

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MAY 24, 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
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 Mr. Gullotta*

The meeting commenced at 7:07 P.M., following the Special Meeting. Mr. Gullotta called for a moment of silence for the victims of a shooting at an elementary school in Texas today.

2. Public Comment.

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

Charles Mozzochi of 227 Hebron Avenue, has published several letters in the Citizen stating that Town officials should hire a COVID-19 expert to carefully review the claim by Dr. Bookman and the BOE that their proposed renovations will improve school safety. He finds the claim to be counterintuitive. If the Council does not comply, he will file a lawsuit in the Hartford Superior Court and pursue this matter to the Connecticut Supreme Court, if necessary.

3. Special Reports. *None*

4. Old Business. *None*

5. New Business.

a. Discussion and action to amend mill rate for real estate/personal property and motor vehicle effective for the July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023 adopted budget.

Mr. Johnson explained that the Town set a bifurcated mill rate of 37.3 for real estate/personal property and 29 mills for motor vehicles when the Governor proposed a mill rate cap of 29 for motor vehicles. To cover that gap, the State awarded Glastonbury a grant of \$3.06 million. However, the motor vehicle cap has been changed to 32.46 mills, reducing Glastonbury's grant to just \$1.79 million. This means that

there will be a revenue loss of \$1.275 million in the coming year. Typically, towns do not adjust revenues after the budget is enacted, but this year, the State legislature has provided towns with the opportunity to adjust the motor vehicle mill rate. Mr. Johnson suggested that the Town increase investment revenue by \$425,000 and achieve \$25,000 from limited highways, which would leave a shortfall of \$825,000. If the Town adjusts the mill rate to cover the gap, the motor vehicle rate would increase from 29 to 31 mills. Aggregating the two rates into a single mill rate results in a 0.52% change.

Mr. Gullotta asked how much revenue nip bottles will generate for the Town. Mr. Johnson replied, \$17,000 annually, but the public act came with the requirement that it cannot be added to the General Fund. Mr. Gullotta asked about the collection rate. Mr. Johnson stated that the budget assumes 99.15% for the collection rate. Mr. Gullotta stated that Rep. Barry recognized this discrepancy and brought it to the Governor, who assured that the State recognized its mistake and seeks to rectify the situation for the communities that fell short. Mr. Gullotta is not enthusiastic to raise the mill rate and would rather take the funds out of the savings account, if need be.

Mr. Niland asked if the BOF needs to get involved if the Council proposes changing the mill rate. Mr. Johnson explained that the legislation reads that only the enacting body could enact the change, which is the Council. Mr. Cavanaugh asked when Rep. Barry anticipates the correction from the State to take place. He agreed with Mr. Gullotta to take the difference out of the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance. Mr. Osgood stated that the Council made a mistake in assuming that the State would have allocated Glastonbury \$3 million. He noted that several months prior, the Council majority went against the BOF's recommendation to move money from the savings account into the pension fund. He believes that the Town needs to maintain its savings level where it is. He supports increasing the mill rate to meet the shortfall.

Motion by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby maintains the real estate/personal property mill rate at 37.3 mills and increases the motor vehicle mill rate to 31 mills.

Disc: Ms. Carroll agreed with Mr. Osgood. The Council pushed back on taking money out of savings to pay for the pension. She asked what this impact will look like for the average taxpayer in terms of their motor vehicle tax bill. Mr. Johnson reviewed the list of different categories, depending on number and value of car ownership. Ms. Carroll thinks that it would be a mistake to dip into their savings. Mr. Niland was also in favor of not taking money out of the Unassigned Fund Balance, which he still supports. In 2019, the Town of Wallingford had their bond rating reduced because of that action. While he is loath to raise the mill rate, he believes it is the responsible thing to do. He is hopeful that the legislature will give Glastonbury what they originally allotted the Town.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what caused the Town of Wallingford's rating to go down. Mr. Niland stated that the Town was downgraded from a AAA bond rating. He does not recall the particulars of their situation. He read the article about their bond rating in the Record-Journal. Ms. LaChance noted that the budget is put together annually based on assumptions on unknowns. She hopes that the State will rectify this action, but she is not going to move off the assumption that they will do anything. Mr. McChesney is concerned that moving money from the General Fund will affect the Town's bond rating, so he supports the motion.

