

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2022**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting 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 {participated via Zoom video conferencing}
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 Tom Gullotta*

Mr. Niland explained that Mr. Gullotta is attending virtually, so he will lead tonight's meeting.

2. Public Comment.

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

John Demarco of Hopewell Road, praised the council members who voted to expand the animal shelter. He recommends a more visible, easily accessible location, as the current one is hidden and subject to traffic during high school games. In addition, a new location would give Animal Control Officers the opportunity to work out of the current shelter and keep Glastonbury animals in town. He recommends a list be presented of possible locations to build the shelter.

3. Special Reports. *None*

4. Old Business. *None*

5. New Business.

a. Discussion and possible action concerning Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling.

Mr. Johnson explained that Glastonbury has a 15-year agreement with MIRA, which ends in 2027. The current tip fee is \$105 per ton. Per agreement with MIRA and the Town Code, there is flow control. The material is brought to the trash energy plant, which will close in July 2022.

MIRA is responsible for honoring the balance of its agreement, so they will send municipal solid waste to out-of-state landfills. Moving forward, the Town may choose to continue with MIRA, by either continuing the 15-year agreement on a year-to-year basis, where the tip fee would start at \$116 per ton, or to execute a five-year amendment, where the tip fee would be \$111 per ton. The opt-out deadline is April 8, 2022.

The second option is to opt out of MIRA and execute a contract with a private vendor with a 3, 4, or 5-year option. He compared the various scenarios of potential tip fees, categorized by company, number of years, and type of waste. All the options assume that the transfer station continues to operate for solid waste disposal. Reviewing the private vendor proposals, Mr. Johnson noted that Company A (Murphy Road Recycling) has a lower tip fee than both Company B (CWPM) and MIRA. Therefore, the recommendation is to opt out of MIRA and execute an agreement with Murphy Road Recycling for four years. Year 5 would be subject to mutually agreed upon terms, as a four-year agreement is more cost effective and predictive.

Mr. Cavanna recused himself because he has business dealings with Murphy Road Recycling.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

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

- 1. In accordance with protocols established through applicable sections of the Tier 1 Long Term Municipal Solid Waste Management Services Agreement for the Provision of Acceptable Solid Waste and Acceptable Recyclables Services between the Town of Glastonbury and the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (MIRA) and formerly CRRA for the period February 1, 2012 through June 30, 2027 hereby exercises its option to terminate the subject Agreement effective June 30, 2022; and*
- 2. Authorizes the Town Manager to execute a formal Agreement with Murphy Road Recycling for solid waste and recycling services effective July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2026 with said Agreement subject to final review and approval of the Town Manager and Town Attorney;*

as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022.

Disc: Mr. Osgood asked if, under agreement, the Town has the option to separate out recyclables. Mr. Johnson replied no because the tip fee is based on revenue for recyclables. Sanitation Superintendent Mike Bisi added that when the RFP was conducted, it was single stream. The market is just not there yet. Ms. Wang asked where the Town stands in terms of food waste reduction. Mr. Johnson stated that the Town can control what is collected out of the transfer station. Mr. Bisi noted that over the past four years, they have averaged 1-2 tons a month. In the near future, there might be a separate bin for homeowners to put their food waste in. Mr. Johnson pointed out that some towns hold the contract with vendors, so they have a little more flexibility. Glastonbury does not hold the contract with All Waste, Inc.

Ms. Carroll asked if they should expect a huge jump in tip fees across the board because many municipalities are clamoring for options outside of MIRA. Mr. Johnson stated that the State of Connecticut has failed to establish a policy for solid waste disposal. Glastonbury's tip fee, which

jumped \$10 per ton in the current fiscal year from the one prior, was likely artificially low for many years. Mr. Bisi added that they hope that in four years, there will be a better long-term solution. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the 1,600 tons of trash being flattened from 3,000 tons is consistent with traffic counts. Mr. Bisi stated that it has remained steady. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how this will affect the current methodology. Mr. Bisi stated that the public will not see a difference in how the transfer station is operated. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about potential increases. Mr. Bisi will return to the Council next month with the schedule of fees.

Mr. Gullotta finds it regrettable that they cannot take out bottles and cans that are a nickel a piece. He thinks that the Town would receive far more than \$90 per ton. Before this contract moves forward, he asked that Mr. Johnson ask the vendor about allowing a bin for individuals to make that separation. This is an income stream that the Town should not be giving away. Mr. Johnson will have that conversation tomorrow. Mr. Niland asked if there is a bottom-line estimate of what MIRA would cost, along the same lines of Company A and B. Mr. Johnson stated that he does not because they only have the first-year number from MIRA, which is \$111 per ton. They do not know what years 2, 3, and 4 will cost, as MIRA adjusts their fee every year. Mr. Niland asked if All Waste, Inc. had a bid. Mr. Johnson explained that Murphy Road Recycling is under the umbrella of All Waste, Inc.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-1}, with one abstention from Mr. Cavanna.

- b. Action on proposed sale of Town owned land – Western Boulevard (set public hearing).

Mr. Johnson showed that this is a 4.83-acre site on the south side of Western Boulevard. There is an executed proposal to sell the acres for the construction of a 45,000 square foot medical office space for \$1.71 million. The purchase sale has been executed. There will be a 7.5% deposit with the Town to be held in escrow. The proposal is to hold a public hearing, and subject to Council approval, the document is enforced, and the developer can move forward with the site plan approvals and marketing. He noted that Metro Realty Group is very experienced in the medical office building market.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with the option for Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider the proposed sale of the Town owned land at 280 Western Boulevard, Parcel E7, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022.

Disc: Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there is any interest in parcel E11. Mr. Johnson explained that there has been on and off interest. The parcel has received a couple inquiries, but none has taken it forward with an agreement. Mr. Cavanaugh will support this going to a public hearing and its eventual sale. He hopes that this will be the second-to-last final move.

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

- c. Action to amend Town Code – Demolition Delay Ordinance (set public hearing).

Mr. Johnson stated that this is a recommendation from the policy and ordinance review committee, which establishes that if there is an objection to a demolition, the 90-day delay is extended out to 120 days. Additionally, the posted sign would be larger. Organizations and individuals interested in historic preservation could register with the Building Official to receive a notice when demolition delay ordinances come in. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to see a mock-up of the sign. Mr. Johnson stated that they can put something together to show the Council. Mr. Osgood does not see the necessity of a 120-day delay for demolishing a 1950s ranch house. He takes issue with the delineation of buildings older than 75 years, and with how this could potentially apply to residences, as well.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 10, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall with the option for Zoom Video Conferencing to consider proposed amendments to Town Code Article IV, Demolition of Buildings, Sections 5-63 and 5-64, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022.

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

- d. Discussion and possible action concerning Public Act 490 – Open Space Designation.

Mr. Johnson explained that Public Act 490 has two mandated adjustments, in forest land and farmland, which communities must offer. There is enabling legislation for open space, to be enacted by Town code, which Glastonbury does not have. The policy and ordinance review group recommended that Glastonbury consider such an ordinance. The questions are the following: Should an ordinance be put in place? What should be the minimum acreage? What should be the per acre value/assessment of land for tax purposes?

Mr. Gullotta suggested a sliding scale. He asked where the Council would like to draw the line with acreage. Ms. Carroll asked if five acres of open space is enough to meet the threshold and affect the Grand List. Mr. Johnson clarified that there are a couple steps before the Council could enact an ordinance. Firstly, they need to determine the minimum acreage and the minimum dollar amount. Ms. Carroll pointed out that there are currently over 300 residential parcels over five acres and over 100 residential parcels with more than ten acres. Mr. Osgood favors a ten-acre versus five-acre limit. He finds this to be consistent with the Council's approach to land acquisition, as well, where they try to preserve open space.

Ms. LaChance agrees that ten acres is more appropriate. However, she sees one difference with open space, which they own in perpetuity. This is more like leasing the open space, but it comes at a much cheaper loss of tax revenue. Mr. McChesney asked if this is a yearly loss to the Town. Mr. Johnson explained that there are a variety of options, but generally, the per acre assessed value would be less than what it otherwise would have been. If the Council would like to consider this, he suggests putting together three or four scenarios on the minimum acreage and

how the Council could establish the values. Mr. McChesney also finds ten acres more appropriate than five acres. He agreed with Ms. LaChance that the Town does not own the property, but they are leasing it at a variable rate. If there is a reassessment and the value of that property increases, they could be losing even more money. Thus, he has some concerns on the impact on their revenue stream.

