

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2024**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Jonathan Luiz, 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

Ms. Jennifer Wang, Vice Chairman

Ms. Deborah A. Carroll

Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. John Cavanna

Mr. Larry Niland

Ms. Mary LaChance

Mr. Jacob McChesney

Mr. Whit Osgood

a. Pledge of Allegiance. *Led by Ginny Roscoe*

2. Public Comment.

Charles Beckius of 31 Spring Street, expressed concern about the scope and creep of the zoning regulations and the backdoors being created by these changes. The Town Center Village District (TCVD) Overlay Zone expansion includes two residential plots, which he interprets as a change of zone. He has concerns about these plots being converted to commercial, just so that they can be developed under the lesser requirements. He requests a resolution to prohibit the rezoning of residential properties within the TCVD overlay corridor.

Ginny Roscoe of 112 Old Farms Road, is president of the Welles-Turner Memorial Library Second Century Fund Inc., which donated money to the library expansion. They hope to draw new patrons to use the new Maker Space. In order to do this, the library needs additional staffing. She encouraged the Town to include a full-time library staff member to the budget.

Ben Larose of 483 Matson Hill Road, is a fourth generation farmer at Belltown Hill Orchards. When the opportunity arose to lease six acres from the Town, they saw it as a good fit to accompany the 52 acres purchased in 2018. Leasing these six acres would allow the underground irrigation system to be reconnected, and as well as allow the use of water on their 52-acre piece, which is crucial for irrigation and frost protection.

Carol Ahlschlager of 60 Jeremiahs Way, urged support for additional staffing at the Welles Turner Library, in order to accommodate the new upgrades.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension, also supports additional staffing at the library.

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

Sandy Gondek of 87 Ferry Lane, is the owner of Rose's Berry Farm. She asked for consideration of their farm in the lease of 297 Matson Hill Road. This parcel housed the infrastructure for Rose's Berry Farm. Being excluded from the Council's decision to lease this parcel created a hardship, cutting off their farm from the irrigation system running to their crops. This last-minute denial was shocking. She asked why the Council drafted leases with two other farms and left out their farm again. She requested that the Council reconsider allowing a share of their lease to include Rose's Berry Farm for some of 297 Matson Hill Road.

Paul Gondek of 87 Ferry Lane, noted that his family contracted to purchase five of the six parcels of Rose's Berry Farm. Belltown Orchards purchased the remaining parcel in 2018 and sold development rights to the Town of Glastonbury. Shortly after going into contract with Sandi Rose, the former Town Manager called to negotiate giving up development rights, but during negotiations, the Council went in a different direction. Eventually, the Town purchased one parcel, leaving his family with four parcels. They invested money to continue the legacy of Rose's Berry Farm, with no intention of developing it. The parcel that the Town purchased was the one with the infrastructure to run the farm. Without that infrastructure, chances are that the farm will fail. In which case, his family would be forced to sell 21 acres of farmland. He asked the Council to work with them to save Rose's Berry Farm.

Brittney Gondek of 35 Dickinson Road, stated that her family has been trying to make a deal with the Town since former Town Manager Richard Johnson reached out with an offer for the development rights. They were under contract with Sandi Rose for all remaining parcels of Rose's Berry Farm. The farms utilities, irrigation, and infrastructure have been kept from them, which has created a hardship. They again ask to be considered to use some of the resources needed to run Rose's Berry Farms. She asked why there is no consideration of a deal for all three farms that are willing to take care of this parcel.

Jake Scoville of 35 Dickinson Road, asked a series of questions about the Town's recent acquisition of 297 Matson Hill: Why were yards of fertile blueberry bushes ripped out of the ground on Town land? Where can citizens obtain the study that the Town did to get approvals to put a curb cut on Matson Hill Road, as well as proper drainage for the new asphalt driveway? Why does the Town not use the driveway at Rose's Berry Farm? Did the Town fund an asphalt driveway? Would drainage have to be added? Will the Town have to fund all the building maintenance? What repairs will taxpayers be responsible for? Would the purchase of the development rights save taxpayers money over time? Where is the rent money going to from the income-producing houses on the Town's parcel? Will the tenants need to be farmers? If the lessor chooses to move into the house, would they pay rent to the Town at the market rate, or would they be allowed to live there for free? Shouldn't any town resident be able to bid on this?

3. **Special Reports.** *None*

4. **Old Business.**

- a. **Action on extension of Farmland Ground Leases with Littel Acres Farm Market and BHO Enterprises LLC d/b/a Belltown Hill Orchards – 297 Matson Hill Road (set public hearing).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 23, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a proposed fifteen-year lease of 17± acres at 297 Matson Hill Road to Littel Acres Farm Market LLC, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated January 5, 2024.

Disc: Mr. Osgood requested that the following information be available at that meeting: what they paid for that property; the rental income from the apartment units and the mobile homes; the status report on the use of the farm structures on the property and the potential costs associated with those buildings; the cost to the Town of putting in that new road; and what information there is on other farm leases in town. Mr. Luiz agreed to provide all that information. Mr. McChesney pointed out a spelling error on paragraph 17, which says “bee” instead of “be.”

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 23, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a proposed fifteen-year lease of 6.0± acres at 297 Matson Hill Road to BHO Enterprises LLC d/b/a Belltown Hill Orchards, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated January 5, 2024.

Disc: Mr. Osgood asked if the irrigation system is on that property. Mr. Luiz believes that the pump house is on the side, closer to the Belltown property. Mr. Osgood noted that the first lease delineates that it will have access to water. He asked to review the access to the pump house equipment and who will be responsible for that.

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

- b. **Action on renewal of Ground Lease with the Historical Society of Glastonbury, Inc. – Welles Tavern, 2400 Main Street (set public hearing).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 23, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider the First Amendment to Ground Lease between the Town and the Historical Society of Glastonbury for siting of the

Welles Tavern through October 31, 2044, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated January 5, 2024.

Disc: Ms. Carroll noted that she is employed by one of the businesses in that building. The Council had no concerns about a potential conflict of interest in setting the public hearing.

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

5. New Business.

a. Discussion and possible action concerning Capital Improvement Criteria.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby accepts the Capital Improvement Program criteria, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated January 5, 2024 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

b. Discussion concerning proposed amendments to the Zoning Map and Building Zone Regulations to create a new Zone Section 4.20 Main Street Corridor Flood Zone (MSCC), to amend Section 4.11 – Flood Zone, and to amend Section 4.19 – Town Center Village District Overlay Zone.

Ms. Caltagirone explained the proposed new Main Street Commercial Corridor Flood Zone (MSCC). In 2008, Glastonbury took a more conservative approach and decided to adopt the higher elevation to require floodproofing. She noted that, within the flood zone, design restrictions can be waived, but when that happens, the TPZ does not have any considerations for preferred uses in the flood zone or lot standards to fall back on. This leaves them without any parameters on how to establish design standards in the flood zone when waivers are sought. The proposed corridor would replace Section 4.11 controls for just 15 properties lining Main Street. She explained that Town Staff recommends reintroducing the General Business district permitted uses and lot standards. They also suggest that structures must comply with all existing flood zone standards except commercial buildings, which would need to be flood proofed to the 100-year flood level instead of the 500-year flood level.

Ms. Caltagirone then spoke to a neighbor's concerns about rezoning two of the residential properties. She clarified that those two properties are not included in the commercial corridor flood zone. She reviewed the current and proposed flood zone uses, noting that none of the current uses in this section of Main Street are permitted within the flood zone. Historically, flood waters have crossed Main Street three times, and it was only in 1936 when a flood event exceeded the flood elevation. She pointed out that the current requirements can be a discouragement for substantial property improvement, which is why there is a lack of maintenance on those properties, as opposed to others on Main Street. Floodproofing buildings to the 500-year elevation is quite an investment. The property would still be required to meet all the standards of the flood zone, and no risk would be added to any adjacent properties. She noted

that they have reached out to the state flood coordinator, who was supportive of relaxing the controls to the 100-year flood zone for commercial properties only.

Mr. Gullotta stated that the state flood coordinator made a reference to the fact that the Council should not modify other things. He asked what those are. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the coordinator was pointing out that relaxing the design standards for residential properties would not be supported by the state. She clarified that there is no such proposal for that here. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the lot sizes are large enough for residential. Ms. Caltagirone stated that that is the conundrum. The regulation does not have lot standards.

Ms. Wang asked how they are ensuring that the two residential homes will not be affected by flooding. Ms. Caltagirone stated that they rely on outside experts to confirm that there will be no impact to other properties. Ms. Wang still has concerns about the neighboring properties, including the road. Ms. LaChance hopes that there will be more discussion because she is hesitant to approve the many new uses that are proposed within the zone. She awaits more public comment on this soon.

Discussion paused for the public hearing, and returned after its conclusion, at 9:15 p.m.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the idea is to expand the existing village district overlay, where compliance with the design guidance is compulsory. Outside of the overlay zone, the guidelines are advisory. Their proposal would amend the district overlay and make the design review compulsory for all new construction and rehabilitation of properties. The design guidelines would be amended from 'preferred' to not 'required' in those areas. She explained the considerations for the TCVD Overlay Zone, which include expanding enforceability of the design guidelines to a larger area. This would bring the village district overlay map in closer alignment to the Town Center planning area in the POCD.

Ms. Caltaigone noted that this increases the number of applications requiring ASDRC review, and requires revision and re-adoption of the design guidelines. It also does not resolve the lack of specific guidance/standards in some underlying zones, such as the lack of lot standards in the Flood Zone. She noted that this is one tool for achieving better design in the town center, but there are other approaches that can be pursued instead. Mr. Osgood was surprised to receive this report because, typically, it is the Council that requests this, not leadership. The design guidelines were passed in October, so there is limited experience in using them. He believes that it makes sense to see how they are currently working before expanding the area that the guidelines cover.

Mr. McChesney asked if there is any residence area in the proposed expansion. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the intent was to exclude any residential areas. The Town Center zone has little pockets of residential zoning, which would be maintained, and the overlay would be kept out of it. Mr. Gullotta stated that he and Mr. Cavanaugh were interested in expanding this village district. Part of the proposal includes the Sakon property and an area that will experience considerable redevelopment. He finds that it makes sense to discuss a change of zoning on Main Street as an opportunity to rediscover a New England village. He supports the Council having a discussion about this concept. Mr. Osgood requested the minutes of the meetings from two or

three years ago, to see why the boundaries of the village overlay district were defined as they were. Mr. Luiz agreed to provide them.

c. Action on addition of single polling location for early in-person voting for 2024 election.

Charles Murray, the Democrat Registrar of Voters, explained that the Registrar of Voters can make a decision on where to hold the location for early voting. They have spent about six months looking at alternatives, and are considering the academy room. The regulations require confirmation by the Council at a public hearing. Because this is relatively new, they do not have experience about what will occur over the multiple days, but they believe that they can do it efficiently through the academy building. Liz Becker, the Republican Registrar of Voters, added that they have access to the state-wide database. In the past, the Academy has been a central location. There was strong encouragement in the legislation to use the location that was used in the past for same-day registration.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the use of the Activity Room at the Academy Building as a single polling location for early in-person voting for the 2024 election.

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

6. Consent Calendar. None.

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report and noted that he will include his capital report with the CIP. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that a lot of trees have been removed on the west side of 711 Hebron Avenue. He would like to know whether those trees were part of a special permit or a condition of approval when the building was approved for construction. Mr. Luiz will look into it.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report.

Mr. Gullotta noted that today is National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. He thanked all law enforcement personnel in town for their service.

b. MDC. None.

c. CRCOG. None.

9. Communications. None.

10. Minutes.

a. Minutes of December 5, 2023 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the December 5, 2023 Regular Meeting.

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

b. Minutes of December 14, 2023 Special Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the December 14, 2023 Special Meeting.

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

11. Appointments and Resignations.

a. Appointment of Ben Kehl to the Insurance Advisory Committee (R-2025).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the appointment of Ben Kehl to the Insurance Advisory Committee (R-2025).

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

PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING

NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING REGARDING A PROPOSED SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER GENERATING FACILITY – 17 WICKHAM ROAD.

Mr. Luiz stated that the company Verogy has submitted information on their project for what they propose on 167 Wickham Road. Bryan Fitzgerald, the Director of Development for Verogy, explained that their company is based in West Hartford, and works on developing solar projects. This proposal is Glastonbury Solar One, a 3-megawatt AC solar PV project.

James Cerkanowicz, PE, licensed engineer of Verogy, reviewed the site plan, which has been submitted to DEEP for review. He noted that the site is located on the western portion of the property. The eastern portion is the cemetery, which will remain untouched. No tree clearing or significant regrading is proposed. He explained that the surface will be grass with a pollinator seed mix, and the runoff will be reduced. The existing curb cut on Hebron Avenue will be utilized, and a new agricultural fence will be constructed along the western and northern limits. He noted that the tracking system for solar is approximately nine feet above grade. There will be no need for regular maintenance of the facility, and the sheep herder will use their own water.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that the site was selected due to its current environmental conditions. The project participates in community solar, so there is a direct economic benefit that they have calculated through Eversource. He reviewed their shared clean energy facility “SCEF” program, stating that new municipal tax revenues are calculated at \$24,000 per year.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension, supports this project because it lowers his residential taxes and power costs, while helping the planet by providing more renewable energy resources. He asked if something could be done with that 400-foot setback. He also asked if the neighbors have been made aware of the solar farm, and suggested painting the solar fence to make it more appealing.

Joe Duva of 86 Glen Place, explained that his community at Glen Place is concerned about their drainage being affected, as well as the visual impacts on a few houses specifically. He stated that the Enfield project is not aesthetically pleasing, and he hopes that something can be done to make this one more appealing. He asked about the tilts of the panels and making the new fence like the existing one. On the southwest side, he would like to see a buffer of evergreens. He asked why the temporary basins are not regular because it will impact the whole street area.

Brad Parsons, Verogy’s Director of Design & Permitting, responded to the questions posed:

- Re the visual: there is a gap in the existing tree lines. Mr. Parsons stated that Verogy is committed to planting evergreens along the corner where the three houses in the back come together.
- Re the fence: the eastern side of the fence will come down. It wraps around the southern portion line, then comes back up the property. Their intention is to keep the existing fence in place. He explained that the Enfield property has an eight-foot chain link fence, but that is not what is proposed here. It will be an agricultural fence, matching the one on the south side.
- Re draining: the majority of the site drains to the north and to the east. He noted that planting a meadow-style grass will improve the drainage patterns and lessen runoff.
- Re the temporary sediment traps: they are not permanent because of the same rationale. Mr. Parsons explained that they are establishing grass on that site, and reducing the rate of runoff, so the need for a permanent basin will be lessened. The temporary sediment traps are there during construction to help stabilize the site.
- Re tilting and reflecting: they are a tracker system. He explained that they are on a single access post that will follow with the grade, tilting east in the morning and slowly turning west throughout the day. By the end of the day, those panels will start to tilt back towards the east. It will be a domestically manufactured solar panel with anti-reflective coating. During the day, at full tilt, they should be at 9-9.5 feet at the top of the panel. At the end of the day, they will go back to being flat.
- Re the remainder of the land being used for a solar farm: the Archdiocese’s cemetery association owns the land, so any decision regarding this will be theirs to make.

Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street, stated that this proposal is the perfect opportunity for a neighbor. It is a good plan, which he would not mind driving by.

