

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 23, 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 {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh

Mr. John Cavanna

Mr. Larry Niland

Ms. Mary LaChance

Mr. Jacob McChesney

Mr. Whit Osgood {excused}

a. Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Jill Barry.

2. Public Comment.

Chrissy Monaco of 41 Rampart Drive, requested an appeal of the judge's decision regarding the proposed housing development project at 51 Kreiger Lane.

Thomas Quinlan, owner of 23 Krieger Lane, stated that, back in March, the TPZ unanimously denied the 51 Kreiger Lane application, on the basis that the industrial zone classification would exempt the proposal from CGS Section 8-30G. He petitioned the Council to appeal the judge's decision.

Bill Constantine of 439 Chimney Sweep Hill Road, also has a building on Kreiger Lane and hopes that the Council can appeal the judge's decision regarding 51 Kreiger Lane.

Jeff Pell of 100 Kreiger Lane, requested that the Council fund the Town Attorney to appeal the decision by the court regarding 51 Kreiger Lane.

Rachel Siporin of 509 Hopewell Road, spoke on the closure of Cotton Hollow Preserve. She likes that the police have begun patrolling the area but thinks that changes need to be made to make the preserve safe and viable in the long term. Some suggestions include requiring a parking sticker and closing down the site earlier.

Alan Preli of 641 Woodland Street, is disappointed at the way in which the MLK mural was handled. He finds it insulting that one of the individuals on the mural called Italian Americans racist. He noted that this town has changed a lot in his 76 years.

Jenn Jennings of 34 Cranesbill Drive, commended the GPD's recent initiative to roll out an explorer's program, which her child participated in. She encouraged parents to reach out about the program. She also

commented on the recent juvenile arrest at GHS, noting that the BOE has received numerous letters of concern about what happened. She is displeased with the school system's lack of response on this matter and wishes that more information were shared with the GPD. She believes that embarrassment is a powerful deterrent and would like the charges to be shared with GHS students.

Lisa Rouleau of 12 Conestoga Way, spoke as a board member of the A Better Chance (ABC) program, expressing outrage at the incident of a GHS student threatening a black student. She is disappointed that school administrators did not call out the racism in the notes that they shared with parents, thereby minimizing its seriousness and allowing it to continue. The ABC House has been a cornerstone in the community for the last 50 years, fostering an environment for diversity. Threats of violence based on race are contradictory to their core values and not what the town should tolerate.

Rhonda Rawlins of 64 Glastonbury Hunt Lane, is president of the ABC program. She explained that parents trust them to be their child's legal guardians, and this recent incident has been a nightmare situation. One of their students was on the list. His mother is uncertain whether to bring her son back to Glastonbury in September. Ms. Rawlins asked those interested in their program to reach out. She also welcomes any groups who may like to partner to address racism in town.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension, gave high praise to the GPD for their rapid response in addressing this issue at GHS. He runs a non-partisan website called Glastonbury Voter, conducting research about everybody on this council, for whom he has immense respect. He believes that national change can begin at the local level. His suggestions for 2025 are to remember that we are all neighbors, and to attack the policies and not the people.

Heaven Diaz of 80 Candlelight Drive, is a GHS graduate. She was told that she, along with a list of black students, are unwelcome here. She was suspended from the Glastonbury community Facebook page for sharing this information. She asked whether it is a crime to be black in America, and if not, then they should talk about it. She rejects white supremacy in all its forms and demands accountability and change. Racism is not something that one is born with but is taught. She asked to make hate speech and hate crimes grounds for suspension in school and to teach CRT in Glastonbury public schools.

Mark DeCapua of 45 Hopewell Road, lives across from the Cotton Hollow Preserve and the Grange pool. He stated that the preserve has been a liability for years now and agrees with closing it until further notice. He believes that security gates are needed, at both the entrance and exits, and at the gravel parking lot. The Town must control that area, and he thinks that the gates will help. He suggested lining the gravel parking lot and charging visitors to park at the site.

Ivelisse Correa of 45 Crown Street in Hartford, read a statement in her capacity as vice president of BLM60. She thanked the town for their investigation into the incident at GHS. Her organization has treated it as the hate crime that it was. However, racism was not addressed or called out in any of the statements that were released by the school. Threats were made to students, and parents fear for their lives because of the color of their skin. She asked what plans the Town has to support the victims and to keep students safe in the district.

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

Matthew Staebner of 589 Hopewell Road, thinks that the Park and Recreation department should start charging online for park passes to Cotton Hollow, which can then be validated by the park rangers. This charge would help to offset the park ranger salaries. If a park pass is not legally allowed, then he favors closing down Cotton Hollow Preserve for the remainder of the summer.

John and Eileen Raymond of 17 Redbud Lane, support the extension of the Village District designation along Main Street, including Griswold Street.

Jaime Page of Hopewell Road, strongly encourages the Town to bring back Community Service Officers at Cotton Hollow. The preserve was never this out of control until the Town got rid of Community Service Officers, who truly cared and helped to keep the area safe.

John Cunningham of 191 Griswold Street, stated that since the House Street intersection was reconfigured and the traffic signals reprogrammed, House Street has become a more convenient route for accessing the Route 2 West ramp, North end of Main Street, and East Hartford, as well as a back road route towards Manchester. The prospect of even more traffic being created by weak control over commercial development is nightmarish to his family. He fully supports the proposed extension of the village district designation to include his area of town.

Jean Cunningham of 191 Griswold Street, asked to support the extension of the village district, to include Griswold Street.

The following comment was made via Zoom:

Tiffany Fobbs of 215 North Ruby Street in Philadelphia, explained that her son is a victim of the recent incident at GHS. She is unsure whether or not to send him back to Glastonbury to continue his education. She seeks more clarification on what adjustments will be made, and what support will be provided from the police, the school, and the community.

3. Special Reports.

a. *Added to the Agenda: Special Report by Police Chief Marshall Porter regarding a recent juvenile arrest.*

Mr. Gullotta stated that, last week, Glastonbury police were notified of a student making threatening statements on social media to other students. He asked if the police responded quickly to the call. Chief Porter stated yes, Youth and Family Services (YFS) reached out to GPD, who responded quickly, culminating in the arrest of the juvenile suspect.

The Chief then read his press release on the matter, explaining that the investigation began on June 11 when YFS contacted them about a Discord page referencing the KKK, Hitler, violence to African Americans, and bomb threats to the high school. Because of the time sensitive matter, the police acquired federal subpoenas instead of search warrants, and learned that the Discord account holder in question was a juvenile victim themselves. He stated that another juvenile suspect had illegally accessed that Discord account and altered the profile page to include the threats.

Chief Porter further noted that the suspect had also sent direct messages from the victim's account to others, with additional death threats, naming several African American GHS students. He explained that staff contacted all victims to advise of the ongoing investigation, and the suspect has been charged with a slew of crimes, including hate crimes. He remarked that the GPD will continue to work with Glastonbury school administrators to ensure the security of students and staff. He applauded the student who came forward with this information to the YFS. Their department will reach out to victims again to answer questions and offer services.

Mr. Gullotta stated that the Council, along with the BOE, find behavior like this unacceptable, and they await the determination of the courts.

Motion by: Ms. LaChance

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

To add Council discussion of this incident to tonight's agenda.

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

b. Added to the agenda: Council discussion regarding the recent juvenile arrest.

Ms. LaChance finds this to be a very distressing situation. About three years ago, she was in a similar situation, where someone hacked into her child's account and posted a racist quote in his yearbook. She hopes that this can bring together their community to have a good discussion with the BOE. She then addressed Ms. Diaz, who spoke during the public comment session, telling her that she is certainly welcome in Glastonbury.

Ms. Wang commended both the police department for the investigation that led to the charges and arrest, as well as the student who raised this issue with YFS. She noted that this has impacted the greater community, which still has a lot of fear, anger, and distress over the incident. She encouraged residents to reach out to their elected officials and community and faith leaders to tell them what they would like to be done. Going forward, she finds that acknowledging this broader community impact will be very important.

Mr. Cavanaugh finds it beyond his capacity to understand how kids this age can hate people. He also spoke to Ms. Diaz, stating that she is his neighbor, and is welcome over his home any day. He then asked Chief Porter whether the individual is still in custody. Mr. Porter's understanding is that no, the individual is not still in custody. Mr. Cavanaugh asked why the victim went to YFS and not directly to the police department. Chief Porter does not know why.

Ms. Carroll also thanked all involved for escalating this matter, especially to the student who approached YFS. She wishes that the Council could do something more directly to impact change. She hopes that the BOE will have a special meeting to give space for further conversation. She thinks that more parent education, around the kind of communication their children have online, would be helpful. Mr. Cavanna agreed, stating that parents need to remember that phones are a doorway into their homes. He asked parents to get involved with what their children are doing on their phones.

Mr. Niland agreed with Ms. Carroll. He is hopeful that the BOE can get together with the public. He explained that a lot of the suggestions that the public raised tonight might pertain more to the BOE because the Council has no authority over them. He also agreed with Mr. Cavanna that parents need to get involved with their children's technology and social media use. He urged parents to pay attention to the things that their children say, and to not tolerate anything inappropriate. He believes that addressing this problem needs to start in the home.

PUBLIC HEARING:

NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS TO CREATE A SOUTH GLASTONBURY VILLAGE DISTRICT OVERLAY ZONE.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the TPZ recommended the creation of a South Glastonbury Village District Overlay (SGVD). She noted that the existing South Glastonbury zoning was established in 2004, composed of village residential and village commercial. Currently, advisory design review is required for multi-family, commercial, and office projects in these zones. If adopted, design guidelines would be compulsory for new construction, substantial reconstruction, and rehabilitation of property within the district. She stated that the proposal is to amend zoning regulations for both the Village Residential and Village Commercial zones. Since the changes affect only the text of the South Glastonbury zone and that section of the code, she found no reason to create a new zoning map; the Town Attorney has agreed with this approach.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the proposed draft text amendment amends the existing zoning district language, rather than establishing an overlay zone, and design controls would apply in both residential and commercial zones in South Glastonbury Village. She noted that the text amendment language is borrowed largely from the TCVD, with a few exceptions. Because of the unique historical and visual character of the district, she believes that it is worth tailoring design guidelines to the area.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the draft also calls for adding Reserved Land to the BZR Section 4.19 to require advisory design review of Special Permit applications. She noted that the TPZ was split in its support of requiring design review for one or two family residential properties. They were also mixed on whether or not to exempt minor scopes of work. She explained that there was consensus that work which does not require a building permit should not also require design review. The commission unanimously agreed that new design guidelines should be created for SGVD, and that a joint committee, comprised of ASDRC, TPZ, and Council members, should steer development of those guidelines.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the TPZ also suggested that if all residential properties are excluded from compulsory design review in the SGVD, then the residential district should remain listed in the BZR Section 4.19 so that special permits there continue to receive advisory design review. She noted that, apart from one commissioner, all favored striking draft language that would limit design review to work that would be visible from public roadways. The reasoning is that most commissioners felt that it would be difficult for Town Staff to make that visibility determination. She then posed various considerations for the Council to think about.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comments:

Peter Alter of 1 Park Place, which is in the proposed village residential district. He does not understand why the Town seeks to superimpose yet another layer of restrictions and control over an area which has developed in a very appropriate and beneficial way. He has conducted five additions on this property over the years. The way he reads this regulation, this means that he would have had to go through the approval process five times. He does not have a problem with requiring this for commercial properties, but expansion into the 63 residences in South Glastonbury is an overreach. He suggests that the motion which was proposed that excludes single family and two family houses is appropriate. He then stated that he has no understanding of what is being referenced in Section 4.16.5.d: “the following should be considered in all development proposals requiring a zoning permit.”

Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive, is concerned that the concept of a village district involves too much subjectivity from very few people in town. She did not weigh in on the first village district because she does not live in that part of town anymore, but she watched the TPZ meeting and agreed with a statement by one of the commissioners, that “the horse is out of the barn.” She found it an overstep for the Town to require Nick Damato to take on an additional expense to improve the appearance of the town. She agrees with Mr. Alter’s statement about making an exception for residential homes. She lives in a condominium complex but is concerned that this might somehow reach her because it seems like a slippery slope.

Mr. Cavanna will only support this amendment if it does not apply to single-family and duplex homes. Ms. Caltagirone stated that there is only one multi-family property within the Village Residential Zone; there are eight duplexes, and the rest are single family properties. Mr. McChesney asked about the zoning permit posed by Attorney Alter. Ms. Caltagirone explained that they do not use that language often, but it is used in the Town Center section of the code, so she borrowed it from that. She explained that a zoning permit applies to review only for zoning compliance.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that, years ago, renovations were made to Richard's Mobile, and the house was moved to the rear. He asked Mr. Alter how these proposed regulations would have affected that proposal. Mr. Alter explained that, through a special permit with design review, they renovated the gas station from being a service station to what it is now, with a canopy and pump locations. Rather than tearing down the Sheffield house, Mr. Richards moved it to the back and preserved it. He suspects that under the current situation with the ASDRC, that this would be very unlikely to make it through that process.

Mr. Cavanna asked what protections they will offer to current businesses that may need to modernize in order to operate in that area of town. Mr. Gullotta clarified that this village district will not change what Mr. Cavanna is saying; the process is virtually the same. Ms. Caltagirone stated that is correct. There will be a slight difference in how strong the TPZ's findings would be, in terms of design review, because they would be able to cite non-compliance with the design guidelines as a reason for denying a special permit. If appealed, this would hold up better in court than the current system does.

Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, asked if any type of multi-family development is already under the purview of the ASDRC. Ms. Caltagirone stated yes, because it would require a special permit. Ms. Lucas noted that the discussion now just concerns commercial properties and multi-family properties, of which there is currently only one. Ms. Caltagirone stated yes, the change would be that the Town would produce design guidelines that are specific for South Glastonbury.

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

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adopts the proposed text amendment (dated July 19, 2024) to the Building-Zone Regulation Sections 4.16 and 4.19 concerning the South Glastonbury Village District, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated July 19, 2024, to be effective August 20, 2024 with one exception:

- *Single- and two-family residential properties are to be excluded from design review in the Village Residential Zone.*

Discussion: Mr. McChesney proposed another exception, which would strike visibility from a roadway as a criterion for design review. Mr. Gullotta agreed.

Amendment by: Mr. McChesney

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

To strike visibility from a public roadway as a consideration in determining whether design review is required for a project, and striking thereby references to visibility within this regulation.

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

Discussion: Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Reserve Land language would correct what was missed the first time around, when they created a village district in the Town Center. Ms. Caltagirone stated yes, it will apply town-wide, not just in this village district.

The amended motion reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adopts the proposed text amendment (dated July 19, 2024) to the Building-Zone Regulation Sections 4.16 and 4.19 concerning the South Glastonbury Village District, to be effective August 20, 2024 with the following exceptions:

- *Single- and two-family residential properties are to be excluded from design review in the Village Residential Zone; and*
- *To strike visibility from a public roadway as a consideration in determining whether design review is required for a project, and thereby, striking references to visibility within this regulation. Approved (8-0).*

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

4. Old Business. *None.*

5. New Business.

a. Discussion concerning Cotton Hollow Preserve.

Mr. Luiz stated that, on July 16, the preserve was closed due to public safety concerns. Over the next two weeks, Town Staff will work on cleaning up the place, performing trail maintenance, and coming up with a list of safety maintenance to discuss at the next Council meeting. He provided legal answers from the Town Attorney to questions posed by council members, as well as an old legal opinion from the prior Town Attorney, concerning whether or not the Town could limit access of the preserve to non-residents and guests. He also noted that the Grange Pool is open at this time that Cotton Hollow is closed.

Mr. Cavanna is happy that the preserve is closed while they figure out how to move forward. He has been checking in on Cotton Hollow daily for weeks. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that, last Sunday, two officers were onsite when a vehicle, with a license plate removed, relocated from the upper to the lower parking lot, then exited; the officer was unable to block them. He learned that, under this police accountability bill, an officer cannot impede the exit of a vehicle he has pulled over. He is concerned about the activity in the cove itself, as well as the crime happening in the upper parking lot and on Hopewell Road. Moving forward, Mr. Cavanna would like to see reserve officers whose sole focus is those areas.

Mr. Gullotta stated that Cotton Hollow's original purpose as a preserve has been abused. He believes that they need to increase controls there, and the parking lot needs a gate. When the parking lot is filled, he suggested temporary 'no parking' signs on the streets. If there is no personnel onsite, then the site should not be open. The closed parking lot gate would ensure a measure of safety, he added.

Ms. Wang asked if the next step is to develop a set of potential remedies with Town Staff and present those at a future council meeting. Mr. Luiz has also reached out to State DEEP for their input. He explained that this would return to the council with a list of recommendations. Ms. Wang is interested in the idea of charging for parking stickers, which is already in place at Eastbury Pond. She would like to explore the idea of purchasing a season pass and putting a sticker on one's windshield. She hopes that can head off the overuse of the preserve, especially considering the amount of intersection between police and public, which makes her uncomfortable for various

reasons. Mr. Cavanna wants their community to get to know their cops because he believes that the more public interaction, the better.

b. Action on a \$60,000 appropriation and transfer to hire a consultant regarding land use matters (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance a request for determination of sufficient monies in the proposed American Rescue Plan Act (Special Revenue) Fund project and the Capital Projects Fund projects, and that the proposed appropriation and transfers of funds totaling \$60,000 is consistent with the US Treasury Guidelines; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 6, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer from the ARPA - Farm Assistance Program of \$30,000 to the ARPA - Public Safety Communication Systems Project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 6, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer of \$30,000 from the Capital Projects Account Fund - Public Safety Communication System to the new Capital Project Account Fund - Land Use Consulting Project;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council refers to the Board of Finance a bid waiver request from the Town Manager and Director of Community Development for a Land use Consulting Project;

all as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated July 19, 2024.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that they received a proposal of a little under \$30,000 for a consultant. He explained that the Town has reached out to FHI because of their familiarity with Glastonbury's land use regulations and because of the fine work they have already done with the recent design guidelines. He explained that a total of \$60,000 is projected to be unspent ARPA money, of which \$30,000 can be used for this project. However, the ARPA guidelines are very strict about uses, and this project does not qualify. He explained that the plan is to swap the monies with another account that is using local dollars for a public safety communications system, in order to keep within the guidelines of ARPA.

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

The Council took a brief recess, returning at 9:10 p.m.

c. Presentation and discussion regarding draft text amendment for inclusion of PADs in the Town Center District and possible action to refer to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and set a public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby forwards the draft text amendment of the Building-Zone Regulations allowing Planned Area Developments in the Town Center Zoning District to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission for a recommendation and schedules a public hearing to consider adoption of the

text amendment on September 10, 2024, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated July 19, 2024.

Discussion: Ms. Caltagirone explained that PADs are allowed in most other residential and commercial zones, apart from the South Glastonbury village commercial zone. Both the TPZ and ASDRC have supported PADs in this zone. She noted that the proposed standards require a minimum development tract size of 5 acres for PADS in the Town Center. However, that may be 3.5 acres if 20% of the proposed units are set aside as affordable or if development is for elderly housing. Density must be maintained at 0.5 Floor Area Ratio (FAR), but may be doubled, to 1.0, if 20% of proposed units are set aside as affordable. She reminded the Council that, with PADs, the Council has full discretion over deciding what is appropriate for the site. If this proposal proceeds, then it would go before the TPZ for review in late August and return to the Council in September.

Mr. Gullotta does not see the words ‘in perpetuity.’ Ms. Caltagirone clarified that that language is already built into the code, with the definition of affordable housing there. Mr. McChesney asked how this impacts the maximum height. Ms. Caltagirone explained that, with a FAR, they are really developing with the volume of a building. Generally, the code seeks to limit projects to 35 feet in height, but the Council has the ability to waive the height restriction. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that this is just a referral to the TPZ, but he clarified that a PAD does not have to include any housing. Ms. Caltagirone stated that is correct; it could be all residential, mixed use, or all commercial.

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

d. Action regarding adoption of the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

WHEREAS, the Town of Glastonbury has historically experienced severe damage from natural hazards and it continues to be vulnerable to the effects of those natural hazards profiled in the Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Plan (e.g. flooding, extreme heat, droughts, severe storms such as thunderstorms and winter storms, dam failures, wildfires, and earthquakes) resulting in loss of property and life, economic hardship, and threats to public health and safety; and

WHEREAS, the Glastonbury Town Council approved the previous version of the Plan in 2014 and 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Capitol Region Council of Governments, of whom the Town of Glastonbury is a member, has determined that climate change is affecting the frequency and severity of some hazards and therefore elected to expand the Hazard Mitigation Plan Update to become a Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, committee meetings were held and public input was sought in 2023 regarding the development and review of the Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, the Plan specifically addresses hazard mitigation and climate adaptation strategies and Plan maintenance procedures for the Town of Glastonbury; and

WHEREAS, the Plan recommends several hazard mitigation actions that will provide mitigation for specific natural hazards that impact the Town of Glastonbury, with the effect of protecting people and property from loss associated with those hazards while adapting to the effects of climate change; and

WHEREAS, the Capitol Region Council of Governments has developed and received conditional approval from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for its Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Plan Update under the requirements of 44 CFR 201.6; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this Plan will make the Town of Glastonbury eligible for funding to alleviate the impacts of future hazards; now therefore be it

RESOLVED by the Town Council:

- 1. The Plan is hereby adopted as an official plan of the Town of Glastonbury;*
- 2. The respective officials identified in the mitigation strategy of the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended actions assigned to them;*
- 3. Future revisions and Plan maintenance required by 44 CFR 201.6 and FEMA are hereby adopted as a part of this resolution for a period of five (5) years from the date of this resolution.*
- 4. An annual report on the progress of the implementation elements of the Plan shall be presented to the Town Council.*

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

e. Discussion and possible action regarding the use of \$450,000 American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) – Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund (CSFRF) grant funds.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby elects to utilize a \$450,000 American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund Grant from the State of Connecticut for the purpose of replacing the roof at the Town-owned building at 50 Nye Road, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 19, 2024.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that there are two unanticipated grants coming into the adopted budget of this fiscal year: one is the \$450,000 ARPA grant; the other is a \$500,000 grant from the State for Nye Road, which will be received soon. He explained that the proposal is to couple these two grants to be spent on Nye Road, primarily on roof replacement, which is quoted at \$739,000. With the former property manager, Mr. Luiz put together a list of other improvements that will need to be made. He conservatively estimates this to total about \$200,000. He explained that this \$450,000 would go towards the roof, and in the future, the \$500,000 would be split: part of it would go towards the roof and the rest would cover whatever is left to complete the project.

Mr. McChesney asked if this has to go before the BOF. Ms. Rowley explained that this action is simply to give Mr. Luiz permission to tell OPM that they will spend money on Nye Road and how; once they receive the funding, then the Council will refer the appropriation over to the BOF. Mr. Luiz added that they can wait until September because the design must be conducted before going out to get this spent. Mr. Gullotta stated that after Mr. Luiz returns from OPM, then the Council can undertake that process.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there has been any more discussion regarding the interior of the building, what the repairs are, and what the costs will be for the BOE, absent the numbers provided tonight. Mr. Luiz replied no, they would work with the Superintendent to find out if there are specific requests and to price those out. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the HVAC. Mr. Luiz stated that it has about five years left, according to the company that made it.

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

f. Discussion regarding \$500,000 Age-Friendly Livable Community Action Plan STEAP Grant and possible action to refer appropriations and transfers to the Board of Finance and to set a public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance a request for determination of sufficient monies in the proposed American Rescue Plan Act (Special Revenue) Fund projects and the Capital Projects Fund projects and that the proposed appropriation transfer of funds totaling \$212,012 is consistent with the US Treasury Guidelines; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 6, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider said appropriation/transfers totaling \$212,012 which includes two American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) FUND transfers (\$106,006) and three Capital Project Account Fund Transfers (\$106,006);

all as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated July 19, 2024.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that this was on the radar prior to his arrival to town. The thought is that the Town would spend \$625,000 on this project: \$500,000 from the STEAP grant and \$125,000 from local funds. Originally, the Town thought that they could use ARPA funds as their local match. However, there has been clarity from OPM that they cannot do that. He then listed the project components and noted that they are ready to turn around to the company that was a low bidder. They would like to get started on this right away, to be done before winter.

At the agenda setting meeting, Mr. Cavanaugh explained that they discussed the overflow parking situation at the Riverfront Community Center. To him, it appears that the overflow parking will be used for the pickleball courts. He also noted that the Conservation Commission insisted that the overflow parking not be bituminous concrete. Mr. Luiz explained that the only component that needed to go before the Conservation Commission was the pavilion, given its wetlands. He noted that a section of the gravel parking lot will be paved because people are using it a lot, due to a lack of abundant parking. He clarified that people can park and use the walkway to get to wherever on site; it is not specific to the pickleball courts.

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

g. Action on a \$69,000 appropriation from the Insurance Reserve Fund.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$69,000 from the Insurance Reserve Fund Unassigned Fund Balance to the Insurance Reserve Fund – Employee Related Insurance for payment of the Fiscal Year 2025 Workers Compensation and Property and Casualty Insurance Premiums, as described in a report Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated July 19, 2024.

Discussion: Ms. Rowley explained that HD Segur provided a budget estimate in October for all the lapses in workers' compensation and insurances. In June, that increase was \$152,000 higher than budgeted. She explained that, after achieving some savings in the premium and a credit from Traveler's, they are still about

\$69,000 over the FY25 budgeted amount. This action would pay that difference out of the Insurance Reserve Fund, which was set up in 2011.

Result: Motion passed {7-0-1}, with one abstention from Ms. LaChance, since the insurance is with Travelers and she works there.

h. Action on a \$19,029 transfer from the Parks and Recreation Operating Fund to Capital Projects Account Fund.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$19,029 intradepartmental transfer from the Fiscal Year 23-24 Parks and Recreation Operating Fund – Vehicles and Trucks and Building Improvements to Capital Project Account Fund – Parks and Recreation Heavy Equipment, as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated July 19, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

i. Action on a \$84,846.39 appropriation increase and transfer from the Capital Reserve Fund Balance to Gateway Corporate Park Capital Projects Fund for the LOTCIP funded Gateway Corporate Park Bicycle Pedestrian Improvement Project Grant (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance the proposed increase and transfer of \$84,846.39 from the Capital Reserve Fund Balance to the Capital Projects Fund – LOTCIP funded Gateway Corporate Park Bicycle Pedestrian project and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 6, 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 Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated July 19, 2024.

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

j. Discussion and possible action concerning the MLK mural project proposals for plaque design and lighting.

Mr. Luiz stated that Mr. Cavanaugh is unable to attend the meetings. He understands that Mr. Osgood would join the group, which will discuss the descriptive plaque that would provide information about the mural. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that Mr. Osgood is excused from tonight's meeting, but he has indicated no interest in serving on the committee. Because that would leave Ms. Wang as the sole member on the committee, he requests that whatever language is worked out in the plaque be returned to the full council. Mr. Luiz clarified that he did not nominate Mr. Osgood and was mistaken about his interest. Mr. Cavanaugh clarified that the discussion was held last night.

The Council agreed that this item will return for Council review and approval, so no action would be taken tonight.

k. Discussion of business terms for use of Nye Road as Glastonbury Public School Administrative Offices.

Mr. Luiz has met with Dr. Bookman, Superintendent, and Al Costa, Facilities Director, to discuss moving ahead with the school administrative offices occupying the 50 Nye Road property. He explained that they are doing a head count to figure out who will move in. Mr. Luiz presented the Council with FY23 numbers for improvement items; using the worst case scenario numbers for what renovations would cost in estimated FY27, the total still comes out to \$250,000. He recommends this to get the conversation started.

Mr. Gullotta explained that Mr. Luiz has presented his thoughts on what they would be willing to do for the BOE. One could read his document as saying that the BOE would renovate as much office space as they might want, which Mr. Gullotta takes issue with. In the event that the BOE needs additional square footage, that conversation can be had down the road, not from the get-go. He would like the BOE to get settled in, and then talk about future space at a future CIP. He supports a like-for-like, in so far as the second floor office space goes. Ms. LaChance agrees with the like-for-like approach, even in the renovations. Mr. Niland concurred. He appreciates this list of expenses. Mr. McChesney agreed with the like-for-like.

Ms. Carroll asked, is there a plan to lay out the long-term responsibility for this building? Mr. Luiz envisions this to be a responsibility of the town. Mr. Gullotta stated that they have a document which identifies this. Ms. Carroll clarified that, when they get down to negotiations on this, she wants to ensure that the Council will have final approval on the terms of that lease. Mr. Luiz replied, absolutely.

6. Consent Calendar.

- a. Action to amend Town Code, Chapter 8 – Solid Waste – Central Connecticut Waste Authority (CCSWA) (refer to Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee).**

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers the Capital Region Council of Government's proposed ordinance amendments to Town Code, Chapter 8 – Solid Waste, to the Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee for a report and recommendation, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 19, 2024.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Mr. Gullotta asked if the 'water main work' sign at the intersection of Manchester Road and Hebron Avenue is routine. He wonders whether there has been any progress in what appears to be a languishing piece of property. Mr. Luiz will report back. Mr. Gullotta asked to take a look at Hillside, where there seems to be erosion. Mr. Niland is happy that the \$800,000 grant has been received and will be used for new sidewalks.

8. Committee Reports.

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

- d. **Board of Education Facilities Committee Report. *None.***
- e. **Policy & Ordinance Review Committee – report and recommendation – Ordinance Concerning Authority to Declare That a Firefighter, Police Officer or Emergency Medical Service Personnel Died in the Line of Duty.**

Ms. Carroll explained that, last week, the committee deemed that the most appropriate approach is to have the Town Manager, in conjunction with the police/fire chief or appropriate medical personnel, make the decision regarding declaring that a firefighter, police officer, or emergency medical service personnel died in the line of duty. She noted that while they recommend approving the Town Manager as the person to approve that decision, the means by which that decision will happen needs to be sorted out before October 1, 2024. Mr. Luiz will put together a plan for council approval prior to that deadline.

Mr. Cavanaugh is still of the belief that the department chief should be making this determination. He is concerned that if the Council is to designate the Town Manager to make this determination, then they need to know what the protocol is beforehand, not before October 1. He also noted that he had asked for a letter from fire commission members to be included in their council packet, but it is missing. Mr. Luiz stated that was an oversight; he will share the letter with all council members.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 6, 2024, in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a proposed new ordinance entitled “Ordinance Concerning Authority To Declare That A Firefighter, Police Officer Or Emergency Medical Service Personnel Died In The Line Of Duty.

Discussion: Mr. Cavanaugh would like to see the protocol prior to making the designation change. Additionally, his reading of the legislation is that the protocol places the department chiefs first, then the town administrators. He will vote against going to a public hearing. Mr. Luiz clarified that he will present his plan at the next meeting; he does not need until October. Mr. Niland supports this going out to public hearing now because the sooner they start this process, the sooner they will get the language right before October 1. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if a draft proposal can be ready for the Council’s August 6 meeting. Mr. Luiz replied, yes. In that case, Mr. Cavanaugh will support the motion, with the proposed amendment.

Amendment by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

The Town Manager will have a draft proposal for a protocol for line of duty death for the meeting of August 6, 2024, accompanying the public hearing.

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

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

9. Communications.

- a. **Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 374 Three Mile Road.**

10. Minutes.

- a. **Minutes of July 9, 2024 Regular Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the July 9, 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. **Added to the agenda:** Discussion regarding pending litigation – Vessel RE Holdings, LLC vs. Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 10:14 p.m. for the purpose of:

- a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.
- b. Discussion regarding pending litigation – Vessel RE Holdings, LLC vs. Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission.

Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager.

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 10:25 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 July 23, 2024 at 10:26 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta
Chairman