

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING – FINAL BUDGET HEARING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2022**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Special Meeting – Final Budget Hearing at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with the option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

1. Roll Call.

Council Members

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman
Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. John Cavanna
Ms. Mary LaChance
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Mr. Whit Osgood
Ms. Jennifer Wang

a. Pledge of Allegiance *Led by Alex Wood*

2. Public Comment.

David O'Connor of 1140 Main Street, expressed appreciation for the hard work of the Council and other elected bodies in town. He hopes that any remaining ARPA funds will be used towards affordable housing. He supports initiatives to meet that purpose, such as land acquisition. He then asked to consider creating a virtual platform inside the RCC to increase participation.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments, as received on the Town website:

CZ Mozzochi of 227 Hebron Avenue, expressed several concerns regarding Dr. Bookman's spending methodology. Before the Council votes on the proposed Naubuc School renovation project, the total financing plan should be in place, without any subsequent, proposed financing, and a COVID-19 expert should carefully examine statements made by Dr. Bookman and the BOE. Dr. Bookman said the BOE is prepared to use significant amounts of funds in various BOE accounts, if necessary, to finance the project. However, those funds were collected from the taxpayers. Additionally, funding for the equipment towards the new Science Center, which Mr. Mozzochi finds unnecessary, will also be collected from taxpayers.

Lisa Rouleau of 12 Conestoga Way, is against the LPRs. The \$40,000 price tag could be used on other items. She is also concerned about the protection of the recorded data, which can be requested by the public. She does not believe that LPRs will not solve car theft problems.

Additionally, Glastonbury is not a high crime community, so it does not warrant such an expenditure.

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

Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, asked that the remaining ARPA funds be used towards affordable housing.

Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, advocates for non-age restricted, subsidized affordable housing units. She was saddened to see that ARPA funds did not include money to buy land to use towards affordable housing. She also asked to use the remaining ARPA funds towards affordable housing.

Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive, asked why affordable housing was eliminated from the list of uses for the ARPA funds and from the list of uses for excess ARPA funds. She would like to see an adjustment in the ARPA funds to be used for affordable housing. Additionally, she has concerns about the cost for the new dog shelter. She sees no reason why the shelter is being moved. She then asked if the pickleball players will provide matching funds for the pickleball courts, as has been done in the past with other types of specialized expenses. She asked if the Williams Memorial Academy expense is urgent.

Mr. Gullotta addressed the question of the use of ARPA funds for affordable housing. The Council is aware that there are additional ARPA funds and affordable housing is an important issue. Those discussions are ongoing. However, they cannot discuss that matter this evening because land acquisition discussions must be done confidentially.

PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING

FINAL BUDGET HEARING – 2022-2023 GENERAL FUND-TOWN OPERATIONS, DEBT AND TRANSFER, EDUCATION, REVENUES, TRANSFERS AND USE OF FUND BALANCE, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, AND SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS.

3. Old Business.
 - a. Action on Resolutions Adopting the 2022-2023 Operating Budget.

Mr. Johnson explained that tonight's resolutions are to formally enact the budgets for FY 2023, effective July 1, 2022.

Mr. Gullotta reviewed Mr. Johnson's memo and explained that the Council will address each issue before voting on resolutions. The first item is a proposal to add \$150,000 to the budget for Youth and Family Services (YFS). Mr. Osgood asked why the BOE does not fill this staffing role instead, since it is an elementary school issue. Mr. Johnson explained that clinical outreach and services have been provided by YFS for many years. A concern was expressed on avoiding duplication of services with the Student Support Services (SSCs). They are two different services. YFS provides ongoing clinical support, while the SSCs provide in-school counseling.

The next item concerns altering the contingency to another type of fund, to go from \$75,000 to \$175,000. Mr. Johnson explained that, for many years, the Town had a contingency account of \$75,000. When the budget was reduced in FY 2017 because of uncertainty of the ECS, the contingency account was eliminated. Much of that was restored. He asked if the Council would consider transitioning the \$75,000 contingency to the Unassigned Fund Balance as an undesignated allocation, in order to respond to cost increases posed by this unstable market with high inflation and growing prices. The proposed \$100,000 would increase revenue by \$25,000, resulting in no net influence on the budget. There is no impact on the tax rate. His concern is that they have limited ways of moving around money. The Council would need to increase Town Operations by \$100,000; reduce Debt and Transfers by \$75,000; and add \$25,000 to the revenues. Mr. Osgood finds that, given the inflation rate, this action makes a lot of sense. Ms. Carroll stated that this equips the Town with a streamlined way to cover increased costs.

Mr. Johnson explained that the BOF recommends a \$1 million lump sum contribution to the pension fund from the Unassigned Fund Balance. This would reduce the ADC by \$100,000, of which \$67,500 is in Town operations. Mr. Osgood supports the recommendation because it would move the Town closer to being fully funded and earning more money than is currently generated in the General Fund. Mr. Niland does not support this action because he finds it short sighted. The Town is on the trajectory to go below the GFOA Best Practices for the Unassigned Fund Balance. If that happens, it will jeopardize Glastonbury's AAA bond rating. Once money is sent to the pension fund, it cannot be retrieved. Ms. Carroll agreed, stating that the AAA bond rating is valuable to the Town. It does not make sense to use 3% of their savings to cover 1% of their debt.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the current Unassigned Fund Balance percentage is and what is the minimum required by policy. Mr. Johnson explained that the minimum policy is 12% and the current FY is 16.74%. Mr. Cavanaugh finds the Unassigned Fund Balance to be bloated. Reducing it would not affect their bond rating. He supports the BOF recommended transfer to save taxpayers money. Ms. LaChance is not in favor of the change, finding it penny-wise, pound-foolish. Going down to the absolute minimum is not wise. It is better to stay with the GFOA recommendation.

Ms. Wang is not in favor of the transfer. She sees the rationale, but the Council's responsibility is not solely to save the taxpayers money, but also to manage their savings in a way that can hedge against future shocks. Right now, there is instability with inflation and war. She is also troubled by the trajectory of the Unassigned Fund Balance in the next few years, which is projected to dip below the GFOA minimum balance. Mr. McChesney is uncomfortable pursuing something that would jeopardize their bond rating. He noted that the Town routinely refinances the bonds they receive, and their AAA rating helps acquire better rates, thus saving taxpayers money. Especially with the current market volatility, the BOF's recommendation carries more risks than benefits.

Mr. Osgood asked how much the Unassigned Fund Balance is, in dollar amounts. Mr. Johnson stated a little over \$30 million. Mr. Osgood does not think that moving the \$1 million will yield a negative effect on the AAA bond rating. Also, he has seen a disinclination of putting money in the pension fund because of fear of what will happen in the stock market. That is not how one should invest in the pension fund. What is short-sighted is not fully funding their pension and saving taxpayers money. Mr. Gullotta countered that the Town is on track to be 100% fully funded in 12 years. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that they have an obligation to the employees of the town. He asked his colleagues across the aisle to stop messing around with the pension and work together to get

it fully funded. Mr. Niland explained that when the mortality tables came in at such a high number, they decided to give taxpayers a break by adding a year to the amortization schedule. Taking \$1 million out of it does not change one day of the 12 years left to pay for it.

The next topic for discussion was the LPRs for the Glastonbury Police Department. Mr. Johnson explained that the Town Attorney stated that the basic data is subject to FOIA. The Town can determine the length of time for record keeping, and they are not required to provide customized reports. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that the estimate of \$100 per camera per year is a little off. He asked if the requested amount would remain the same. Mr. Johnson explained that the contract vendor's fee is dependent on the contract length of time. The fee is either \$100 per camera per month for five years, or \$200 per camera per month for one year. Mr. Johnson assured the Council that, even though the one-year option doubles the cost, they will not ask for twice the funds originally requested.

Mr. Cavanna asked how this will affect staffing. Police Chief Porter explained that there will be dedicated staffing who are authorized to use the system. Ms. Wang's main concerns are around privacy and unintended use. There is a risk of misuse of personal liberties. This is not a challenge unique to Glastonbury or even the State. LPR data is a public record, and anyone can submit an FOIA request. She also noted that if somebody can get the data via a spreadsheet on FOIA, then that negates the Town's protective policy of purging data after 30 days and limiting access to certain personnel. This is because anybody can take data and keep it in perpetuity. While the data itself is not customizable, spreadsheets are easily customizable. She finds that the risks outweigh the benefits.

Mr. Cavanaugh is concerned about the number of cameras and the expense. Chief Porter explained that the thought was to try to cover every major entrance and exit to/from Town. The current proposal is for 41 cameras to cover 13 intersections. He has the list of locations and can submit it to the Council. The Chief noted that, if the Council allotted fewer cameras than requested, they will readjust their purchase. Mr. Johnson added that they could pick a certain number of the listed intersections to pursue. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to explain the difference between mounted LPRs versus LPRs on the cruisers. Mr. Porter explained that the mobile units are typically used to conduct motor vehicle enforcement activities. Mr. Cavanna has firsthand experience with how effective LPRs are in preventing and solving crimes. He invited the Council to his operation center in Hartford to show what the technology can do.

Mr. Niland stated that if the Police Chief believes that these LPRs will solve crimes, then he will support it. If an officer were to abuse their power, there would be disciplinary action against them. This technology is used all over the country. He understands the worry about being tracked, though his smartphones are far more of a risk in that regard. The benefits will far outweigh the privacy concerns. Ms. Carroll has no doubt that these are a fundamental tool in crime prevention. She is not concerned about abuse of this system by law enforcement. Her concern is that the scope of what people can and will do with public information is too problematic for her to support.

Mr. McChesney supports the LPRs. He takes the Chief at his word that this will be a vital tool in helping Glastonbury remain safe. Glastonbury is behind the times in using this technology, which many of their surrounding communities have been using for years. He shares Ms. Carroll's concerns about the technology being subject to FOIA requests. He asked if the police tracks requests from cases such as an abusive partner trying to track their loved one by a FOIA

request. Chief Porter stated that he personally does not, but their police staff does. He noted that the data contains no personal identifying information. They cannot give information requesting a name or a specific license plate number. However, if someone requests information from a particular place and time, then they must hand over that information. The Chief explained that California has a law in the books that LPR data is not allowed to be disseminated outside of law enforcement. There is an opportunity here to effect some change in statutory law.

Mr. McChesney stated that the concern is with the dissemination of information. They must have a mechanism to ensure that if someone's information is shared, they will be notified. Mr. Gullotta agreed with Ms. Carroll. This is an issue of sacrificing one's rights to privacy for information. This is the privacy of everyone who gets on the road and drives by one of these cameras. While other towns have accepted this technology, he cannot.

In a preliminary show of hands, the Council favored budgeting \$40,000 for LPRs {5-4-0}, with Mr. Gullotta, Ms. Carroll, Ms. LaChance, and Ms. Wang voting against.

The Council recessed for 10 minutes, reconvening at 8:31 P.M.

(1) RESOLUTION FOR THE GENERAL FUND 2022/2023 BUDGET

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$47,160,184 for the 2022/2023 **Town Operating Budget**.

Amendment by: Mr. Niland

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$47,477,695 for the 2022/2023 **Town Operating Budget**.

Disc: Mr. Niland explained that the following additions were incorporated into the budget: \$100,000 to the Town Operating Budget Unassigned Expenditures; \$150,000 to fund increased clinical social workers in YFS; and \$67,500 to offset the reduced contribution to the pension ADC.

