



**TOWN OF LEDYARD**  
 CONNECTICUT  
 TOWN COUNCIL  
 HYBRID FORMAT

741 Colonel Ledyard Highway  
 Ledyard, CT 06339  
<http://www.ledyardct.org>  
 Roxanne M. Maher  
 860 464-3203

Chairman Kevin J. Dombrowski

**MINUTES**  
**ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

5:30 PM

Town Hall Annex Building

- I. CALL TO ORDER – The Meeting was called to order by Councilor Ingalls at 5:33 p.m. at the Town Hall Annex Building Meeting Room.

Councilor Ingalls welcomed all to the Hybrid Meeting. She stated for the Town Council Administration Committee and members of the Public who were participating via video conference that remote meeting information was available on the Agenda that was posted on the Town’s Website - ICompass Meeting Portal.

- II. ROLL CALL-

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Location	Arrived	Departed
Andra Ingalls	Committee Chairman	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm
Whit Irwin	Town Councilor	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm
Mary McGrattan	Town Councilor	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm
Bill Saums	Town Councilor	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm
S. Naomi Rodriguez	Town Councilor	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm
Sheri Fernandez	Resident	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	5:43 pm
Gay Son	Resident	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	5:43 pm
Earl Lamb	Resident	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm
Roxanne Maher	Administrative Assistant	Present	In-Person	5:33 pm	6:00 pm

- III. CITIZENS' COMMENTS

Councilor Ingalls noted before she opened the floor for Citizens Comments she wanted to remind people to keep their comments to three-minutes and to keep their comments civil.

Ms. Shari Fernandez, 60 Kings Highway, Unit #3; Gales Ferry, Kings Corner Manor, stated last month she received a notice about a Special Administration Committee Meeting. She stated on the Agenda was listed “*Discussion regarding Kings Corner Manor Tenant Letters Concerning the Housing Authority*”. She stated seeing how she had filed a written complaint against a Board Member she attended the May 25, 2022 meeting. She was then blindsided when there was no discussion, but rather was informed by Councilor Ingalls that she had spoken to Housing Authority Chairman Charlie Duzy,

the person whom she had filed a complaint about; Housing Authority Director Colleen Lauer of the facility at which she lived and where the incident occurred, and Councilor McGrattan, Housing Authority Liaison. She stated Councilor Ingalls stated after speaking with these individuals that she found no evidence of verbal abuse, or reason to dismiss Mr. Duzy from his position on the Housing Authority. She stated at no time did anyone speak to her about the incident; or to any of the other residents who were present when the incident occurred. She stated even in a court of law both parties were allowed to present their evidence and witnesses. She stated she was not given this opportunity, and therefore, she found that the Councilor Ingalls' investigation was prejudicial and was sorely lacking in evidence. She stated that she ventured to guess that no one bothered to view the video from the Town Council's May 2021, when she first brought this matter to the attention of the Town Council. She stated if they had viewed meeting video they would have heard her clearly state that Charlie Duzy was yelling loudly, told her to shut up, told her she had no rights, told her that if she did not like it she could leave. She stated this behavior continued at the next two consecutive Housing Authority meetings. She stated that still they found no evidence of verbal abuse. She stated that Councilor Ingalls did admit that the three individuals she spoke to all stated that Mr. Duzy had raise his voice. She stated raising one's voice was considered unprofessional, and it also falls under the heading of misconduct. She stated by Councilor Ingalls' own admission that she believed that Mr. Duzy was guilty of misconduct. She stated that there were two sides of every story; and the truth can never be gleaned by listening to only one side. She stated there was no search for the truth in this matter and she was appalled by the lack of regard and respect that she was shown by this Committee. She concluded by stating that she wanted to leave them with the following question: *"Why is it that whenever people enter into the political or governing arena they seem to lose all sense of values, morals, principals"*.

Councilor Ingalls stated Ms. Fernandez three-minutes was up; and she asked her to stop because she moved into accusing character.

Councilor Ingalls stated they normally do not address Citizens Comments; however, she was going to address the following:

- Agenda Discussion Items – Councilor Ingalls stated when a discussion item was listed on the Agenda, that it did not mean that it was a public discussion, with back and forth between residents and members of the Committee. She explained that the discussion was among the appointed members of the Committee. Therefore, she stated the discussion was among Administration Committee Members: Councilor McGrattan, Councilor Irwin and herself. She stated the courtesy was often extend to other elected Councilors. She stated to clear up any confusion about what it meant that there was a *"Discussion"* that it did not mean there would be a back and forth.
- Discussions with Housing Authority Chairman Charlie Duzy, Housing Authority Director Colleen, and Councilor McGrattan – Councilor Ingalls stated she stood by the conversations she had with these individuals. She stated Councilor McGrattan was

in attendance at all the meetings that Ms. Fernandez referenced. She stated that she trusted Councilor McGrattan’s judgment; and that she saw no reason to dismiss Mr. Charlie Duzy. She went on to state if raising one’s voice was grounds for dismissal that for goodness sakes, there would be nobody serving anywhere, ever. Ms. Fernandez stated that she did not say it was grounds for dismissal, she stated it was misconduct. Councilor Ingalls questioned whether Ms. Fernandez was looking for Mr. Duzy to be dismissed from the Housing Authority. Ms. Fernandez stated she was not looking for Mr. Duzy to be dismissed. Councilor Ingalls questioned if the purpose of Ms. Fernandez complaint was not to dismiss Mr. Duzy, then what would she like the Administration Committee to do. Ms. Fernandez stated the purpose was to get people to hear her side of the story, nobody bothered to talk to her or to any of the tenants that heard what happened. Councilor Ingalls stated Mr. Fernandez’s comments were on the record, noting that “*She found the incident prejudicial, she did not want Mr. Duzy removed*”. Therefore, she stated there was no further point to this conversation.

**RESULT: COMPLETED**

IV. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – None.

V. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

MOTION to approve the Special Meeting Minutes of My 25, 2022

Moved by Councilor Irwin, seconded by Councilor McGrattan

VOTE: 3 – 0 Approved and so declared

VI. OLD BUSINESS

1. Public Act 21-01- Legalization of Cannabis/Marijuana -Retail Stores and Micro-Cultivator.

Councilor Ingalls stated at the Administration Committee’s May 25, 2022 Meeting the Committee approved to forward the following to the Town Council.

MOTION to recommend the Town Council submit the following question to the townspeople to be included on the ballot of the November 8, 2022 Election:

***“Shall the sale of recreational marijuana be allowed in the Town of Ledyard?”***

Councilor Ingalls went on to state the topic of tonight’s discussion was to review the draft Information Sheet titled “*Facts to Know Regarding the Retail Sale of Adult Use of Cannabis (Senate Bill #1201)*” . She explained in preparation for the November 8, 2022

Election the Land Use/Planning/Public Works Committee suggested the town provide information to the residents. She stated the *Fact Sheet* noted below was a good summary of Public Act #21-01. She went on to state that the *Fact Sheet* provided a link to Public Act #21-01 for those who were interested in reading the 300-page document. She suggested the *Fact Sheet* also include links to the following articles noting that there were also very informative:

***Town and County Article – May 2022 Edition*** – The featured two opinions one for and one against.

***Ledge Light Health District -PowerPoint***

The Administration Committee reviewed the Information Sheet titled “*Facts to Know Regarding the Retail Sale of Adult Use of Cannabis (Senate Bill #1201)*” and agreed with Councilor Ingalls’ to add the two links. They also discussed publishing the *Fact Sheet* in the August 2022 Events Magazine, noting that it would be the last publication before the November 8, 2022 Election. The Committee also discussed putting the *Fact Sheet* and the links on the town’s website and contacting *The Day* to see if they would publish an article regarding the Public Act 21-01. Councilor Saums suggested the Events Magazine include the *Cannabis Fact Sheet* in all of their Municipalities August, 2022 publication, noting that the information provided was not town specific.

The Committee continued by discussing the timing for the Town Council to act on the “*Ballot Question*” to be included with the November 8, 2022 Election. It was noted that in accordance with CGS 9-370 that the Town Council must vote on the question to submit to the Town Clerk no later than 60 days prior to the election; and that the Town Clerk was required to file the question as it is to appear on the voting machine ballot labels at the election to the Office of the Secretary of the State at least 45 days prior to election.

Councilor McGrattan questioned the process if the townspeople do not approve the “*Ballot Question*”; and if they approve the question. She suggested they contact the Town Attorney to be sure the town was following the correct process.

The following processes would be required.

- Approve the Question – The Planning & Zoning Commission would be required to draft Zoning Regulation to designate the areas of town where the retail cannabis stores could be located; etc.
- Do not approve the Question – The Town Council would draft an Ordinance prohibiting retail cannabis stores in town. In addition, the Planning & Zoning Commission would also need to draft Zoning Regulations to do the same.

DRAFT: 3/30/2022 6/8/2022

On the November 8, 2022 Mid-Term Election the following question will be presented to Ledyard Voters:

***“Shall the sale of recreational marijuana be allowed in the Town of Ledyard?”***

**Facts to Know Regarding the Retail Sale of Adult Use of Cannabis**

(Senate Bill #1201)

On June 22, 2021 Governor Lamott signed Senate Bill #1201 *“An Act Concerning Responsible and Equitable Regulation of Adult-Use Cannabis”*. The Law is slated to become effective in stages.

Local referendum (Sections 83-84):

Effective July 1, 2021, if at least 10% of a municipalities electors petition for a vote to allow certain marijuana sales it must be done at least 60 days before a regular election. If met, the municipality must hold a referendum to determine whether to allow: (1) the recreational sale of marijuana in the municipality; or (2) the sale of marijuana in one or more of the cannabis establishment license types. The law specified specific language to be used in the referendum question.

**Retail Sales:**

Retail sales of cannabis is scheduled to begin in Connecticut by the end of 2022. The sale, manufacture, and cultivation of cannabis (aside from home grown) requires a license from the state. Products that contain delta-8-THC, delta-9-THC, or delta-10-THC are considered cannabis and may only be sold by licensed retailers. Individuals who are not licensed by the state may gift cannabis to others but may not sell it. Individuals may not gift cannabis to another individual who has "paid" or "donated" for another product.

For the first 30 days after cannabis retailers or hybrid retailers open, the law allows municipalities, to charge the retailer up-to \$50,000 for any necessary and reasonable municipal costs for public safety services related to the opening (such as for directing traffic).

**Municipalities and Zoning:**

Local officials will play an important role in the implementation of cannabis legalization. For example, local officials can control the number and locations of cannabis retailers through zoning. Municipalities can also determine where smoked or vaped cannabis can be consumed (e.g. in city parks or beaches, or on sidewalks or streets).

Until June 30, 2024, the bill prohibits municipalities from granting zoning approval for more retailers or micro-cultivators than a number that would allow for one retailer and one micro-cultivator for every 25,000 municipal residents as determined by the most recent decennial census.

**Municipal Cannabis Tax (Sections 126—127):**

The law imposes a 3% municipal sales tax (in addition to the state cannabis tax established at 6.35%) on the gross receipts from the sale of cannabis by a cannabis or hybrid retailer or micro-cultivator.

Under the law, "gross receipts" means the total amount received from cannabis sales by the retailer or micro-cultivator. The tax must be collected from consumers at the time of sale and be held in trust until remitted to the municipality. The law exempts from the municipal sales tax: ( a) cannabis for palliative use;( b) sales of cannabis by a delivery service to a consumer; and (c) the transfer of cannabis to a transporter for transport to any cultivator, micro-cultivator, food and beverage manufacturer, product manufacturer, product packager, dispensary regulating the delivery of cannabis of any form. In addition, the law prohibits municipalities from negotiating or entering into local host agreements.

Tax structure:

- (1) Includes a 3% municipal sales tax, which will be directed to the town or city where the retail sale occurred;
- (2) Includes a 6.35% state sales tax that will be based on the THC content of the product, which will be 2.75 cents per milligram of THC for cannabis edibles; 0.625 cents per milligram of THC for cannabis flower; and 0.9 cents per milligram of THC for all other product types. This means that Connecticut generally will have about a 4% lower tax rate than New York and about the same as Massachusetts.

Under the law, the sales tax remitted will become part of the municipality's general revenue and must be used for the following purposes:

- (a) Streetscape improvements and other neighborhood developments in communities where cannabis or hybrid retailers or micro-cultivators are located;
- (b) Education programs for youth, employment, and training programs in the municipality;
- (c) Services for individuals living in the municipality who were released from DOC custody, probation, or parole;
- (d) Mental health or addiction services; e) youth service bureaus and municipal juvenile.

The 6.35% State Sales Tax may be used to:

- (a) Support economic opportunities in targeted communities: Portions of the revenue obtained from retail sales of cannabis will be directed to communities that have been most negatively impacted by the war on drugs through the creation of the Social Equity and Innovation Fund. Funding from this account will be appropriated for use by the Social Equity Council to provide business capital, technical assistance for business start-ups and operations, workforce education, and community investments. These investments will not be limited to the cannabis market.
- (b) Support substance misuse prevention and recovery services: Portions of the revenue obtained from retail sales of cannabis will be directed to support substance misuse prevention, treatment, and recovery services through the creation of the Prevention and Recovery Services Fund. Connecticut's health agencies, including the Department of Public Health, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Department of Children and Families will launch new programs and initiatives regarding prevention, treatment, and recovery in regard to cannabis.
- (c) Prevent underage use: The law adapts the state's strong framework regarding preventing access to alcohol by minors in the context of cannabis. For example, it will be a Class A misdemeanor to sell or provide cannabis to a person under 21 years old. In addition, an individual allowing someone under 21 years old to loiter at a cannabis store will receive a \$1,000 fine on the first offense with subsequent offenses as a Class B misdemeanor. It will be a Class D misdemeanor for a person under the age of 21 to lie about their age or use a fake ID in an attempt to buy cannabis. Delivery services will be required to use online ID and age verification.

**State parks and beaches:** Cannabis use is prohibited in state parks, state beaches, and on state waters.

**Smoking Prohibited:** The legislation has extended the same restrictions of smoking cigarettes to smoking cannabis as provided in CGS 19-341.

This Facts Sheet, along with Public Act 21-01 <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2021/BA/PDF/2021SB-01201-R02SS1-BA.PDF>, and other Articles regarding this subject are available on the town's website or by scanning the QR Code below.

- *Town and County Article – May 2022 Edition*
- *Ledge Light Health District*



MOTION to forward to the Town Council for consideration and approval the “*Facts to Know Regarding the Retail Sale of Adult Use of Cannabis* (Senate Bill #1201)” as presented in the draft dated June 8, 2022 in the August, 2022 to be included Events Magazine Publication in preparation for the November 8, 2022 “*Ballot Question*”.

Moved by Councilor Ingalls, seconded by Councilor McGrattan

Discussion: (See above)

VOTE: 3 – 0 Approved and so declared

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>3- 0 APPROVED TO RECOMMEND</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Andra Ingalls, Committee Chairman
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Mary McGrattan, Committee Member
<b>AYES:</b>	Andra Ingalls, Whit Irwin, Mary McGrattan

VII. ADJOURNMENT

VOTE: Councilor Ingalls moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Councilor Irwin  
3 - 0 Approved and so declared, the meeting was adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andra Ingalls  
Committee