Tony Granado of 230 New London Turnpike, has experience with solar panels like this as a fire safety expert. He asked whether Verogy will own the project throughout its lifespan or will they sell it to another property. He asked if there is a decommission plan to return it to farmland after 20 years. He inquired whether the generator power will go mainly to Glastonbury or will it be shoved to the Eversource grid. Relatedly, he asked where their closest technician is, and would like to see a plan for a vegetation border, perhaps of evergreens, on Hebron Avenue.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded to the various questions and comments posed:

- Re the lifespan: Verogy is designed to be the owner and operator of this project long-time.
- Re the decommission plan: Verogy does have a decommission plan, which was required as part of their filing to the CT Siting Council. The lease agreement with the cemetery association obligates the removal of all equipment installed on the property.
- Re the emergency response training: Verogy currently offers that in another town, and will do so in Glastonbury, as well.
- Re generator power: Verogy will sell all metered activity to Eversource. He explained that the electrons are delivered to the grid and will be used at the next possible location.
- Re technical staff: Verogy's staff and team is based in West Hartford, so their response time on a project like this will be quick. They will not be staffed full time.
- Re the substation: they do not build substations for this project, but he noted that there are a couple ways to de-energize a system.
- Re screening along Hebron Avenue: that five-acre area with the 400-foot setback falls under the jurisdiction of the cemetery association. However, Verogy is open to considering a landscaping border directly north of their fence line.

Joe Duva of 86 Glen Place, noted that the drainage on the left side is where all the water is coming down, into their subdivision area. He asked where the cut and fill is supposed to take place. Mr. Parsons explained that the cut and fill is just associated with the temporary sediment traps.

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

Deborah Bolnick of 57 Stanley Drive, is in opposition to the proposed solar voltaic power generating facility at 17 Wickham Road. She would like to see this land continue to be used for farming rather than an industrial facility. Installing such a facility in this location would substantially change the feel of their community, in a negative way. She also has concerns about the potential environmental and property value impacts this will have on those who live in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Melissa Passarello of 1786 Chalker Hill, opposes the proposal, citing the 2016 Fuel Cell that appeared on the corner of Hebron Avenue and Chalker Hill as a cautionary tale to utility takeover. She worries about the further diminishing of Glastonbury's rural community feel. She also noted that those who purchased homes in the area did not agree to neighboring solar panels. She urged the Town to explore every aspect of this proposal and fight to ensure that the Siting Council does not allow another utility to ruin Hebron Avenue.

Christina Burke of 80 Candlelight Drive, opposes the proposal, finding the use of the term "farm" inherently misleading. She does not believe that there is anything farm-like about a

desolate field filled with large industrial metal panels. While she understands that the property is privately owned by the Catholic Cemeteries Association, she does not find that the solar panels encapsulate their own ethos, which is to preserve serenity, peacefulness, and beauty.

Kelly Hogan of 45 Lindsay Lane, does not approve of the proposal. While solar farms can be beneficial, she does not think it appropriate for one to be so close to a densely populated area. She worries what the implications would be on animal and human life, as well as the future of their agricultural community. She believes in setting boundaries now, in order to preserve what this town was built on.

Sarah Dzialo of 363 Main Street, finds it a shame to lose the open space. She thinks that solar farms are a real eye sore, and solar panels are best on roofs of buildings.

Michael Lawlor of 76 Ridgecrest Road, supports the project because expanding solar energy is crucial for energy independence and economic growth through increased tax revenue. By incentivizing and prioritizing solar initiatives, governments can enhance energy security while also bolstering their fiscal health, creating a win-win scenario that aligns with both environmental and economic objectives.

Kristen Davis of 81 Founders Road, does not support the development of solar in this area. She noted that the farm in question is across the street from two schools. In the past, the farm sold local crops to the public and other family-oriented events during the fall. To turn it into a solar facility would not only be an eyesore, but a complete disregard for those who utilize the farmers' market and farm on a regular basis. She hopes to continue supporting local farms and maintaining Glastonbury's limited open space in the main areas of town.

Erik Eaton of 30 Butternut Drive, voiced opposition to the project. While he understands that the lot is private property, he wonders whether there are better land uses to consider because a PV farm does not provide an energy-dense generator to the local economy, and modern solar arrays are an eyesore. Additionally, this project would constrain future flexibility in land use. He urged further review for the property owner and town committee.

Mr. Niland asked about the location of the inverter bank. Mr. Parsons stated that it is on the northeast portion of the site. Mr. Niland would like to see the site screened and kept as natural as possible. Mr. Cavanna asked about the sheep that will be onsite. Mr. Parsons stated that they put together a specific rotational grazing plan with their grazer in Ellington. There will be three sheep per acre, so a total of 45 onsite. They will spend the night there. Nobody will be with them overnight. There will be no enclosure, but he explained that they would get more shelter here than at a normal grazing farm. Mr. Cavanna asked if there will be a mobile water trough unit. Mr. Parsons replied, yes. Mr. Cavanna asked how many other farms in this area do mobile grazing. Mr. Parsons stated that it is more prevalent than one would think. Their contract with the grazer is for 20 years; if their grazer were to stop for whatever reason, then they would be obligated to find a replacement.

Mr. McChesney asked why they are paying to have the sheep graze here. Mr. Parsons explained that it is better for the environment than mowing the site. It is also in concert with the Department of Agriculture's requirements, to keep that agricultural presence on the site. Mr. McChesney's reading of the letter from the Siting Council is that it discourages the placement of these types of projects on prime farmland. He added that the sheep farming component, in the

Siting Council's view, meets that requirement to keep this agricultural land. Mr. Parsons clarified that the letter was from the Department of Agriculture, not the Siting Council. Mr. McChesney understands that there is a loophole, but the sheep part strikes him as a way of working around the requirements of the Siting Council to meet the word but not the spirit of the regulation.

Ms. Carroll has concerns about the noise that will be generated by the inverter bank, which will sit close to the cemetery. She also suggested committing to bigger trees than the proposed birch, for the landscape border. Mr. Parsons clarified that the inverters were specifically chosen because of how quiet they are; their noise level compares to a fridge or an AC unit running. Regarding the landscaping, he explained that their reasoning for birch was because they were told by others that the evergreens looked like a wall. If the Council prefers evergreens, then they can add them.

Ms. Wang asked to summarize the community engagement done thus far, as well as how long the pollinator-friendly seed mix will take to establish. She asked whether the sheep farmer has previous experience with agro voltaics. She also asked what the oversight is by the Department of Agriculture over the lifespan of the project, what the expected lifespan of the project is, and whether 'long-term' equates to the life of the project.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the initial community engagement happened in early November, with letters sent out to neighbors and a project website set up. In early December, their attorney sent out the official Siting Council notice. Mr. Parsons explained that the sheep and pollinator mix is a native mix, usually coming from Ernst seed mix, and is designed specifically for solar and foraging. Mr. Fitzgerald explained that they get contacted by sheep farmers around the state for the opportunity to graze. This gives them the ability to expand the lease ground that they would not have had access to otherwise.

Regarding oversight of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Fitzgerald explained that Velogy is bound to do this for the duration of the project. They are also incentivized to keep this up and running. Mr. Parsons added that the project has a 20-year contract, but the lease offers three 5-year extensions, so the potential duration is 35 years. Whether or not those projects are sold, any project is bound by the CT Siting Council and Department of Agriculture, he explained.

Mr. Cavanna asked if the removal and remediation of the site back to farmland is bonded. Mr. Fitzgerald replied, no. Mr. Cavanna asked how many solar farms Velogy has constructed in the last six years. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that eight other facilities are a direct comparison to this. Mr. Cavanna asked how many of those sites are mowed mechanically. Mr. Fitzgerald replied, about three or four. Mr. Cavanna asked if there will be a shelter put up for the sheep to sleep in at night. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that there is no plan currently. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that the public has the opportunity to communicate with the Archdiocese directly about this project.

12. Executive Session.

a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 9:29 P.M. for the purpose of:

a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.

Attendees to include Council Members, Town Manager, and Director of Parks and Recreation Lisa Zerio.

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 9:39 p.m.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of January 9, 2024 at 9:40 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Thomas Gullotta

Recording Clerk

Chairman