Mr. Cavanaugh will oppose the Town operating budget because he wants the \$1 million transferred into the pension fund. The \$67,500 would be a saving to taxpayers. They are not offsetting tax increases. With the ARPA funding and the high balance in the Unassigned Fund Balance, the Council could use this opportunity to reduce the mill rate even more. Mr. Gullotta finds the budget responsible and noted that it lowers the mill rate, so he will support it.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Niland

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves an appropriation of \$63,500 from ARPA funds to cover the following capital outlay projects: the accessibility ramp to the annex backyard at Youth and Family Services; the electric zero turn mower for Parks and Recreation; and the Welles Park basketball renovation through Parks and Recreation.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$116,937,381 for the 2022/2023 **Education Budget**.

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained that the balance of the \$100,000 reduction consists of \$67,511 for the Town and \$26,489 for Education. The BOF reduced the BOE budget by \$300,000, inclusive of the \$26,489. Mr. Osgood proposed reducing the budget by an additional \$300,000.

Amendment by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves an appropriation of \$116,637,381 for the 2022/2023 **Education Budget**.

Disc: Mr. Osgood explained that this reduction would bring the BOE to where they have come in under budget for the past two years. Mr. Niland stated that, given inflation, he is comfortable with the BOF's recommended budget. Ms. Carroll is not interested in making things tighter for the BOE. Mr. Cavanaugh forgot to mention earlier that the car tax issue will impact his vote. The State is proposing a cap of 29 mills for motor vehicles and the difference will be placed on property owners' real estate taxes. However, this funding may be taken away by the State, leaving municipalities to make up for it. He supports the amendment as an opportunity to save some money. Mr. McChesney finds it odd to bear out the concern of the car tax on the education budget. He also finds it unlikely that the State will entirely cut the amount.

Result: Amendment failed {3-6-0}, with Mr. Gullotta, Ms. Carroll, Mr. McChesney, Ms. LaChance, Ms. Wang, and Mr. Niland voting against.

Disc on main motion: Mr. Cavanaugh stated that this is the third time that the State has changed the motor vehicle tax. He simply forgot to mention this point earlier during the overall Town budget. Ms. LaChance agrees with the recommendation of the BOF this year and their reduction to the BOE budget.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$13,457,486 for the 2022/2023 **Debt & Transfers Budget**.

Amendment by: Mr. Niland

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$13,382,486 for the 2022/2023 **Debt & Transfers Budget**.

Disc: Mr. Niland stated that this is the \$75,000 reduction of the contingency into the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance.

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

(2) RESOLUTION FOR THE GENERAL FUND REVENUES, TRANSFERS AND USE OF FUND BALANCE

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2022/2023 **General Fund Revenues and Transfers** in the amount of \$177,555,051.

Amendment by: Mr. Niland

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2022/2023 **General Fund Revenues and Transfers** in the amount of \$177,797,562, to include an increase in the transfer in of the General Fund of \$300,000 and a \$25,000 undetermined operating revenue.

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained the added amounts: \$150,000 for the YFS, \$67,511 for the pension, and \$25,000 for the difference between the \$75,000 contingency that was reallocated and the \$100,000 that was added to the Town operating budget.

Mr. Niland explained that this additional \$300,000 in opening cash in the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance goes back to the Town Manager's original proposal of gradually stepping back down to the \$575,000 over time. It reduces their opening cash in by \$100,000 but gives back an additional \$300,000 to the taxpayer. It also helps to offset the adjustments they have made to the budget.

Mr. Osgood will not support this motion because it reduces the Unassigned Fund Balance by \$300,000 with no benefit to taxpayers, whereas the \$1 million transfer to the pension has multiple benefits to taxpayers. Mr. Niland disagreed, explaining that adding the \$300,000 back is giving the money directly back to taxpayers. It is a small amount, added gradually, instead of producing a large cliff.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves a transfer, to be made in FY 2021-2022, of \$1,000,000 from the General Fund Unassigned Fund to the Pension Fund.

Result: Motion failed {3-6-0}, with Mr. Gullotta, Ms. Carroll, Mr. McChesney, Ms. LaChance, Ms. Wang, and Mr. Niland voting against.

(3) RESOLUTION FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Johnson clarified that the sewer sinking fund is \$305,000, not the originally listed \$250,000. The \$3.88 million is totaled up with the ARPA projects. Deducting that from the ARPA total of \$10.2 million yields a balance of \$6.23 million. Regarding the Naubuc School Open Space classrooms, there was a discussion that the \$700,000 recommended for ARPA funding would not be eligible for state reimbursement. Mr. Johnson proposes funding the project through the Capital Reserve Fund, and then offsetting it by either Option 1 or 2. \$700,000 of ARPA funds could be spent instead on traffic signals, the boat house, and the Grange Pool, to net.

Further, the Council will consider whether to move forward or not on the following items: \$1.6 million for the Fire Apparatus, an additional \$1 million for the Williams Memorial Academy, \$150,000 for the animal shelter, and \$1.2 million for the Gideon Welles boilers and ventilation, which may receive State grant funding. Mr. Gullotta asked whether the Council would like to pay for the Naubuc School renovations with \$700,000 of ARPA money or Town money, and if Town money, through either option 1 or option 2. He noted that his colleagues have expressed the desire to wait and see how things develop with Williams Memorial.

Mr. Osgood stated that there is a third option, which is to pay for the Naubuc project completely with ARPA funds because that saves \$2 million in taxpayer money. The budget for Naubuc is about \$3.2 million, of which Town taxpayers pay two-thirds and the State pays one-third. Funding the project entirely through ARPA means that Town taxpayers would not have to pay for any of the funds. Mr. Niland disagrees with that logic, stating that they are shortchanging taxpayers \$1 million by spending it all through ARPA. Mr. McChesney agreed, stating that they will deprive the Town of grant money to pay for it entirely with ARPA, so in the end, they save taxpayers more money by spending it elsewhere.

Mr. Osgood remarked that, in maximizing the amount of money spent on projects, the question becomes, do they need to spend \$13 million on projects or not. The Town Manager has identified another \$1.2 million grant potential for Gideon Welles. Mr. Gullotta responded that, each year, they have several million in improvements that need to be made to the community and the CIP money needs to be increased. He cannot see funding the Naubuc project with just ARPA money. It ought to be funded completely with Town money, so that they can recover the \$1 million grant. While Mr. McChesney understands Mr. Osgood's point, that would require an accompanying reduction of a few million in the CIP budget, which is not the case. That is why he views this as moving \$700,000 around CIP and receiving a net additional \$1 million.

Mr. Osgood's proposal did not receive support.

Mr. Cavanaugh supports the animal control shelter. He asked about other possible locations for it. Mr. Johnson explained that they had identified a potential site, but it lacked a driveway and utilities, and the building would need to be constructed, all increasing the project cost. Mr. Osgood stated that the Council could potentially pursue both Options 1 and 2, since there is still \$2.4 million in ARPA money remaining, with a potential \$1.2 million grant to cover the boilers

and air handling units at Gideon Welles. Mr. Johnson cautioned that while the Council could do that, it assumes that both state funds would be approved.

Mr. Gullotta stated that the two fire apparatuses have a two-year lead on them, so the decision is to fund the \$1.6 million now. Action to fund the Gideon Welles boiler and air handling units is on hold because Mr. Johnson is hoping that there will be additional state funds to cover the costs. Mr. Cavanaugh begged the Council to approve the Williams Memorial project. He is not in favor of a referendum to bond for it, but he would like to see this project go through with the ARPA funds. Mr. Johnson explained that ARPA money is best used for brick-and-mortar projects, rather than design. That is why the \$150,000 allocation for the design of Williams Memorial is separate. They have received an independent estimate of just over \$2 million for the project cost. He explained that the Council could vote to either fund the project now or fund the design with a cost estimate and revisit the funding at a later date.

Ms. Carroll understands the desire to do this project. However, she feels more comfortable holding off on the additional \$1 million to reassess and look at the scope of other projects in the queue. A lot of projects in town have been funded in pieces. Ms. LaChance agreed. Ms. Wang visited the site and thinks it is a beautiful space. However, she does not think that it is a “need to have” project. She favors reducing the Capital Reserve Budget by \$150,000 because she does not think that the Council should proceed with the cost estimate of this project. She cannot support it consuming almost a quarter of the ARPA funds. Additionally, to ameliorate the meeting space problem posed by COVID-19, the library renovation will provide additional meeting space and there exists improved audio equipment at the RCC. While there is space for the intended purpose of this project, she cannot support it at this time.

Mr. Johnson explained that the impetus behind the project proposal was due to the fact that there is not enough room in the Council Chambers to hold Town meetings in a socially distanced way. The \$1 million request is a way of making it clear that this project will run beyond the \$150,000 for the design + \$1.25 million allocation. The Council’s options are to fund the second half through ARPA. Mr. McChesney asked, if they were to take away the \$1.25 million, would that impact the CIP. Mr. Johnson stated that it would reduce the \$3.88 million by \$1.25 million. Mr. McChesney struggles with this project. It is \$1.25 million, which is over 20% of ARPA funds. He agreed with Ms. Carroll that there is sufficient meeting space with the new library refurbishment. They are not engaging enough conversation as a council to use these funds to directly help the community, especially local businesses.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the PPP loan program helped businesses and several stimulus checks were issued. This money should go to relieve taxpayers of the burdens on their taxes. Mr. Niland favors the project but not tonight because of other pressures on helping the community and the possibility of affordable housing. Mr. Osgood would like to see a design before allocating any money to the Williams Memorial project. Using ARPA funds for capital projects, which otherwise would be paid for by residents through property taxes, helps everyone in the community by reducing property taxes.

Mr. Osgood, Mr. McChesney, and Ms. Wang sought to remove the \$1.25 million funding for the Williams Memorial Academy. No one else agreed, so the amount remained.

Support for the animal shelter funding appropriation of \$150,000 was {7-2-0}, with Ms. Wang and Mr. Osgood voting against.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2022/2023 **Capital Improvement Program Budget** in the amount of \$15,415,317. Funding will be provided as follows:

Capital Reserve Fund	\$9,019,100
Town Aid Road	\$461,217
Sewer Sinking Fund	\$305,000
American Rescue Plan Act	\$5,630,000

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained that, in addition to the \$3.88 million ARPA allocation, \$1.6 million was added for the fire apparatus and \$150,000 for the animal control shelter. \$700,000 of ARPA monies is reprogrammed from the Naubuc School project (Option 2) to fund the Grange Pool, the boathouse, and traffic signals. An additional \$900,000 was added to the Capital Reserve Fund for the Bell Street sidewalk project.

Mr. Gullotta asked if the budgeted money will be sufficient to give Welles Village an appropriate reworking. Mr. Johnson stated that the basketball court and playground equipment should be in good shape. Even though he is not in favor of the pickleball courts, Mr. Gullotta will vote in favor of the overall budget since Welles Village will be taken care of appropriately.

While Mr. Cavanaugh appreciates funding for the design of Williams Memorial and for additional funding towards the project, he will vote against the Capital Improvement budget because the Naubuc Project is underfunded at \$3.2 million, and the item should go to a referendum. Additionally, he takes issue with the fact that this council refuses to bond projects when interest rates are low.

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

(4) RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL REVENUE FUND APPROPRIATIONS

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2022/2023 **Special Revenue Fund Appropriations, Revenues and Transfers** as follows:

Sewer Operating Fund	\$3,298,217
----------------------	-------------

Disc: Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the sound system at Town Hall. Mr. Johnson explained that they have conducted a complete analysis of the sound system, both at Town Hall and at the RCC. They have applied for a grant to fund up to 100% of the project. If they receive the grant, he will return to the Council with possibly an off-budget appropriation.

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

4. Adjournment.

Motion by: Mr. McChesney

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their meeting of March 16, 2022 at 10:18 P.M.

Result: Meeting was adjourned unanimously {9-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman