge Drive, agreed that mail-in ballots and virtual meetings are both linked. Community safety should take priority. She is dismayed that some people have chosen to put politics ahead of the safety and health of all. She asked why it is okay to spend money to keep Town Hall open now for the two council members who are currently there, but not okay to spend it on absentee ballots.

George Norman of 378 Weir Street, stated that requesting an absentee ballot is not a hard process. He is against spending \$20,000 to mail ballots to all.

Robert Laughlin of Manchester, Executive Director of Historical Society of Glastonbury, explained that the Historical Society is in favor of the building amendment to establish a town village center district, and they will do all they can to help.

Jane Gordon Julien of 9 Candlelight Drive, stated that public health must supersede politics. Children learn better in school, but adults can manage just fine on Zoom. She appreciates that the Council wants everyone safe. She is in favor of absentee ballots, noting that many elderly residents cannot use computers and are too vulnerable to go out and vote. She is sad that outrage culture does not want to make voting a privilege available to all.

Jennifer Wang of 84 April Drive, is a candidate for the Council, but she is speaking as a neighbor. She stated that while the number of absentee ballots in Glastonbury are few, they are growing in number each election. She expects there to be almost four times the typical number, somewhere around 1200-1600 absentee ballots, this year. She encouraged everyone to get an absentee ballot, as it is a great way of ensuring free and fair elections.

Joseph Weiss of 25 Lazy Valley Road, stated that the nastiness of this town, its newspapers, and some council members needs to change. He asked all to be adults.

Jennine Michaels of 225 Grandview Drive, is concerned about the Zoom-only meetings. Children are masked and safe in schools. The Council should follow suit. She supports a hybrid meeting with both Zoom and in-person options available. She does not support the absentee ballots initiative.

Steve Bielitz of 80 Newell Lane, seconded Mr. Laughlin's comments. He is on the Board of the Historical Society but is speaking as an individual. He supports an amendment to protect the Town Center. The initiative will attract a lot of people and spur tourism and economic development. He also suggested a pedestrian corridor around historical buildings.

Robert J. Hale, Jr. of 832 Hopewell Road, seconded Mr. Bielitz’s comments. The Town was active in trying to save the Cotton Hollow mill, and he supports the idea of a historic district and enforcing the regulations to preserve the historic character of the town. Glastonbury is a beautiful town, but much of its beauty is being lost. He favors repurposing existing residential structures in the center of town and not allowing them to be knocked down.

Gina Kopcinski of 702 Neipsic Road, does not see the need for council members to work from home because the rest of the world is moving about and working. She also does not support the mailing of absentee ballots to everyone. It is each person’s responsibility as a voter and as an adult to request one, and she believes that mailing it to everybody is enabling adults to act like babies.

- 3. **Special Reports.** *None*
- 4. **Old Business.** *None*
- 5. **New Business.**
 - a. **Action on proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations – Town Center Village District (Overlay Zone) (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report and recommendation).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to add Section 4.19 – Town Center Village District Zone and requests the Commission to forward its report and recommendation to the Council within the 35-day review period per Building Zone Regulation Section 16, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 10, 2021.

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained that he was asked to prepare a draft for tonight’s meeting, which he has done. The draft regulation is modeled after Statute 8-2j. The action for referral is for both the text and the map amendment, which includes the three areas that had previously been identified by the Council. Also provided is a photographic survey of those corridors, and a mechanism for design guidelines to be developed. He has reviewed the draft with the Town Attorney.

Mr. Osgood asked what additional steps would take place if this ordinance were adopted. Mr. Johnson explained that the application would be referred to the Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC), who has 35 days to report their thoughts and recommendations to the TPZ. Or the applicant could meet with the ADRC before they submit an application. If there are other recommendations down the road, it would be brought back to the commission for review. Mr. Osgood asked, if the TPZ recommended this and the Council approved it, would the ADRC immediately be able to review projects, or would they have to wait until design guidelines are developed. Mr. Johnson explained that they can review projects per regulations as they exist now. The design guidelines would just be another element which would add value to the process. Mr. Osgood asked why the Shoppes at Fox Run/Whole Foods is not included. Rebecca Augur,

Director of Planning and Land Use, stated that it was not included because it has a Welles Street address. Mr. Osgood contended that it should be included. Mr. Johnson agreed to add it.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the ADRC would be established by Statute 8-2j and not by a code of ordinances. Mr. Johnson explained that, should the Council decide that they want to have the group review plans outside of the village district, then they would have to amend the Town code. Mr. Cavanaugh would prefer to do that. He then asked that an overlap extension be made to Rankin Road and School Street because of the demolition clause in 8-2j, which is not included in the Historic District. Mr. Johnson confirmed that both buildings are in the Historic District and agreed to be so designated. Dr. Beckett suggested expanding it all the way down School Street and Rankin Road to New London Turnpike. Ms. Tanski is fine with expanding it, given that this is a referral to the TPZ, but asked to exercise some caution. There are a limited number of historic buildings along a stretch of non-historic development, which will inform her thoughts about the proposal generally.

Dr. Beckett stated that part of this design review is to make the Town Center more appealing. He asked if the village center designation will allow putting in place pedestrian-friendly measures. Ms. Augur explained that they may have some influence, but the underlying zoning regulations will stand. Mr. Osgood proposed holding a public hearing on this at the next Council meeting, before sending it out to TPZ for review.

Amendment by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

Disc: Mr. Osgood believes that, for a major zoning change, due deliberation with significant public input is, by far, the best process. Mr. Cavanaugh will not support the motion because time is of the essence. The Council is the final zoning authority, so they can make amends when they hear from the public. Mr. McChesney concurred. Ms. Tanski is ready to move forward with this tonight, but she believes that Mr. Osgood makes a good point about speaking with the property owners beforehand. It would be easier to hear their voices at this stage of the process rather than later. Mr. Johnson clarified that Mr. Osgood's suggestion would be a public informational hearing, rather than a zoning meeting. Ms. Carroll and Mr. Gullotta agree with Mr. Cavanaugh that time is of the essence.

Mr. Gullotta remarked that he and Mr. Cavanaugh have been exceedingly patient on this matter, so he is against delaying it even further. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed, adding that, in his view, it is unprecedented to have a public hearing before a review. Mr. McChesney stated that there will be many opportunities to have discussions and get public input. There is no reason to move away from regular procedure here.

Result: Amendment failed {3-6-0}, with only Dr. Beckett, Mr. Osgood, and Ms. Tanski voting for.

Result: Motion passed {8-1-0} with Mr. Osgood voting against.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NO 1: PROPOSED TOWN ACQUISITION OF THE 10± ACRE WELLES STREET PROPERTY AND A \$1,750,000 APPROPRIATION PER THE RESERVE FOR LAND ACQUISITION. (CONTINUED FROM JULY 27, 2021 COUNCIL MEETING.)

Mr. Johnson explained that the land has been farmed for many years. They discovered some areas where the residential pesticide exposure requirement is slightly elevated. However, it is not widespread, and the Town can manage it. The other component of this acquisition is the parking license for the area that exists to the rear of the church. It will be a public parking space with a few exceptions, such as Easter and Sunday mornings. The Town and Church will share 50-50 maintenance of the parking lot. Mr. Johnson explained that they hope to proceed with the purchase and execute the parking agreement, which is for a 10-year period, and up to 50 years maximum.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments from Zoom attendees.

Jared Soper of 39 Fawn Run, stated that \$3 million that is currently in the Land Acquisition Fund was approved in November 2019. At that time, there were only four criteria for the fund, and the criterion used to purchase this land was not one of them. The criteria were then changed in May 2020, during a time of lockdown and COVID-19. Hence, he does not think that it was well-known that the criteria were changed. The Council needs to better publicize these actions because the residents did not approve \$3 million for this purchase.

Doug Foyle of 534 Addison Road, expressed strong support for the purchase of this property because it is a wonderful opportunity for the Town to buy. He also appreciates the Zoom meeting format.

There were no further comments from the public.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the chemical on the property was the same as on Nayaug School. Mr. Johnson stated yes, but the concentrations at the school were far higher. They tilled and treated the soil and reduced the levels of concentrations. They then removed the soil and replaced it with clean soil. Mr. Cavanaugh responded to Mr. Soper's comments, stating that it is his belief that the ordinance for land acquisition was for other municipal uses. Mr. Gullotta concurred. Mr. Johnson stated that the ordinance was written that way. Ms. Tanski believed that the language was an appropriate change, but in the interest of clarity for the community, she asked for details about it. Mr. Johnson explained that the one area of the ordinance which was added is the statement of land that promotes orderly development of the town. That was the most significant change between the old language and the new language. There is no proposed intention for any specific use on this site at this time, so the site is consistent with the court order.

Dr. Beckett fully supports this application, and the parking fulfills the public's need. Mr. Niland asked for the restrictions on the property. Mr. Johnson explained that for five years following closing, uses would be limited to recreational, open space, municipal facilities, agriculture, and commercial uses, but not medical. After that point, there is no such restriction. Mr. McChesney agrees with Dr. Beckett. The parking space is a good boon to the town. He agreed with Ms.

LaChance's clarifying comment that this is an existing parking lot, not a new one. Ms. Carroll believes that this is a great acquisition for the town.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves purchase of 10± acre parcels owned by Saints Isidore and Maria Parish Corporation located off Welles Street in accordance with the Real Estate Contract between the Town and Church dated June 29, 2021 and a \$1.75 million appropriation per the reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation for the proposed town acquisition as recommended by the Town Plan & Zoning Commission and Board of Finance;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the Parking License Agreement between the Town and Saints Isidore and Maria Parish Corporation to establish a public parking use in accordance with the Parking License Agreement between the Town and Church dated June 29, 2021;

all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 10, 2021.

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

**NO 2: PROPOSED TOWN ACQUISITION OF THE 1.18 ACRE GOODALE-RAMAKER POST #56 PROPERTY AND A \$195,000 APPROPRIATION AND TRANSFER.
(CONTINUED FROM JULY 27, 2021 COUNCIL MEETING.)**

Mr. Johnson explained that the survey is complete. There is a requirement that the American Legion continue to use the front room as their museum, where they hold monthly meetings, for the first three years after closing. After which, it will continue on a year-to-year basis subject to Council action.

There were no comments from the public or the Council.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves town purchase of the 1.18-acre parcel owned by Goodale-Ramaker Post #56 (American Legion) located at 1361 Main Street and a \$195,000 appropriation from the Reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation as recommended by the Town Plan & Zoning Commission and Board of Finance, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 10, 2021.

Disc: Mr. Osgood stated that this is a critical piece to ensure access to Earle Park, so he will support this. Ms. Tanski agreed that this is a very good investment from the town, with an opportunity for expanded recreational space, beyond schools.

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

NO 3: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TOWN CODE ARTICLE IV – “TOBACCO-FREE AND SMOKE-FREE RECREATION AREAS” TO INCLUDE CANNABIS PRODUCTS.

Mr. Johnson explained that in September 2017, the Council enacted a tobacco and smoke-free ordinance for Town parks and recreation areas. This amendment builds upon that to include marijuana and cannabis products as a prohibited use.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for public comment.

Robert J. Hale, Jr. of 832 Hopewell Road, is surprised that the ordinance includes not only use, but also possession. Enforcement would be difficult. He suggests deletion of the part of the ordinance that would ban possession and tailor the use for only that which goes into the atmosphere and affects the area, such as smoking and vaping.

Mr. Johnson explained that the ordinance does not talk about possession. It mainly speaks to the use of either tobacco or cannabis products. Ms. Tanski was not on the Council at the time that the ordinance was passed. However, given that this is a town ordinance, she believes that the Council should regulate the use of cannabis at least as much as they regulate the use of tobacco products in public spaces. She believes that the language of the ordinance clear that this is not about possession. Mr. McChesney finds this ordinance to be a reasonable update to a reasonable town regulation. He, too, wants to ensure that the language is limited to smoking, and not include eating a brownie, for example. Mr. Johnson explained that chewing tobacco is banned in town parks, so there is not a huge distinction between that and eating a brownie.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves Amendment to Town Code Article IV “Tobacco-Free and Smoke-Free Recreation Areas,” to include cannabis products as a prohibited use in Town recreation areas; the said Amendment effective October 4, 2021, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 10, 2021.

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

b. Appointment of Council Member to the Selection Committee for the Design Guideline RFQ and Council Members to the Building Zone Regulations Working Group.

The Building Zone Regulations Working Group: Mr. Cavanaugh, Dr. Beckett, and Mr. Gullotta will serve, by consensus.

The Selection Committee for the Design Guideline RFQ: Mr. Gullotta and Mr. Osgood will serve, by consensus.

c. Discussion and possible action – distribution of applications for absentee ballots.

Mr. Gullotta explained his rationale for asking to include this on the agenda. In Connecticut, those who have had a breakthrough COVID-19 experience and passed away are over the age of 70. Demographically, the over-70 age group votes in high numbers. With that population, in particular, and the fact that they are not necessarily computer-savvy, he reasoned that mailing an absentee ballot application to senior citizens made sense. He was made aware that they could not select age groups, so his idea was to send it to everyone. He was told that the logistics were impossible, so he is not encouraging mailing applications to everyone. However, he encourages all those who would like to vote via absentee ballot to do so.

Mr. Johnson explained that he was asked to look at the process of sending out an absentee ballot application. He consulted with Town Clerk Michelle Krampitz. They found that the logistics of printing the ballots would take some time, and it is likely that voters would not receive them until a week or two before Election Day. However, he noted that they looked at the potential of sending out a postcard advising voters of where to get an absentee ballot and where to vote. The cost would be cheaper, and the turnaround would be shorter. Ms. Krampitz explained all the information that will be listed on the postcard. She noted that applications for absentee ballots are very easy to get, and people have been calling in for them already. People do know that COVID-19 is one of the reasons that they can choose to vote via absentee ballot in this election. Additionally, people living in nursing homes, congregate housing, and assisted living facilities will be sent an absentee ballot regardless.

Dr. Beckett thinks that \$20,000 is the wrong metric to look at because this is not a money issue, but one about democracy and voting. Connecticut has some of the most restrictive voting laws in the country. The postcard at least helps people know how to go about voting and be informed about the process. Ms. Carroll agrees. Making voting easier and most accessible should be the metric. She noted that this seems like a great way to achieve transparency and inform the public on what is going on. In 2020, Glastonbury had over 9,000 absentee ballots. Ms. Krampitz stated that is true, but in a typical municipal election, it is only around 300 or so. The Secretary of State's office is working on a new process to expand the absentee ballots process in the future. Ms. Tanski asked what the cost of the postcards would be. Ms. Krampitz stated about \$13,000. There will also be some absentee ballots placed in various town facilities, such as the RCC and the library, which would be at no additional cost to residents.

Mr. Niland is in favor of this because he wants people to vote safely. He noted that absentee ballots multiplied almost five times since COVID-19. Mr. Osgood stated that everybody knows that there will be an election in November. Anyone who needs or wants an absentee ballot can get it, so he does not see the need for a \$13,000 expenditure for a notice to tell people what they already know. Mr. McChesney stated that he has talked to many people who did not know that elections are coming up. COVID-19 is still a valid reason to request an absentee ballot, which he believes is the most important thing to share with the public. He thinks that the postcard is a good idea.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby appropriates \$13,000 to send out the postcards, as described by the Town Manager and the Town Clerk, to the residents of Glastonbury.

Disc: Ms. Tanski asked that there be press releases and social media used to communicate this information. Ms. Krampitz stated that that is what they normally do and will do so again this year. Mr. Osgood believes that the Council is grossly underestimating the intelligence of the Glastonbury citizen. He will vote against this. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that 2020 was an unusual year, so making projections on the absentee ballot numbers based on that is not sound. He does not know why the idea of the ballots changed to postcards. He believes that they can depend on the electorate to turn out for votes. Mr. Niland countered Mr. Cavanaugh's insinuation that this is an attempt by the Democratic party to subvert voting.

Ms. Tanski asked where the funds will come from. Mr. Johnson stated that the money would come out of funds that are appropriated for the current year, generally for printing and postage. Ms. Tanski stated that the state legislature has made the absentee ballot more accessible than it has ever been before. Bringing national politics into Glastonbury is unfortunate, and it does not apply. All council members want everyone to vote. The question is whether the \$13,000 is appropriately spent in this way or should be saved instead. Ms. Carroll believes that if it gets more people voting, then it is money well spent. She also took issue with Mr. Cavanaugh's suggestion that something nefarious is going on by the Democratic party, calling his comments inappropriate and offensive.

Amendment by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Ms. Tanski

Mr. Osgood proposed an amendment that, instead of the postcards, they allocate \$500 for advertisements to be put in the Citizen with the same information.

Result: Amendment failed {2-7-0}, with only Mr. Osgood and Ms. Tanski voting for.

Result: Motion passed {6-3-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh, Mr. Osgood, and Ms. Tanski voting against.

d. Action on general wage adjustment effective July 1, 2021 – Town Manager.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the following actions:

1. *2.0% general wage adjustment effective July 1, 2021.*
2. *\$7500 contribution to the Town Manager's retirement fund.*

Disc: Dr. Beckett thanked Mr. Johnson for his hard work and efforts over the past year. Mr. Niland echoed. Mr. Osgood proposed an amendment to change \$7500 to \$5000 because this is not a position that has a bonus associated with the salary.

Amendment by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Disc: Mr. Cavanaugh stated that they typically do not offer a bonus, but they contribute to the Town Manager's retirement fund. He asked why there is a boost in the retirement fund this year. Dr. Beckett believes it was \$5000 the last couple of years, but this year has been an exceptional one, with COVID-19, and the Town Manager went above and beyond to respond to the crisis. This is a way for the Town to say thank you. Mr. Cavanaugh countered that Glastonbury Police, Fire, and others have also worked very hard, and they are not being rewarded in this way. Ms. LaChance agreed wholeheartedly with Dr. Beckett, adding that this has been an unprecedented year, and Mr. Johnson's efforts have been outstanding. Ms. Carroll agreed, thanking Mr. Johnson for his outstanding judgment and commitment to the Town. She remarked that trying to nickel and dime him for the exceptional work he does for this town is unacceptable.

Ms. Tanski stated that, were she spending her own money, she would support more than a \$2500 increase for the Town Manager. However, it is not appropriate for her to out give discretionary taxpayer funds, especially in a manner that is not spread out uniformly across staff but to one individual. Mr. McChesney stated that these are discretionary funds. It is wrong to paint this as a zero-sum between Mr. Johnson and other staff. This is about Mr. Johnson tonight, and he has done a tremendous job. Mr. Gullotta remarked that, just a few days after surgery, Mr. Johnson made sure that homes with concerns about flooding had services in place. He supports the motion.

Result: Amendment failed {3-6-0}, with only Mr. Cavanaugh, Ms. Tanski, and Mr. Osgood voting for.

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

6. Consent Calendar.

a. General Fund Transfer – Goods and Services.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 28, 2021 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance \$411,000 for goods and services ordered but not yet

received as of June 30, 2021, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 10, 2021.

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

e. Action to establish meeting format per COVID.

Motion by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Niland

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adds to the agenda a discussion on Council meeting formats and how the next Council meeting will be handled.

Result: Motion to add item to agenda passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

Mr. Osgood is in favor of a hybrid format, with meetings conducted both in-person and via Zoom. Mr. Niland commented that, when Glastonbury is in the red zone, all meetings should be conducted exclusively via Zoom. Ms. Tanski asked how the Council will be meeting on September 28, and what the metrics are that will dictate how meetings will be run. The Town is still in the process of learning and conducting better Zoom meetings. She asked to refer the question to the Rules and Procedures subcommittee, for a report at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Cavanaugh proposed having hybrid meetings for the rest of the term, which ends on November 2. Ms. Carroll stated that, just because the Council can meet in person does not mean they should. The metric they should use is if Glastonbury's COVID-19 numbers fall in the Red Zone. She noted that a lot of discussion was had around children going back to school. She pointed out that the COVID-19 dashboard for Glastonbury public schools shows about 80 children who are either quarantined or in isolation. It is important to model good governance. While she does not want to meet virtually, at this time, it is necessary.

Ms. Tanski stated that, while they have been in the red zone, they have met at Town Hall. A significant amount of investment has gone into making Council Chambers safer and to make a nearly seamless hybrid experience. The question is whether they will allow constituents to come into Town Hall and participate in the process, if that is the way they see most appropriate. Town governance is important enough to show up and to keep meetings open and responsive. Ms. LaChance clarified that they have not met while in the red zone, and the public does not have to have the app to access the Zoom meetings; they can dial in by phone, as well. Mr. McChesney stated that the Council can take steps to move Glastonbury out of the red zone, such as moving their meetings to an online format.

Dr. Beckett offered another metric that, when Town Hall is open, then the Council Chambers will be open for Council meetings. Mr. McChesney pointed out that Town Hall does not generally attract a huge mass of people, like many of the Council's meetings do. That is why he agrees with the metric proposed by Mr. Niland. Mr. Johnson stated that there should be a limit on the number of people in Council Chambers at any given time. This could be done by markings on chairs to create social distancing in the room. The Council agreed to have Mr. Johnson and the Health Director determine the maximum capacity in Council Chambers.

Motion by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council will meet in person, subject to the ability for council members and the public to attend the meetings through Zoom.

Result: Motion failed {4-5-0}, with Ms. Carroll, Ms. LaChance, Mr. McChesney, Mr. Niland, and Mr. Gullotta voting against.

Mr. Niland proposed his motion:

Motion by: Mr. Niland

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council will meet via Zoom, if the most recent COVID-19 metric report for the Town of Glastonbury is in the Red Zone. If Glastonbury falls in the Orange Zone or below, then the Council will meet in person, with the option for Zoom attendance.

Disc: Ms. Tanski will support what she believes to be the incorrect metric but for the right reasons, explaining that this at least gives the chance of restoring live public meetings for their neighbors. Ms. Carroll hopes to return to in-person meetings soon, but she advocates a cautious, responsible approach. She supports the motion. Mr. McChesney agreed. Mr. Osgood will also support the motion because it sets a criterion for how they decide whether to meet in person or not.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson explained that Glastonbury is one of a handful of communities across the state to be recognized for both budgeting and financial reporting. The Town is also, once again, a Heart Safe community. The crime dashboard is being rolled out. He would like to schedule the demonstration at either the next Council meeting or the one after. He also asked the Council to

schedule a public information meeting in October to discuss the American Rescue Plan Act. He will present some broad concepts on how monies can be allocated. He also noted that the Town was recently advised that their application was approved for a \$150,000 grant to improve exhaust systems at the firehouse.

Mr. Osgood requested that the BOE give a presentation to the Council on how they plan on spending leftover funds from the budget. Mr. McChesney finds it reasonable to have the option for members of the public to turn on their video on Zoom, should they so choose. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the cut-through from Eastern Boulevard to Addison Road. He noted that the Town had promised residents to buffer that with bushes. Mr. Johnson thinks that the tree buffer was planted by the Town, but he will check the required conditions of approval.

8. Committee Reports.

- a. **Chairman's Report.** *None*
- b. **MDC.** *None*
- c. **CRCOG.** *None*

9. Communications.

- a. **Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 175 Dickinson Road.**

10. Minutes.

- a. **Minutes of July 27, 2021 Regular Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

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

- b. **Minutes of August 11, 2021 Special Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

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

- c. **Minutes of August 31, 2021 Special Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

Result: Minutes were accepted with one abstention from Mr. Osgood since he was not present at the meeting {8-0-1}.

11. Appointments and Resignations.

- a. **Resignation of Napali Bridgelall from the Community Beautification Committee (D-2023).**
- b. **Resignation of H. Scott Miller from the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (Alternate, R-2023).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

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

12. Executive Session. None

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their regular meeting of September 14, 2021 at 11:01 P.M.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman