

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MAY 14, 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
Mr. John Cavanna {excused}
Mr. Larry Niland
Ms. Mary LaChance
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Mr. Whit Osgood

a. Pledge of Allegiance. *Led by Whit Osgood*

2. Public Comment.

Susan Motycka of 24 Fairfield Lane, was disappointed by the mural that was accepted by the Council. She did not know who the mural commemorated or why they are important. She understands that the original contract stipulated that three murals be presented, but only two were. She asked to go back to the drawing board to represent the people of Glastonbury.

Marshall S. Berdan of Mystic, is a former resident of Glastonbury who sees the mural as a historical travesty and a contemporary remedy to a non-existent disease. The goal of racial equity is undermined by the fact that racial inequity has never been much of an issue in Glastonbury. He believes that the artist attempted to make the Smith sisters as non-white as possible and that Sarah Onepenny was chosen simply because she is a female.

Allen Friedrich of 47 Prospect Street, Apt. D, thanked all who attended the opening of the Putnam Bridge trail. He also thanked Town Engineering staff for their help, as well as the DOT and their state representatives. He thanked the Council for their support all across the board.

Anne O'Connor of 22 Fairfield Lane, finished reading the rest of Mike Berdan's letter against the mural, explaining that Kirby Edmonds and Zandra Flemister, who both feature prominently on the mural, barely lived in Glastonbury, while the Smith sisters and Prince Simbo are reduced to small status in this mural. Siphax Moseley and his wife were not even considered, even though they were discussed early on in the process. She stated that the mural design approved by the Council is a reverse-engineered black wash of Glastonbury history, which was approved in violation of RiseUp's contract.

Tom Metzner of 406 Georgetown Drive, stated that, recently, there was a state bill and hearing on nips. Despite receiving seven cosponsors, the alcohol industry killed the bill. However, they will return next year, with a focus on drinking and driving. He thanked the Council for their support.

Bob Rader of 111 Lexington Road, is a member of the MLK Community Initiative. The committee finds it important that Glastonbury be seen as a place that welcomes outsiders and celebrates diversity. They reiterate support for this mural, which was already approved by the Council.

Maniben Patel of 41 Salem, CT represented BAPS Charities, which has a branch in Newington. On June 2, their organization will host their annual charity walk-run, "In the Joy of Others," at Elm Ridge Park in Rocky Hill. She encouraged all to attend.

Susan Karp of 32 Rampart Drive, reiterated her support for the mural that was presented. She found it surprising that there was much concern about what was presented by the committee at the last meeting. She also found it perplexing that some were concerned about certain people not being represented in the mural. She supports a second mural to address these concerns, after this one is finished.

Julie Thompson of 252 Bluff Point Road, is perplexed about revisiting the mural, which was thoroughly discussed and approved by the Council at the last meeting. She stated that the Historical Society board met once the mural committee was formed, held multiple discussions, and agreed that their one task was to support the historical research that the mural committee would request. The Historical Society's vice president volunteered to take on that task.

Maura Paulekas of 251 Wickham Road, is the vice president of the Glastonbury Historical Society but spoke as an individual. The committee spent a lot of time and consideration in selecting the people for the mural, guided by the community survey. She stated that the town seems to not be on the same page, and perhaps their history can teach them a lesson.

Chip Beckett of 308 Tryon Street, expected to see the mural on an overpass, but it has been downsized to be on the Town Hall. He believes that there should have been a public information hearing where residents could have weighed in their opinions and recommendations. He hopes that this can still happen, as most residents do not know what the committee has done.

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

John Cavanna of 63 Woodland Street, explained that membership to the advisory group on the mural fluctuated greatly, ending with a small group. He does not recall a formal vote ever taking place to present one mural before the council and exclude other designs. The contract clearly stipulates that at least three presentations be presented before the council, but he does not recall it ever being shared with the advisory group. He also believes that RiseUp exercised minimal supervision, delegating this project to the advisory group. While he voiced concerns that the advisory group may not be complying with council expectations, he believes in a Glastonbury-themed mural to celebrate diversity. He hopes that the council will receive three proposals, and then schedule a public information session at its next meeting to permit residents to share their opinions.

Scott Gac of 298 Cedar Ridge Drive, is a member of the mural advocate group who supports the Glastonbury MLK39 mural design. As a professor of American History, he often works on projects that commemorate important and meaningful histories. He thanked the artist for doing a great job in

representing a variety of viewpoints expressed by group members. He believes that this mural design captures the best spirit of the Glastonbury community.

Audrey Yellen Quinlan of 90 Candlelight Drive, submitted Ms. Flemister and Mr. Edmonds' names as possible honorees for the RiseUp mural. While she initially loved the design, she thinks that their depictions dominate the mural, thereby minimizing the contributions of the other honorees. She urged the Council to revisit the mural with a focus on equal visual weight. She also asked what input the RiseUp committee had from the Historical Society, and who represented them on the committee. She noted that RiseUp did not fulfill its contractual obligation to present three designs to the Council. She asked how the Council will address this breach of contract.

Trina Williams of 32 Plank Lane, explained that the mural honors individuals from various backgrounds who have made significant contributions to the town's history. For many, seeing representation of diverse and upstanding figures in the community's narrative is a powerful affirmation of identity and belonging. It underscores the historical reality that individuals from diverse backgrounds have long been integral to the fabric of Glastonbury.

The following comments were made via Zoom:

Michelle Polgar of 511 Griswold Street, is a member of the mural project advocacy group. She supports the design which was driven by the community and has been inspired by the artist's thoughtful design and receptive response to feedback. There is too much history for one mural to represent it all. She hopes that this will be the start, not the end, of the exploration of more murals throughout town.

Andrea Hawkins of 33 Leer Street, is also a member of the mural advocacy group. As a woman of color who has been in town for ten years, she still feels new to the community. Part of this is because she does not see people like her represented in town. She was excited to be a part of the mural process and supports the work that has been done by the group.

3. Special Reports.

a. Presentation of Proclamation – National Skilled Nursing Home Week.

Ms. Carroll presented a proclamation on behalf of the Council designating May 12-18 as National Skilled Nursing Care Week. Patrick McDonald received the proclamation.

4. Old Business.

a. Discussion and possible action regarding the MLK39 Racial Equity Mural Tour project.

Mr. Gullotta stated that the Council received only two conceptual designs from the artist, but the Town's contract with RiseUp stipulates that they should have received three. RiseUp Executive Director Matt Conway explained that three concepts were ready to be presented to the Council, but the mural committee decided to include only two of the designs in their presentation before the Council. Therefore, three designs were produced and presented to members of the town, and at their last meeting, the Council approved the presented design in an 8-1 vote.

Mr. Gullotta stated that RiseUp shall not assign or sublet any part of the project except with a prior written consent of the town, but Mr. Cavanna had suggested that this might not have been the case. Mr.

Conway explained that RiseUp gave their full attention to this project, helping to facilitate the committee meetings. He also noted that the Town is not paying RiseUp for any of this project. They have put in hours of in-kind contribution to provide this facilitation to the town, simply because the community wants it.

Mr. Gullotta noted that, at the last meeting, he got a sense of urgency from RiseUp that this needed to be approved then, but their contract extends to December 2025, which is 1.5 years away. Mr. Conway explained that the sense of urgency came out of respect for the volunteers who put effort into this project, the donors who financially contributed to it, and to the artist who spent hours outside of the scope of her work to satisfy the Glastonbury community. He explained that the genesis of this project was not RiseUp soliciting the Town, but rather, the Town soliciting RiseUp to help facilitate this project. The urgency comes from the Glastonbury community who wants this nearly two-year project to conclude.

Mr. McChesney finds the questions asked tonight, and the comments made in the Citizen, entirely inappropriate. He stated that RiseUp has taken on all the finances of this project, and they take the term 'breach of contract' very seriously. He clarified that it is not the council at large that believes there was a breach of contract. He clarified that the Council received two mural proposals, not three. There was discussion of a third proposal, but the committee decided not to proceed with it, for whatever reason. He pointed out that this initially came before the Council as a mural in an underpass, but it was Mr. Cavanna's request to have it in a more public, visible space.

Mr. McChesney stated that just because someone was not born in Glastonbury, that does not mean they shouldn't be celebrated as part of their community. He wants people to look at a mural and ask who those people are and what they contributed, in order to find out. He was astonished by the use of the term 'black-washed' in comments tonight. A child of color spoke to this council months ago and indicated that, growing up, she often felt that learning history in town has been whitewashed. Mr. McChesney is proud of the design that has been proposed. He noted that what the Council saw is probably a mockup design. This is a nice mural which should be celebrated, and he supports more murals to commemorate more people throughout town.

Ms. Wang pointed out that there was a suggestion from the council to include another family, and that suggestion was incorporated by the artist. At the beginning of this process, she shared that her friend, who is a minority and lives in another town, felt represented in her town's MLK mural, so Ms. Wang thought that this mural would mean a lot to the people in Glastonbury, as well. She did not anticipate that people would feel like something has been taken away. Another friend shared with her their experiences of racism in town. They were uncomfortable putting their name on their public comments. Ms. Wang does not believe that this mural is a political statement or blackwashing. As a mother of two children of color, it is important to provide a mural for youth of color to feel a sense of belonging and inclusion.

The public hearings commenced at 8:00 p.m. After their conclusion, discussion resumed on Item 4a.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALKS ALONG MAIN STREET/ROUTE 17 BETWEEN RED HILL DRIVE AND THE CIDER MILL.

(CONTINUED FROM APRIL 23, 2024 COUNCIL MEETING.). THE PUBLIC HEARING WILL INCLUDE A PRESENTATION/REVIEW OF THE PROJECT BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves construction of new sidewalks along Main Street/Route 17 generally extending between the Cider Mill and Red Hill Drive, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission pursuant to CGS Section 8-24.

Mr. Luiz stated that a meeting was held with the DOT to discuss the DOT's previous refusal to allow construction of retaining walls on the west side of Main Street. It was an educational meeting, and DOT representatives volunteered to come together to provide the same information. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the Council had voted unanimously to meet with the commissioner, so he would like to know why that did not happen. State Rep Jill Barry explained that she does not know why the commissioner wasn't available, but she felt it important to hear what the DOT has to say.

Scott Bushee of the CT DOT Highway Design Unit explained that the DOT is supportive of closing the sidewalk gap on Route 17. He reviewed the alternatives they came up with to address this difficult stretch. Option 1 was to fill a wall with five-foot concrete sidewalks and a six-foot lane shift to the east. Option 2 proposed a nine-foot lane shift to the east, getting rid of the retaining wall, and providing a sidewalk. This was the option recommended by the DOT. Option 3 would cut into the embankment and build a taller retaining wall, which was ruled out early on because of poor soil conditions.

Option 1 became a concern because of various safety issues regarding snow maintenance, the clear zone, ADA laws regarding maximum grade, and limited sight distance. Option 2 has none of these concerns. Mr. Bushee explained that, originally, this project was being designed by the Town and would have been funded entirely by Glastonbury. However, this particular section qualified for a LOTCIP grant; the DOT commitment to fund Option 2 is about \$1.3 million.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked, if the roadway is shifted nine feet to the east, will there be more state right of way. Mr. Bushee replied yes, but it is not about how much property they have. It is about how they get a sidewalk in there which meets design standards. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there are options for a Merritt Parkway type of barrier. Mr. Bushee stated that the guide rail itself introduces safety concerns, and there is nothing on the east side that would warrant that safety need. Mr. Niland noted that neighbors on the east side have had cars end up on their lawns. Mr. Bushee explained that the proposed sidewalk is four feet, which is the absolute minimum allowed. Additionally, their snow shelf is four feet, but the DOT agreed to reduce it to 3/3.5 feet, just to minimize the widening on the east side.

Mr. McChesney asked if the DOT is open to working with the town on traffic calming measures. Mr. Bushee watched the video of the last council meeting and heard the public's concerns regarding high speeds and other safety issues. The more he listened, the more it justified the need for a sidewalk. However, the suggestion for additional traffic calming measures is a different project for road safety. His recommendation is to use local police enforcement. Another option is the portable message signs

that notify what one's speed is. Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the right of way width of the existing curve was. Mr. Pennington stated that, on average, it is around 35 feet from the curve to the highway line.

Mr. Cavanaugh will vote against this project because he wants the people on the east side of Main Street to know that they have been heard. Mr. Niland finds it vitally important to do this project.

Result: Motion passed {7-1-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

NO. 2 ACTION CONCERNING LEASE AGREEMENT WITH CRONIN GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC – 50 NYE ROAD.

Mr. Luiz stated that Cronin is purchasing a building where they would move their operations to, but they need a few months to get it ready, so they asked for a lease extension. Mr. Osgood thinks that this makes sense, as a month-to-month lease, but the Council needs to figure out what to do with this building and make a move on it.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute a new Lease Agreement for 50 Nye Road with Cronin Group Holdings LLC, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

The Council recessed for ten minutes, returning at 8:50 p.m. Discussion returned to Item 4a.

Ms. LaChance stated that the Council voted on this design already. She finds it inappropriate to return on the basis of something in the contract which was not even brought up in the discussion. To then follow that up by an article in the Citizen, and then place the matter on their meeting agenda, is not how the Council should run. The people represented in the mural are impressive, and she believes that they should be represented. Mr. Niland agreed with Ms. LaChance, stating that this mural will be a great addition to their community, and he is not interested in litigating this.

Ms. Carroll stated that a couple people mentioned a lack of public discussion regarding this matter, but the mural was actually an agenda item on five separate council agendas over the course of 1.5 years. The Council often laments the lack of public participation in the budget process, but what does get people out to comment is anything to do with representation and equity. This project has had overwhelmingly positive support and involvement until a few weeks ago. She stated that the people most vocally opposed to expanding representation and equity in their community are those who have faced the fewest struggles in finding representation. No one project will satisfy everyone, and the suggestion of future projects is not appeasement but genuinely hopeful. She believes that the community should be strengthened by this project, not diminished by it.

Mr. Gullotta explained that his primary concern at the last meeting was that the Moseleys should have been represented on the mural but they were not. At the time, he voted for the mural, but the contract was provided to him just recently. He read it and has concerns which should be referred to the Town Attorney for review. While he continues to support this project, he is pointing out that a bad decision is being made, not on the mural or the citizens, but with the company they have a contract with. He stated that choosing to ignore the stipulations listed in the contract will set a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Osgood pointed out that Mr. Gullotta voted in favor of the mural design, and is now raising concerns about a contract that is not specific. He explained that the committee is a town representative, and they reviewed three designs, so this is a moot discussion. Ms. Wang appealed the decision of the Chairman to not allow RiseUp another opportunity to speak, since they have been directly implicated in contractual violations, and there has been the suggestion of involving the Town Attorney.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

I appeal on the decision of the Chair to not allow RiseUp another opportunity to speak since they have been directly implicated in contractual violations and with a suggestion of bringing in the Town Attorney.

Result: Motion passed {7-1-0}, with Mr. Gullotta voting against.

Matt Conway explained that they have had legal counsel review this contract. He requested that Chairman Gullotta publish an article in the Citizen retracting his statement that RiseUp violated the contract because his public statement hurt their credibility. Mr. McChesney explained that the comments made by one town council member in a local newspaper do not constitute comments of the council at large, for purposes of any future pending legal action.

b. Action to establish a Joint Town Council/Town Plan and Zoning Commission Subcommittee – Town Center Village District Overlay Zone Expansion.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby establishes the Town Center Village District Overlay Zone (TCVD) Joint Subcommittee for the purpose of reviewing the expansion of the TCVD, sign regulations, and making design review a requirement for special permits in Reserved Land Zones, and which Joint Subcommittee shall include the following members/designees: Town Council three (3) members Deb Carroll, Tom Gullotta, and Kurt Cavanaugh, and Town Plan and Zoning Commission three (3) members Robert Zanlungo, Sharon Purtill, and Corey Turner, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024.

Disc: Mr. Osgood would like to serve on the subcommittee. He finds it inappropriate for Mr. Gullotta and Mr. Cavanaugh to be two of the members as they have supported the expansion of the TCVD. He explained that this matter went before the TPZ, and it did not pass. He would like to have a more balanced representation from the council.

Amendment by: Mr. Niland

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

To add Mr. Osgood to the subcommittee, as a fourth council member.

Result: Amendment passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

Disc: Ms. Wang explained that four members of the council is almost the majority, so she is not convinced of the utility of this extra subcommittee. She would like clarification about the purpose of the subcommittee and its added value. Mr. Gullotta explained that the TPZ had a couple concerns, which they would like addressed. The intent is for the subcommittee to hold that discussion, then bring the matter back to the full TPZ and full council. Mr. Cavanaugh watched the TPZ meeting where they discussed this. He supports members meeting together to share ideas and concerns, as well as to hear what the objections were from the TPZ.

Result: Amended motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

5. New Business.

a. Action on authorization for Gideon Welles School Roof Replacement Project.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approved a \$2,500,000 appropriation to the Capital Project Fund entitled “Gideon Welles School Roof Replacement Project” in the adopted Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes Glastonbury Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Alan Bookman, to submit an application for a School Construction Reimbursement Grant for the Gideon Welles School Roof Replacement Project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council authorizes Town staff to proceed with design and construction documents for the Gideon Welles School Roof Replacement Project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council refers to the Town’s standing Building Committee the approval of final design plans for the Gideon Welles School Roof Replacement Project;

all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024 and as recommended by the Board of Education.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

b. Discussion and possible action concerning proposed agreement between Board of Education and Glastonbury Education Association (GEA) – July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2029.

Board Chair Doug Foyle reviewed the process that led to this agreement, explaining that the BOE appointed a negotiating committee. They were also joined by Town Council representative Larry Niland. The committee authorized Dr. Bookman to meet with GEA leadership to work out a deal over formal negotiations. They reached a formal agreement, which came to the full BOE, who approved it unanimously. Everyone who spoke said it was a fair agreement.

Alan Bookman, Superintendent of Schools, stated that they met over a four-week period to negotiate. The General Wage Increase (GWI) is the wage increase for the teachers, who have 12 steps on their contracts. He explained that their budget has some savings based on retirement, but the final wage increase of 3% could be offset by health benefits. He stated that both the BOE and the teachers' union thought this formula was fair. He explained that since this law went into effect, the only rejections by a council in the State of CT have been when the deal was decided by an arbitrator not the BOE.

Mr. Osgood asked how they came up with the step increases. Dr. Bookman explained that the step system has existed for many decades, and many towns use it to control costs. Mr. Osgood asked for a copy of the contract. Dr. Bookman stated that it is posted on their website. Mr. Osgood asked when the next contracts are coming up. Dr. Bookman explained that, next year, they will have new contracts with administrators, nurses, secretaries, and paraprofessionals. Mr. Osgood asked if this contract negotiation will affect those contracts. Dr. Bookman replied yes, the teachers and administrative contract does not go into effect until next year, but the contract for the nurses, secretaries, and paraprofessionals goes into effect in the current year.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the current agreement expires on June 30, 2024. Dr. Foyle stated that that is a typo; it should say June 30, 2025. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the unions have ratified the agreement. Dr. Bookman replied, yes. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how many people are in the union. Dr. Bookman stated, around 520. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the bifurcated health care plan. Dr. Bookman explained that new people have to go to the high deductible plan. About 80% of all staff are on that plan. Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the impact will be on the following four years, dollar-wise. Dr. Bookman will provide that information to Mr. Luiz.

Mr. Osgood suggested not voting on this until the Council gets a better understanding of the impact it will have on the town budget. Dr. Bookman noted that the Council has 22 days left in their 30-day window to take a vote.

Motion by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

To table the matter until the meeting of May 28, 2024.

Result: Motion passed {7-1-0}, with Mr. Gullotta voting against.

c. Action on proposal for the 2024 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, May 28, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing on the proposals submitted by The South Glastonbury Public Library Association, Inc. and Town of Glastonbury – Open Space Land Acquisition Fund under the 2024 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

d. Action on 2023 Small Town Economic Assistance Program (STEAP) Grant – Nye Road Affordable Housing Development Parking Area.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that Town Manager Jonathan Luiz, be, and hereby is, authorized to accept on behalf of the Town of Glastonbury, a 2023 Connecticut STEAP Grant in the amount of \$500,000 for Construction of new parking areas which support construction of up to seventy (70) units of affordable housing on Nye Road; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Town Manager Jonathan Luiz is hereby authorized to enter into and execute any and all agreements, contracts and documents necessary to obtain said 2023 STEAP Grant with the State of Connecticut;

all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

e. Action on a \$91,967 appropriation from the Capital Reserve Fund to Capital Improvements Projects Fund – ARPA Senior Center Facility Improvement Grant, funded through the State of Connecticut Department of Aging and Disability Services ARPA funds (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance the request for a \$91,967 appropriation and transfer from the Capital Reserve Fund to Capital Improvements Projects Fund – ARPA Senior Center Facility Improvement Grant and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 28, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider the proposed appropriation and transfer, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

6. Consent Calendar.

a. Action on Master Municipal Agreement for Rights of Way Projects with the State of Connecticut Department of Transportation.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Manager is hereby authorized to sign the Agreement entitled “Master Municipal Agreement for Rights of Way Projects,” as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 10, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

7. Town Manager’s Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. He noted that UConn has requested that Glastonbury sign off on an archaeological dig for the Wangunk settlement. There were no objections from the Council to authorize that. Ms. Wang suggested using the Storytime at the Fire House event as an opportunity to recruit for the fire service. She also asked to look into adding a crosswalk on the other side of Addison Road. Mr. Luiz will look into it. He added that he and his predecessor have shared with the Town Attorney their thoughts on the Town Charter, which the Town Attorney will review and have a statement of in advance of the Council's June 25, 2024 meeting. Mr. Osgood noted that the police made an arrest of a stolen automobile, largely as a result of the LPRs, so he is glad that the process is working out.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report. *None.*

b. MDC. *None.*

c. CRCOG. *None.*

d. Board of Education Facilities Committee Report.

Ms. Wang stated that the committee met on April 19. They discussed enrollment projections and elementary classroom space data. Those reports are available on their website. She also noted that the administration is developing an RFP for a consultant to conduct a comprehensive facilities assessment. The committee will meet again in the fall.

9. Communications.

a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 577 Bell Street.

10. Minutes.

a. Minutes of April 23, 2024 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the April 23, 2024 Regular Meeting.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations. *None.*

12. Executive Session.

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

b. Pending litigation – Bemer Petroleum.

c. Personnel matter – Town Manager.

Following the Executive Session, the Council will discuss, in private, collective bargaining negotiations and such discussions are not treated as a meeting under the applicable sections of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Attendees for the private session include the Town Council members and the Town Manager.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 9:43 p.m. for the purpose of:

- a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.*
- b. Pending litigation – Bemer Petroleum.*
- c. Personnel matter – Town Manager.*

Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager.

Following the Executive Session, the Council will discuss, in private, collective bargaining negotiations and such discussions are not treated as a meeting under the applicable sections of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Attendees for the private session include the Town Council members and the Town Manager.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

The Council came out of Executive Session at 10:10 p.m.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of May 14, 2024 at 10:11 p.m.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

**Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta
Chairman**