Result: Motion passed {7-2-0}, with two votes against by Mr. Gullotta and Mr. Cavanaugh.

Before moving forward, Mr. Johnson pointed out that Finance Director Julie Twilley, who has been with the Town for five years, will be moving on. She will be missed by all. The Council wished her the best in her next career opportunity.

b. Action on amendments to fees and charges for Transfer Station operations effective July 1, 2022.

Mr. Johnson explained that revenues typically offset operating expenses by about 75% annually. Effective July 1, the tip fee for solid waste will increase from \$105 to \$110. In order to reach the 75% reimbursement, revenues need to be increased by \$19,000. This proposal will increase revenues by \$20,000. He reviewed the list of permit and per-trip costs which will increase to make up that amount. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the Town does receive about \$17,000 annually from the nip revenue, but that must be allocated to reducing solid waste. Additionally, the Town has a satellite food collection program. Thus far, 20 tons of material have been collected and transported to Southington, where it is burned to generate electricity. He noted that the tip fee for food waste is less than the tip fee for solid waste.

Sanitation Superintendent Mike Bisi added that food waste comprises about 30% of the waste stream, and it is very heavy, so incinerator use is discouraged. He explained the satellite food collection program, where users register online and receive a key card to access bins to discard food waste, which would then be transported to the same facility that the food waste is now. Mr. Bisi noted that All Waste, Inc. is willing to consider a pilot program for a small neighborhood in town. However, that service is already being provided by Blue Earth Compost, so duplicating the effort with a private company seems redundant.

Ms. Carroll thanked Town Staff for finding ways to make this work. She is pleased that it will be as accessible as possible for residents. Ms. Wang asked about the price. Mr. Bisi stated that it will be at no cost for residents. Ms. Wang is excited that the proposal takes an innovative approach on the issue of waste. She asked how the program will be promoted once it is ready to roll out. Mr. Bisi explained that the website lists all permit works, so there would be a link with Blue Earth's contact information. Mr. Johnson added that there will be lots of avenues to transmit the information across town.

Mr. Osgood asked if the Town pays for the transportation cost from the facility. Mr. Bisi stated that the Town pays a tip fee in service charge, as well. Mr. Osgood asked if the savings to the transfer station offsets that. Mr. Gullotta commented that it does save money because the Town would be paying \$65 instead of the \$110 tip fee. Mr. Johnson added that there is a savings, but it is quite close. If the food waste came in as municipal waste, then it would be hauled to the Murphy Road facility. Instead, Blue Earth will pick it up and haul it to Southington to burn for electricity use. Ms. Wang pointed out that if food waste were to be removed from the waste stream, then All Waste customers could pay for a smaller bin. This would be an incentive for households to divert food waste while saving money.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that there will be a savings to the bulky waste if operation is reduced from six to four days a week. He asked Mr. Bisi if there are times during the week that he would consider closing the transfer station. Mr. Bisi stated that if they were to reduce operations to just four days a week, then he would likely select to operate on Monday and Tuesdays, and Fridays and Saturdays. He explained that the intent was to achieve potential savings on the expense side, rather than raising fees. Mr. Osgood asked if the fees will also change at the bulky waste site. Mr. Bisi replied no, these fee changes are just for the transfer station.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendments to the fees and charges for disposal of municipal solid waste at the Town Transfer Station effective July 1, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022.

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

c. Action on amendment to Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule effective July 1, 2022.

Mr. Johnson explained that each spring, there is a proposed amendment to the fee schedule. Parks and Recreation Director Lisa Zerio takes a hard look at this every year to ensure that the program can maintain its self-supporting basis. Largely, the fee schedule is influenced by minimum wage increases and the need to stay competitive in a very competitive market.

Ms. Wang asked if the department has ever considered doing a free or community pool day, to take the edge off the fee increases. Ms. Zerio explained that last summer, they tried several creative things, such as pop-up days with free ice cream. They could repeat that, which would not take away from their revenue sources. Ms. Wang asked how the splash pad access will work upon opening. Ms. Zerio explained that there is no separate fee for the splash pad from the pool. Next year, they hope to fence in the splash pad, which will block off access to the main pool. This way, the splash pad could open earlier in the season than the main pool.

Ms. Wang asked if there could be a lower range cutoff fee for children who would only access the splash pad, and not the pool. Ms. Zerio noted that the possibility was discussed, but they determined that it was hard for Town Staff to monitor that, so they sought to keep it consistent. Ms. Wang explained that while inflationary pressures are reflected in the fees, she hopes that the Town will continue to come up with ways to safely extend water recreation, while keeping it affordable for families.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the Parks & Recreation Department Schedule of Fees and Charges – General Fund and Special Revenue Fund, as amended, effective July 1, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022, and as recommended by the Recreation Commission.

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

d. Action to accept donation of open space – Casella Estate – 28± acres – Old Hebron Road.

Mr. Johnson explained that this land is located on the old Hebron Avenue. Jon Casella was a community-minded individual who helped on countless town projects. His lone condition is for the open space to be named after his late mother. The TPZ has issued a favorable recommendation. Mr. Niland asked how the Town can ensure that parking does not become a problem for residents in the area. Mr. Johnson agreed that it is a challenge because of the blocked access across the private property extending off old Hebron Avenue. They will look at options for how to best handle parking.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby accepts the donation of the 28± acre open space parcel located off Old Hebron Road by the Estate of the late Jon Casella; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Town Council on behalf of the Glastonbury community expresses its sincerest thanks and appreciation to the Estate of Jon Casella for this generous and enduring donation in support of the Town's open space preservation program;

all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022.

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

6. Consent Calendar.

a. Action to transfer uncollected taxes to Suspense List – \$191,309.73.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the transfer of \$191,309.73 of uncollected taxes to the Suspense List, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022 and recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

b. Action on proposal for the 2022 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program (set public hearing).

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, June 14, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing on the proposals submitted by The Connecticut River Valley Chamber of Commerce, InterCommunity, Inc., and Town of Glastonbury – Open Space Land Acquisition Fund under the 2022 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022.

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

c. Action on transfer from General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Education (Agriscience VoAg Program) (set Public Hearing).

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, June 14, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a \$102,879 transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Education (Agriscience and Technology Program), as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

d. Action on FY 2022 Public Health Emergency Preparedness Grant – \$ 22,530.84.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager, is authorized to make, execute, and approve on behalf of the Town of Glastonbury, any and all contracts or amendments thereof with the Capitol Region Council of Government for the FY 2023 Public Health Emergency Preparedness Grant.

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

NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – AMERICAN RESCUE ACT PLAN (ARPA) FUNDING.

Mr. Johnson explained that in October 2021, the Council began a series of public information hearings on how to appropriate Glastonbury’s \$10.2 million ARPA funds. This is the fourth public hearing. Monies need to be allocated by December 2024 and spent by December 2026. Roughly \$4.5 million has not yet been allocated. There has been discussion on various possible uses for the remaining funds. Most recently, Mr. McChesney brought up the option of a small business assistance program. If the Council were to consider this project, the following questions would need to be answered:

- How much to aggregate to the program,
- What the grant amount(s) would be,
- What would be considered a small business,
- Clarity on eligibility and uses.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for comments from attendees.

Lauren Fuller, owner of Fuller Yoga Pilates and Massage, supports use of ARPA funds for the small business assistance program. Grant money would allow her to do more community and diversity programs. She would also like to increase pay for her instructors. Since the pandemic, many of their stress relief classes have been popular, which she would like to expand. Her business offers opportunities to help aging residents age better.

Stephen Collette of 7 Uplands Way, explained that when the pandemic started, his company, FooNow, Inc., launched a web training program, mostly for food businesses but applicable to all businesses. During COVID-19, all the large retailers did well because they had the web and visual technology. Their technology could level the playing field for small businesses. He would like to be informed when training comes forward.

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

Lisa Rouleau of 12 Conestoga Way, is happy with the use of ARPA funds thus far. However, she is adamantly against use of the funds to assist small business owners for several reasons:

- The money was not designed to be given to individuals because all were financially impacted by the pandemic.
- The pandemic is past the era of businesses shutting down and consumers staying at home.

- Small businesses were given financial assistance from the federal government. It is not right to do it again.
- Such a program would also put the Town Council in the awkward situation of deciding which businesses would receive funding. There are four council members with ties to small businesses, so she questions how they could remain impartial. If they were to recuse themselves, then only five council members would make such a large decision.

If the Council seeks to consider businesses to receive ARPA funds, she suggested looking at non-profit groups because they benefit others, not just themselves. She urged the Council to do what is best for the entire community, not a select few.

Jessica Olander of 2400 Main Street, and President of the Connecticut River Valley Chamber of Commerce, supports designating a portion of the ARPA monies to assist Glastonbury small businesses. She cited the following as hardships that local business owners are taking on: the continued COVID-19 impact, rising inflation and gas prices, supply chain issues, increased regulations and mandates, repayment of the state's unemployment fund, and difficulty in finding qualified people to work. Other towns are already implementing their small business assistance programs, and she encourages Glastonbury to do the same. The Chamber assisted East Hartford in setting up a simple application process for business owners to request funding. Their Town Council allocated \$4.5 million toward their Small Business Assistance Program. Through this fund, they were able to add a part-time position to the Chamber to create a liaison between the businesses, the Town, and the Chamber. She is happy to discuss the details of that program with the Glastonbury Town Council.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments from Zoom:

Andrea Hawkins of 33 Weir Street, and owner of Berkens Blend Cafe on Hebron Avenue, supports the small business assistance program. Her business had a 41% drop in revenue and still has not returned to pre-pandemic sale numbers. While she received PPP funding and grants, those monies were just to keep them employed. She also has large EIDL loans which will become payable in the next year. Supply chain issues and increases in the cost of goods, gas, and employee wages all make it difficult to maintain their costs for customers. She would appreciate any support from the Council to help her business as loans become due.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked Ms. Fuller if her yoga studio had free programs before the pandemic or if it were an initiative that she would like to start. Ms. Fuller stated that they always had a free class pass/trial. In the past, they had received a grant to provide free yoga for cancer survivors. They have also offered a paid six-week course of yoga for trauma survivors, which they would love to turn into a free program. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if Mr. Fuller participated in the Paycheck Protection Program. Ms. Fuller replied, yes. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there were any other programs that she participated in. Ms. Fuller stated that she did not receive an EIDL loan, but she did receive a \$5,000 state grant.

Mr. Osgood asked if the preliminary process has started for the Williams Memorial Academy building. Mr. Johnson stated that they are completing the RFQ process. Mr. Osgood stated that everyone in town has been affected by the pandemic and rising inflation, not just small businesses. ARPA funds can be used to reduce the tax burden on all taxpayers in town. He is in favor of spending ARPA monies on projects that the Town needs to do which will reduce the impact on taxpayers.

Mr. McChesney countered that the ARPA funds were passed partly to assist small businesses in the community. The purpose of a small business assistance program is to help strengthen Glastonbury's small business community. Several business owners in town have spoken out about the various

problems they still face. He noted that the Williams Memorial building will total \$2 million, which is 20% of the ARPA funds. He will propose \$250,000 to the small business assistance program, which is just 2.5% of Glastonbury's total ARPA funds. He finds Mr. Johnson's suggested grant values, which range from \$5000-\$10,000 per business, to be reasonable.

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

Motion by: Mr. McChesney

Seconded by: Ms. LaChance

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby directs the Town Manager to provide a proposed small business assistance plan at the June 14, 2022 meeting.

Disc: Ms. Carroll thinks that the Council can support small businesses while also funding capital projects. It does not have to be an either/or situation. Ms. LaChance agreed, adding that small businesses struggled to get by for two years, which cannot be discounted. Mr. Osgood countered Mr. McChesney's statement that Mr. Johnson recommended \$250,000 for the small business assistance program. Instead, he recommended either \$100,000; \$250,000; or other. He would like to know how many businesses would be affected by this potential grant before discussing a motion. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that this motion will direct the Town Manager to come forward with a more fleshed-out plan. The Council would then take a second vote, and the funding number might change.

Mr. Cavanna commented that while the Council continues to debate this, meeting after meeting, there are small business who continue to struggle. He would like to get the ball rolling. Mr. Cavanaugh asked Mr. McChesney what kind of allotment he hopes for. Mr. McChesney stated that the \$5,000 to \$10,000 grant options set forth by the Town Manager seem appropriate. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed with Mr. Osgood that the ARPA funds should go to the masses and not to individuals, so he will vote against this motion.

Ms. Wang agreed with Ms. Carroll that the Council could fund both capital projects and the small business assistance program. She is in favor of the \$5,000 grant amount, which would total an allocation of \$100,000. Her reasoning is that the ARPA funds are spent by running down a list, rather than looking at the complete remainder of the money in a comprehensive way. If there is a massive uptake of the program, then she would consider allocating an additional \$150,000.

Mr. Gullotta would love to see Williams Memorial Academy be made available for public hearing space, especially after last week's packed TPZ meeting. There is now a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to do that, not with Glastonbury taxpayer money, but with a state grant.

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

NO 2: ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TOWN CODE ARTICLE IV, DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS, SECTIONS 5-63 AND 5-64. (CONTINUED FROM MAY 10, 2022).

Mr. Johnson explained that this action is to amend the demolition delay ordinance to the Town Code to increase the waiting period from 90 to 120 days. He has reviewed it with the Town Building Official who requested that the Council consider the delay period from the date of the legal notice, which must be published within 15 days of the application. Thus, the action would be to have the 120 days commence from the date the legal notice is published, not the date of the application.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves 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 May 20, 2022 and as recommended by the Policy and Ordinance Review Committee with said amendments effective June 10, 2022.

Disc: Mr. Osgood believes that the increase from 90 to 120 days in an unnecessary and unjustified infringement on property rights. Ms. Wang pointed out that some towns provide for a step where buildings are evaluated for their historical significance, but Glastonbury does not. She noted that the maximum period allowed under the statute is 180 days, so this amendment still falls below that. The demolition delay ordinance has been used successfully in the past, and she believes that this action strikes a good balance between protecting private property rights while preserving historical structures in town.

Result: Motion passed {8-1-0}, with one vote against by Mr. Osgood.

NO 3: ACTION ON POTENTIAL LAND ACQUISITION – BECK PARCELS – DAYTON ROAD.

Mr. Johnson explained that the land acquisition is for four parcels totaling 95 acres off Dayton Road. The purchase price is \$350,000. The site would be dedicated to open space purposes and would be funded through the Reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation. Both the BOF and the TPZ have issued favorable recommendations. However, an environmental analysis is pending. He suggested continuing the public hearing until the survey results are confirmed.

There were no comments from the public.

There was Council consensus to continue the public hearing to the meeting of June 14, 2022.

NO 4: ACTION ON PROPOSED NEW SIDEWALKS – BELL STREET.

Mr. Johnson explained that the proposal is to complete the remaining length for the sidewalk connection. Mr. Pennington has been in touch with the property owner at 520 Bell Street to respond to any concerns.

Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street, is also the owner of Spencer Farms. He is opposed to the construction of sidewalks along the frontage of his property. While he understands that the Town needs to complete the Stallion Ridge subdivision, he is not a part of that subdivision. While he likes that the developer will pay for the project, he does not want it.

Mr. Pennington explained that the developer is required to construct sidewalks along Bell Street and Stallion Ridge Drive. South of the subdivision, the Town has grant monies to construct sidewalks all the way to Gideon Lane. Right now, the subdivision is a standalone island in the sidewalk network, but the

Town anticipates it to eventually connect to a much larger network. Mr. Gullotta asked about the size of the Spencer property. Mr. Spencer stated that his frontage is 110 feet long.

Mr. Spencer asked what the homeowner liability is for sidewalk maintenance. He worries that the heavy machinery which runs over his property frontage could damage the sidewalks. Mr. Pennington stated that the abutting property owner is required to take care of snow and ice removal. However, capital and routine maintenance is the responsibility of the Town. Typically, a different type of sidewalk section is used for commercial driveways with heavy truck traffic. He noted that it may be well-suited across this frontage.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves construction of new sidewalks at 520 Bell Street, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.

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

NO 5: ACTION ON TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND-UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE FOR UPDATES TO COUNCIL CHAMBERS – \$44,000 GRANT AWARD.

Mr. Johnson explained that the grant has been awarded and will be received in the General Fund. The goal is to redo the audio system in Council Chambers. An RFQ has been conducted and the Town is set to receive the equipment in July. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the TPZ meeting last week experienced a lot of audio issues. He asked if these improvements will also improve the quality when people watch on TV, as well. Mr. Johnson stated yes. He explained that at last week's TPZ meeting, the amplifier failed, which was a frustrating experience. Mr. Cavanaugh believes this to be a good investment in a community room. Ms. LaChance added that she was online for that TPZ meeting and could not hear anything, which is why this action is very important.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$44,000 appropriation and transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Capital Projects-Town Hall for updates to the Council Chamber audio and visual system with related improvements, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 20, 2022 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson stated that COVID-19 cases continue to increase in Glastonbury. He noted that the Memorial Day Parade will set off at 9:00 A.M. on Monday, May 30, and will be followed by a program

at Hubbard Green. The ribbon cutting ceremony for the splash pad opening has been changed to 6:00 P.M. on Monday, June 6. On Thursday, August 11, the annual Senior Citizens picnic will be held at the RCC. On Monday, June 13, the DOT will hold a public information hearing via Zoom to discuss the potential of constructing a roundabout at the Route 17/New London Turnpike.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked why residents were not allowed to stand in the back at last week's TPZ meeting. Mr. Johnson thinks that commissioners were just trying to move people to the hall. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Town has a budget for expert testimony. Mr. Johnson stated that there are funds available in the budget. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there is enough time to source expert testimony from non-Town staff, to comment on the application discussed at the last TPZ meeting. Mr. Johnson replied yes, there is. Mr. Osgood asked about feedback from the State regarding the sidewalk project on Main Street. Mr. Johnson explained that the DOT will present a couple concepts to the Town. Mr. McChesney asked to send council members information regarding the roundabout. Mr. Johnson noted that it is already posted, but he will double check. He will send out the concept again and will also post it to the Town website.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby recognizes the Town Manager's expense report for January 2022 to March 2022.

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

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 58 Montano Road.**

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

10. Minutes.

a. **Minutes of May 10, 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 May 10, 2022 Regular Meeting.

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

b. Minutes of May 10, 2022 Special Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the May 10, 2022 Special Meeting.

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

11. Appointments and Resignations.

a. Appointment of Emilio Flores to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (D-2023).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Result: Appointment was approved unanimously {9-0-0}.

12. Executive Session.

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 9:03 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 9:14 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta
Chairman