Mr. Niland asked if each individual parcel would have to come to the Council. Mr. Johnson replied no, there would be an application process with a formula. This would go through the assessor's office. Ms. Wang asked which other municipalities in the region have implemented this. Mr. Johnson stated that it is a mixed bag and hard to characterize, as there are many approaches in terms of acreage value of the lot. Mr. Cavanna asked what the Town would lose for 15 or 20 acres. Mr. Johnson stated that they have not calculated that. This was a broad stroke estimate to give a rough order of magnitude of the financial implications. Mr. Osgood would like to see scenarios of 10 acres and greater. Mr. Cavanna would like to know how many farms are actually farming under 20 acres.

PUBLIC HEARING:

NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – MAIN STREET PAVEMENT REHABILITATION AND BICYCLE/ PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS – GATEWAY AREA.

Mr. Pennington provided background of the LOTCIP state grant program, which will fully reimburse the Town for two construction projects: the Main Street pavement rehabilitation and the bicycle/pedestrian improvements at the Gateway area. He noted that they have only reached 30% of the design stage, so many details are not available right now. Mr. Pennington first discussed the Main Street rehabilitation project, which underwent a full reconstruction in 1997. There is an existing nine-inch pavement structure. The proposal for this project is to mill and repave the top four inches, which they hope will last another 25 years. He then reviewed several options to improve safety and mitigate traffic in the area:

- Traffic-calming measures:
 - Install a 175-foot mountable raised median island to access and exit Ripley Road.
 - Narrow travel lanes from 12 feet to 11 feet.
- Cyclist safety:
 - Modify the pavement width so that there will be a 5-foot shoulder on both sides of the road.
 - Where there is on-street parking, there will be 9 feet of separation.
- Pedestrian safety:
 - Several sidewalk ramps at the side streets will be removed and replaced with ADA compliant ramps.
 - The existing brick snow shelf will be replaced with a brick surface with a concrete base.
 - All the crosswalks will be replaced with decorative high contrast crosswalks.

Mr. Pennington cautioned against implementing too many traffic calming measures in the corridor, as to not discourage traffic in one of the primary roadways in town. The plan does not call for installation of RRFBs (Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons) at the two midblock crossings. If the Council would like, it may be installed. He would also like feedback on the on-street parking. Right now, there is angled parking at 60 degrees with the curb. There will be 63 spaces once the project is completed. One alternative is to change the 60-degree angle to a 45-degree angle, which could be within the 9-foot shoulder. However, that would reduce the number of parking spaces to 49. In addition, it would make it more difficult for vehicles headed in the northbound direction to park. The milling and pavement portion of the project will be conducted during nighttime hours, and the estimated cost of the project is \$2.076 million. The project will be designed and administered by Town Staff.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for public comment from in-person attendees:

Rich Kubica of 50 Brookview Drive, asked what the requirement is for a bicycle lane. Mr. Pennington explained there is no hard and fast rule. The five feet is meant to encourage use of it as a bicycle lane if it does not meet a certain standard. Mr. Kubica asked if there is any indication that bicycles will be there. Mr. Pennington replied no, there is no intention to have a stencil mark the road for bicyclists.

Ms. LaChance opened the floor for comments from Zoom attendees:

Jeffrey Stein of 142 Old Stage Road, is the Vice President of Bike Walk Glastonbury but is speaking as an individual. He supports the flashing lights, at least for the midblock crossings. He asked for more information about the reverse angle parking option. Mr. Pennington responded that West Hartford recently implemented reverse angle parking on LaSalle Road, and the feedback has been quite negative. His sense is that such an alternative would also not be received very well in Glastonbury.

John Langmaid of 2200 Main Street, lives at the intersection of Main Street and Ripley Road. He supports staying with the 60-degree parking spots and installing pedestrian lights. While he favors the idea of a raised island, he worries that more trucks will turn tightly and tear up the grass on that corner. He would like to see either the corner hardscaped by the Town or to move the curb in. Mr. Pennington stated that regardless of which scenario they choose, the spaces will be wider than what is currently there now. They could either move the curb or hardscape the corner, as suggested. Another alternative to address the concern is a median island that is not raised but flushed with a contrasting texture or color.

Allen Friedrich of 47 Prospect Street Apartment D, is the President of Bike Walk but is speaking as an individual. He stated that many drivers back into parking spaces, no matter which angle is available. Regardless of the angle of parking on Main Street, he supports installing flashing signs at crosswalks.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the 100% grant reimbursement includes any cost escalation. Mr. Pennington stated that there is a 10% provision of incidentals. Beyond that, they must explain the reasoning for the increase and request additional funds. Typically, those requests are approved,

provided that it is not the result of a scope increase. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if any traffic counts have been conducted at the roundabouts on Ripley Road or Rankin Road. Mr. Pennington stated no, but they can get that information. Mr. Cavanaugh does not like the flashing signs on that part of Main Street. He would like to keep the angled parking at the highest number possible. He then asked what the striping will look like. Mr. Pennington stated that it is just an edge line which will be five feet off the curb. Ms. Carroll also does not like the idea of flashing lights at pedestrian crossings for aesthetic reasons, but if there are safety issues, then she will support it. She also does not support the change to 45-degree angled parking spaces as it will make parking very cumbersome. Mr. Pennington pointed out that the midblock crossing is relatively short. That factored into their current proposal, to not install the rectangular flashing light.

Mr. Cavanna asked what is currently done with the millings. Mr. Pennington explained that the contractor is responsible for removal and disposal, but they are willing to let towns retain the millings, if they so choose. Glastonbury uses some of the millings for ongoing operations. The request for proposals to purchase the millings has now expired and will not be reissued because they do not anticipate many millings this year. Mr. Cavanna asked if the Town maintains the equipment. Mr. Pennington replied, no. He can provide information on the rental equipment and their value, as well as the value of millings that have been screened by this vendor. Mr. Johnson added that when they went out to market, it was \$1 per cubic yard. The system in place is effective in terms of cost avoidance. 75% of the towns they surveyed do not even keep the millings, and they let the contractor take them.

Ms. Wang strongly favors protected bicycle lanes. Studies have shown that the paint on the shoulder does not really protect cyclists. She worries about a wider shoulder that is not marked as a bicycle lane. She suggested placing bollards every 5-10 feet to provide a physical separation. Mr. Pennington will investigate the possibility of a physical and visual barrier. However, he predicts complications, such as snow plowing in the winter. Ms. Wang is unsure how she feels about the flashing light option, but she pointed out that pedestrian fatalities have more than doubled over the past 10 years in Connecticut due to a combination of factors. Therefore, she supports anything to improve pedestrian safety at midblock crossings.

Mr. McChesney favors the 60-degree angled parking option, as reverse angle parking will be difficult. He understands the concern with flashing lights in the area, but he wants to ensure that the Council does not prematurely write off an opportunity to potentially enhance pedestrian safety in the area. He asked what the biggest expense would be there. Mr. Pennington replied, the pedestal in the light. Mr. McChesney asked if Town Staff had particular intersections in mind. Mr. Pennington stated that it would be for the two midblock crossings. The design is not recommended for crossings at intersections. The cost of installation of the flashing beacons would be \$25,000 to \$30,000. Mr. Osgood also supports the 60-degree parking space option. He does not find the beacons appropriate for the area and suggested instead strobe bollards as a less intrusive and very effective option. Mr. Niland asked for accident information surrounding the diagonal parking. Mr. Pennington stated that he can get that information. Mr. Niland is in favor of the flashing lights. He noted that they will only go off when people go by, so he would rather err on the side of safety.

Mr. Pennington then reviewed the bicycle and related improvements project, which aims to provide an alternative to busy Hebron Avenue for non-motorized transportation. The objective is to fill in the gaps in the sidewalk network throughout Gateway Corporate Park and to install a five-foot shoulder throughout the park. They propose removing the raised landscape median island, which acts as a pinch point for cyclists, and providing a substantive shoulder for bicyclists. He noted that there are also ongoing private development-related projects within Corporate Park to construct sidewalks. To achieve the pavement width necessary for the five-foot shoulder on both sides of the road, there would be a sliver widening of about three feet. The project would be constructed during daytime hours, and the estimated cost is \$1.013 million, which will be fully grant funded.

Mr. Osgood asked about the project timing. Mr. Pennington stated that they are dependent on the State to review the documents and issue the green light to proceed. On the Town's end, the design can be completed within a couple months. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if this would complete the sidewalks within the whole Corporate medical area. Mr. Pennington stated yes, there will be sidewalks on one side of the road throughout the park. The lone exception is in the corner of the Winding Brook intersection on Western Boulevard up to Hebron Avenue. Mr. McChesney likes that there will be sidewalks down Western Boulevard, National Drive, and Eastern Boulevard, and a continuous sidewalk from the new walking path to Smith Middle School. Mr. Niland also finds this a worthy project.

Rich Kubica of 50 Brookview Drive, asked to put in mile markers, as they are nice goals for walkers.

With no further comments, Mr. Niland closed the public hearing.

- e. Action on Collective Bargaining Agreement. **Tabled**
- f. Action to appoint members to the Design Guidelines Steering Committee.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby appoints Council Members Kurt Cavanaugh and Tom Gullotta as designees to the Design Guidelines Steering Committee, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022.

Disc: Mr. Osgood asked Mr. Johnson to make the Council aware of when these meetings take place so that they could attend. Mr. Johnson agreed to do so.

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

- 6. Consent Calendar.
 - a. Action to schedule public information hearing – Main Street/Route 17 Sidewalks.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public information hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall with the option for Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider proposed construction of new sidewalks along Route 17/Main Street generally extending between the Cider Mill and Red Hill Drive, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022.

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

- b. Action on waiver of Competitive Bid Process – Road Resurfacing Program (continued from March 8, 2022).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a waiver of the competitive bidding process for pavement reclamation services for the 2022 construction season, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

- c. Action to schedule public hearing – proposed amendments to the Building Zone Regulations – Adaptive Redevelopment Zone and Planned Area Development.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing on Tuesday, April 26, 2022 with the option for Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider amendments to the Building Zone Regulations Sections 4.17 – Adaptive Redevelopment Zone and 4.12 – Planned Area Development, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 18, 2022 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson has sent out a copy of the most recent COVID-19 report. He noted that Town Attorney Bruce Chudwick is retiring next month, so he would like to discuss next steps soon. The Council will be on spring recess starting tonight until April 26. The Affordable Housing Steering Committee meets next Monday to complete their review. The TPZ will consider their plan, which will work its way to the Council, who must vote on it by June. There has been discussion on other possible allocations for ARPA funding. If the Council so chooses, Mr. Johnson can provide information on other concepts. Lastly, the Town has received a bid on the sprinkler system at the boathouse, and the contract has been awarded.

Mr. Cavanaugh is uncomfortable with Shipman and Goodwin assigning a replacement Town Attorney without another request for proposal. He then stated that it is time to enact sign patrol.

Mr. Johnson acknowledged that signage throughout town has become an issue and they are paying attention to it. Mr. McChesney thanked Town Staff for keeping Riverfront Park clean. He asked when the library project will be completed. Mr. Johnson stated it should be completed within the next couple of weeks. Mr. McChesney has spoken with the Chamber of Commerce to explore some type of program to help businesses in town. East Hartford and Windsor have implemented such programs. He would like the Council to explore how Glastonbury can do the same, using the remaining ARPA funds. Mr. Gullotta suggested holding another public information session. Mr. Cavanna suggested using some of the ARPA monies to assist the Peter Monaco Jr., Detachment 40 Foundation.

Ms. Wang is also interested in using ARPA funds to support local businesses and nonprofits. She noted that the Town of Mansfield is doing a farm to family program for seniors and those who are food insecure. She would love to see more public art to enhance the physical environment and sense of community, while also supporting local artists. Regarding affordable housing, she reached out to Welles Village residents on ideas for improvements to the Town's current affordable housing stock, many of which need renovation. While she appreciates Mr. Gullotta's suggestion for holding another public information hearing for ARPA, she would like the Council to conduct some research and return with more concrete details and ideas beforehand. That way, they can draft a more crystallized plan for the public to provide feedback on.

8. Committee Reports.

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

9. Communications.

- a. Letter from Crown Castle regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 374 Three Mile Road.
- b. Thank you letter from Glastonbury MLK Community Initiative.

10. Minutes.

- a. Minutes of March 1, 2022 Special Meeting – BOE Budget Workshop.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the March 1, 2022 Special Meeting – BOE Budget Workshop.

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

- b. Minutes of March 8, 2022 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the March 8, 2022 Regular Meeting.

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

11. Appointments and Resignations.

- a. Resignation of Jennifer Sanford from the Board of Finance (R-2023).
- b. Appointment of Jared Soper to the Board of Finance (R-2023).
- c. Appointment of Stephen Ludwig to the Insurance Advisory Committee (R-2023).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Disc: Mr. Niland thanked Ms. Sanford for her service on the BOF and welcomed back Mr. Soper.

Result: Resignation and appointments were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

12. Executive Session.

- a. Potential land acquisition.
- b. Personnel matter.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition and personnel matter at 9:50 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, Ms. Deb Carroll, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Mr. John Cavanna, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Mr. Whit Osgood, and Ms. Jennifer Wang, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 10:25 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 10:26 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman