

AVON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY

May 11, 2017

Selectmen's Chambers, 7:00 p.m.

Town of Avon

PUBLIC HEARING

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Avon Water Pollution Control Authority was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Mr. Johansen.

AWPCA

Present: Eric Johansen, Chairman
Terry Ryan, Vice Chairman
Tom Armstrong
Chris Roy
Lawrence Baril, Town Engineer
Tim Foster, Superintendent of Sanitary Sewers

Absent: Keith Jones, Member

II. MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING – April 13, 2017

MOTION: Mr. Armstrong made a motion for approval of the April 13, 2017 minutes. The motion, seconded by Mr. Ryan, received unanimous approval.

III. COMMUNICATION FROM THE AUDIENCE – Mr. Johansen inquired whether there is anyone in the audience who would like to speak besides what is on the agenda. An audience member noted that most people in the audience are present for agenda item number eight (2016 – 8).

IV. NEW BUSINESS – 2017 – 4 Public Hearing regarding proposed increase for sewer use fee – Mr. Johansen noted a study on town rates will be conducted. The current rate is \$350. The Town's budget increase is approximately 4%, which is \$14. Based on cost of living increases and the subject will be revisited again. Mr. Johansen proposes an increase to \$365 per year. Mr. Johansen noted there is no public comment due to lack of audience members.

MOTION: Mr. Johansen made a motion to increase the annual rate for the EDU from \$350 to \$365. The motion, seconded by Mr. Roy, received unanimous approval.

Mr. Armstrong provided sewer rates for area towns in the Farmington Valley and reviewed the sewer fund and budget spreadsheet and noted there are a number of items on the AWPCA agenda that need to get paid by the AWPCA.

V. OLD BUSINESS -

2016 – 6 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for portions of Winding Lane and Stony Corners South

Mr. Baril provided an update noting the contract has been received from the contractor and there is a tentative pre-construction meeting scheduled. There are easement documents ready for signature. The pre-construction will not happen until the easement agreements are in place.

2015 – 8 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for School Street - Mr. Baril has reached out to three different consultants. He has prices from two of the consultants to do value engineering, review the Town's design and develop a template spec package to go out to bid. The numbers are low - \$6,000 to \$8,000. The goal is to get it out to bid in early June.

2016 – 4 Potential Sewer Connection Charge Increase – Mr. Baril recommended to table the agenda item and will address some items under Staff Comments under the cost of service analysis which will have a direct impact on this agenda item.

2016 – 8 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for Paperchase Trail South –

Mr. Johansen requested that Mr. Roy recuse himself as he is a resident of Paperchase Trail. Mr. Johansen noted the cost received for the project is a rate that generated a lot feedback from people who thought the price was too high. He inquired if there was anyone in the audience who was in support of the project. Mr. Johansen reviewed the history of the project, approximately a year and a half ago, noting people came forward who wanted sewers in their area as they had concerns. Mr. Andy Case of 64 Paperchase Trail noted it began because someone wanted an inquiry about the feasibility about sewers – not because they wanted sewers and then it escalated. Mr. Johansen continued to note the process was continued such as a feasibility study, testing, layout and design and then out to bid. The first bid came back with numbers higher than the Town is used to. The project was split into two projects anticipating a lower cost due to prevailing wages. The bids came back and the numbers weren't any better. An audience member inquired about what the numbers were. Mr. Baril replied noting the first bid came in approximately \$900,000 for the entire project, divided by 42, approximately \$20,000 per house. Mr. Johansen noted the numbers were higher than past projects based on various factors such as timing and technical requirements - hitting ledge. Mr. Baril noted another variable is the zone difference. This project is an R40 zone which has larger lots, larger frontages per house. The other two projects (people have referred to erroneously) which were an R15 and R30 zone, much smaller lots, tighter compact houses. The frontage per linear foot mainline is different. Mr. Baril is comparing these projects to the Deepwood Drive and Verville Road sewer projects. He provided further clarification regarding zone differences. Mr. Baril noted projects are put forward to try and help residents - the Town is not trying to force a project onto residents nor does the Town have an interest in creating any bad will. Comparing projects that are not alike is not logical. An audience member acknowledged Mr. Baril's comment but asked for the numbers for these projects which Mr. Baril provided. Mr. Baril clarified a question regarding the number of homes included in the project which includes homes on Hurdle Fence. There is a total of 44 lots that are involved.

Mr. Johansen noted the Board is moving towards a decision which he believes the majority will be in favor of. Mr. Johansen directed his next comments for those people who are in favor of the project. He noted the Board is not required to take a vote on these projects. The Board has the authority to go forward with a project once it's decided. The Paperchase project included meetings which included comments from people who were in favor of the project. The Town Council approved the project but then the Engineering Department received emails and phone calls with opposition of the project. Mr. Johansen said the Board took the unprecedented idea of conducting a survey based on a feeling the Board may not have had a good idea of what was going on. Mr. Johansen acknowledged some residents may not have voiced their opinion at the meetings due to concern with potential neighbor conflicts. Many people responded to the survey who were against the project and a group of people who were for the project with conditions (did not want to pay \$22,000 for the assessment). The project

was put forward even with the assessment as it was a benefit for everyone in the neighborhood. Mr. Johansen provided a personal narrative of his experience with a failed septic system and the challenges he faced. He was able to tie into the Town's sewer system. Mr. Johansen mentioned the AWPCA's charge is not to put sewers in the entire town but to make it available in case a resident is in an emergency situation when their septic system fails, there's a really good option that has already been in place. The Board has looked into this and will be making a motion to cancel the project. Mr. Johansen invited those residents who are in favor of the project to speak up.

Mr. Richard Getz of 18 Paperchase Trail provided background on his septic system and feedback on his research regarding the life term for one's septic system. He noted the worst case scenario if his system fails – he does not have a choice but to replace his system and then sometime down the road the Town comes forward and puts sewers in. Mr. Getz mentioned his opinion is that there will be a time when septic systems won't be allowed and he would like sewers to go in – it's not going to get any less expensive. He noted he felt umbrage of anonymous notes left in his mailbox with erroneous information. Mr. Getz mentioned he was sad to hear the project will be cancelled because he feels perhaps some people were relying on poor information. There were people who mentioned in earlier meetings who said they've already changed their septic over because they had no choice – they were in favor of the sewers. There is a value proposition relative to your house – it's a personal decision. Mr. Getz wishes to have the right information and not misleading about the decision to be made and mentioned he has been to every meeting. He mentioned his questions to Mr. Baril were answered promptly. Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Gordon Stead's (55 Hurdle Fence Drive) question that he has responded to every email he has received and sent those emails that were informational or opinion-poll were sent to the AWPCA.

An audience member expressed concern about how the open-endedness of the assessment is bothersome to a lot of people and inquired if the Board considered placing a cap. Mr. Johansen noted the money in the sewer fund is the sewer users. The Town of Avon does not have a treatment plant. The Town pays fees to Farmington, Canton and Simsbury and the Town of Farmington is undergoing a major renovation. There isn't money in the fund to cover overages – it has to cover itself. The audience member acknowledged there are a variables and knew numbers can fluctuate but asked if there was a bid for Hurdle Fence. Mr. Baril responded there is a bid for the South project which includes about 19 homes. Mr. Johansen responded to the question raised about potential unknown increases to a bid price and an unknown variable as hitting ledge can increase a bid price. Mr. Ryan responded to a question noting contractors are privately run businesses and can do what they want to do. The Town receives several bids and knows bad apples from good apples. Mr. Armstrong noted there is a state statute that prevents the Town from charging a benefit assessment until after the project is completed. By law, the Town cannot exceed the cost of the project. If the Town went out to bid for a fixed price, the numbers would be higher.

Keith Yoreo of 76 Paperchase noted there's a disconnect and the problem is the Town does not have a big enough denominator. There is a million dollar numerator but dividing it by 44. Has the Town ever looked at using EDUs - the number of users on the system – 6,000 and dividing \$1 mm by 6,000 is \$166. Mr. Johansen noted that every town has different ways for calculating figures and the AWPCA plans to conduct a study regarding sewer rates fees. Mr. Yoreo's suggestion is the annual fee should be \$500, \$600, \$700, \$800 a year so the people who are using it when they get brought on, they are not absorbing the huge cost up front. Mr. Johansen responded noting there have been opposition to raising fees in the past, similar to the

taxes and it's important to have a budget and stick with that – to artificially inflate that amount of money for future projects isn't something the Board feels comfortable doing.

Ms. Karen Metersky of 10 Paperchase Trail noted she is in favor of having the sewers and noted Mr. Getz's comment that the septic systems will fail sooner or later and likes the option of connecting. Ms. Metersky takes offense regarding the information left in her mailbox without a name on it which prevented her from responding to those people who were making those comments. Mr. Baril responded to Ms. Metersky's comment about stopping the project and noted that the Town (before Mr. Baril's time) has stopped a project from moving forward. Ms. Metersky commented people need the correct information in order to make intelligent decisions. Mr. Johansen noted the agenda item has been discussed for months, if not a year and the Board felt strongly going forward with the project. Ms. Metersky recalled hearing at a meeting that the Board's job was pollution control and that all neighborhoods at some point in time will be switched over to sewers. Mr. Case agreed and noted was originally for the project but now he mentioned he does not have enough information. Mr. Case commented his concern is partially the cost but also the unknown variables that will determine the cost. Mr. Johansen reviewed the bidding history in an attempt to get the best price. Mr. Johansen also reviewed how the Board plans future sewer projects along with the Town's pavement management program. If the Town's pavement management program continues as plan (repaving in the next couple years) the potential to have sewers in at that point, residents will be responsible for the road overall cost, which will increase the project cost even more.

Mr. Michael Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence noted he is an Engineer and wants to know what is going on. He is upset about the process. Mr. Baril noted that all AWPCA meetings are open to the public and there have been three public meetings specific to the Paperchase / Hurdle Fence project. Mr. Gilmore mentioned he requested a number of how many people are for it and against it. Mr. Baril responded there was never a vote. Mr. Gilmore noted his homes' septic systems are working fine and made suggestions on how to have a septic tank last a long time. He commented about the cost difference between Avon and the other town he lives in where he pays less. Mr. Gilmore inquired what will happen if the Town states there's a mandate to hook up. Mr. Gilmore is aware of a project in another town where it cost the residents \$250 a piece to hook up. Mr. Gilmore commented that if this is a Town-wide project, it should be handled the same way as if were a state wide project – it goes in and it gets people on that tax base will get charged for it. Mr. Armstrong noted that it's not in the Board's control to say the Town will pay for residents' sewer extensions and noted he is trying understand where the people stand on the Paperchase / Hurdle Fence project and acknowledged Mr. Gilmore may have concerns regarding State of Connecticut policies which can't be addressed. Discussion continued regarding who owns the pipes in Town noting the AWPCA owns the pipes and how the sewer fund is funded.

An audience member noted he is strongly opposed to the project considering the cost from removing one's septic system to the cost of connection and also noted the \$3,000 to \$6,000 mentioned earlier may be erroneous and low given the acreage we do have. Adding up all the costs in addition to the \$23,000 residents will have to pay to put the pipe in the street it gets up there - \$30,000. If you look at your alternative costs should your system fail, you are replacing your septic system at the same cost. When adding up the numbers, it doesn't make sense to move forward at this price. The audience member noted he is frustrated by the process and noted earlier comments that the Board is not incentivized by the project and when the audience member hears that this is self-funded and the money goes in to pay the salaries and for certain expenses, there's a conflict of interest. Mr. Johansen clarified that the \$900,000 residents

would pay goes directly to the contractor to pay for the bills to put the system in the ground. The user fund is used for salaries.

Mr. John Wilbur of 73 Paperchase inquired whether the 10 year payback period could be extended. Mr. Armstrong noted it's in the regulations as 10 years.

An audience member commented the salability of one's home will be affected whether you are connected to the sewer rather than having an old septic system. He continued to mention he is for the project if the numbers were more fixed or close to being fixed and he appreciated the Board's attention.

Ms. Deborah Northrop of 30 Paperchase Trail mentioned she is a realtor and noted a house in New Hartford where the septic failed two months ago costs \$75,000 to replace. She had two homes in Avon in the last 6 months with failing septic systems. She approached Mr. Baril and he mentioned the area is on the list but wouldn't be serviced for approximately ten years. The costs were \$64,000 and \$56,000 to fix. She agreed that prices are high.

Mr. Johansen reviewed earlier comments noting the AWPCA does not have an agenda whether the sewers go in or not, it's frustrating for the Board when flyers go into mailboxes, the Board is not trying to exaggerate the cost. The Board is taking real information and letting residents make the comparison and have received an overwhelming amount of people come out who are strongly opposed to the project.

Mr. Bob Bernaducci of 41 Paperchase Trail noted he is for the project but has a couple questions since the numbers are fairly unreasonable for most people. How many homes are included in the project? There is a small sample here – 44 homes. This is the largest cost for any system ever put in this town, correct? Mr. Johansen responded yes. Mr. Bernaducci asked if the Board typically uses a 44 or less sample. It would have certainly been smarter for us to share it with a lot more homes. Mr. Johansen mentioned there is a plan in place for the gravity system and where the system is now and where it has to run. It does not lend itself for the Board to put a project together and put 120 homes in it. Another limitation is the limited amount of money to pay the contractor. If there were a multi-million dollar project, the Board would have to go out for bonding as there is not enough money. Mr. Bernaducci asked if there is an average size for such sewer projects. Mr. Baril responded noting the Verville project had approximately 30 homes, the Deepwood Drive project had approximately 41/42 homes. The Haynes Road project done by a developer but was on target for a town project was 78 homes. One of the circumstances with your neighborhood is that proposed sewer was not going to provide service to other parts of town – you're somewhat on an island. You have access to Cambridge Crossing. The Winding Lane / Stony Corners area is going to provide access to other parts of the Stony Corners neighborhood. Mr. Bernaducci noted he inquired earlier about having a cap and requested affirmation from the Board they are not providing. Mr. Johansen replied people who responded in the survey were looking for a large amount of money, which would have placed a heavy burden from the sewer fund.

Ms. Barbara Wolfangel of 70 Paperchase Trail wanted to comment on an earlier comment regarding one's house is worth more if you have sewer. That's not correct. What if someone said you don't have public street lighting? You don't have water – what if my well runs out? You can't put this project through and say my house will be worth more—you never know that. Also, people should know when you have a septic system, you clean it out and you don't throw anything down that septic system.

Ms. Anita Marcotte of 15 Hurdle Fence Drive wanted to make a comment about the paving based on information from the first meeting. It would be paved if it were in the budget if sewers were going to go in. For confirmation, she emailed Mr. Baril who replied her comment is correct. She noted her son's home is in Avon (purchased two years ago) and the house needs a new septic system and the cost is \$20,000. Ms. Marcotte is concerned about hooking up and inquired about the cost.

An audience member inquired what average depth is when a sewer goes in noting the depth is a big part of this cost. Mr. Johansen noted it depends and does not receive feedback from the contractor – just a price. A bid package is out and a number is returned. Mr. Baril noted it's a quantity based bid.

Heidi Larkun of 100 Paperchase Trail has lived in her home for 2 1/2 years and noted two of her neighbors had to have their septic system replaced. Ms. Larkun has their system pumped every year and noted the cost, about \$325, is the same as paying for sewers. Ms. Larkun noted she is for the project.

Mr. Robert Wolfangel of 70 Paperchase Trail noted he has attended every meeting he received notice for. He noted from the beginning there were doubts. There were pros and cons, there were guesses. However, we have gone around and around, the same thing happening each time. I sent an email to Mr. Baril for the results of the survey. The people do not have a vote – it's up to staff. I do believe it's in the best interest for the people who are here. There is miscommunication, misinformation. You can think through some of these things yourself. We have been in the house for 35 years. We clean our system every two years. We do what we can. I feel you are trying to get an answer from those who do want it. They are definitely in the minority. I have spoken to both streets. The over majority are not for this project. Our house was only built in 1978/77. We go around and around – it's obvious the feeling is they are not really for it. Why do we keep laboring?

An audience member said she is not quite sure that everyone is against it. Mr. Wolfangel mentioned it's not up to a vote. Mr. Johansen noted that after the first public meeting, the Board tried to get a feel on how people feel. Mr. Johansen mentioned his intention was to ask for those audience members who were in favor of the project to have the opportunity to speak. Mr. Gilmore mentioned he had a lot of questions and inquired when there will be an opportunity for those residents who are against the project. Mr. Armstrong offered the results of the survey from what he has seen from the prior week. Mr. Armstrong inquired for those people who sent in a negative letter after the vote was taken and wanted to change their mind. Mr. Armstrong counted 8 people who raised their hand. If you sent in a negative survey (you said no to the project or you wanted the project with a cap lower than \$20,000) and you want to change your mind to yes. Mr. Armstrong inquired for the addresses – 73 Paperchase, 3 Hurdle Fence Drive. Ms. Brown from 3 Hurdle Fence noted that there was a vote at one of the meetings, and most everyone in attendance were for the project. But the escalation of the cost from \$22,000 to maybe \$25,000 plus the \$2,500 hook up fee that may be further in the future cost you more if you don't hook up right away. It could end up costing a lot more than initially the first meetings laid out. I liked the survey and the part of the \$20,000 being a cap. As a resident of 3 Hurdle Fence, that's where I'm at. Mr. Armstrong clarified Ms. Brown's comments, mentioned the Board cannot guarantee a \$20,000 cap and noted a cap is a policy decision that needs to be resolved Town-wide – not just for this project. Mary McDonald of 58 Hurdle Fence says she has the same concern regarding the fees that seem to be escalating every time you turn around. I was in favor at \$20,000 with the cap but I'm really concerned with the numbers that keep going up. I would love to have the project go forward. Mr. Armstrong

summarized the results noting somewhere in the neighborhood of 8 or 9 in favor, several with a \$20,000, with only 6 in favor of it directly and about 21, maybe 20 against.

An audience member from 72 Hurdle Fence Drive noted he is a new neighbor and is an attorney. He noted he looked at the statutes and inquired about the special benefit and what happens if we are assessed and we go through the appeal process and the special benefit that actually accrues to our property is less than \$20,000 or \$40,000 or whatever it is going to be. Who gets stuck with the overage because the assessment comes in at the end of the project? Mr. Armstrong replied noting it will eat into the reserves after the cost of litigation is paid by both sides but the Board does not want that.

Mr. Foster noted he recognizes where the audience members are coming from as he receives calls every day from people asking if sewers are available in a certain area, the proposed date of sewers coming in as there are people who are trying to sell their house. Mr. Foster reviewed the needs matrix noting there are old systems in the Paperchase / Hurdle Fence neighborhood. He encouraged the residents to weigh it out. The goal is to abate any pollution problems that could take place in that area in the future. Mr. Foster offered a scenario if one's toilet overflows and your system is failing, that's money that will be spent right away. Also, if the Board denies the project, he's not sure if they will be back. He concluded that a decision needs to be made.

Mr. Baril clarified an earlier comment noting that environmental law and restrictions are becoming more and more restrictive. A septic system design 50 years ago is nothing like a septic system design today – meaning in the past was a lot more flexibility and more leeway, no one really did the definition of how many bedrooms, bathrooms were to be served and then identify the size of the septic tank and the more important thing is your leaching system. Septic system designs today are not all engineered systems but in this neighborhood, I would say with high confidence that most of yours will require an engineered system –you don't have percolation rates of 1 to 3 inches a minute. You have very slow percolation rates. When you pour water into the ground, it doesn't just disappear. Restrictions are getting greater and greater. The interest in installing collection system has also increased with time. When I suggested I expect to see the Town of Avon will be 100% sewered (or some portion of thereof) I'm not saying by 2020 or 2050, it may not happen for another 200 years. Sewer extensions don't get abandoned. They continue to happen for a good reason. The Town and AWPCA don't get a true benefit from extending sewers into your neighborhood. It doesn't matter to me personally if you get sewers in your neighborhood – we think it's a good idea for a variety of reasons but we're not paying the bill. Mr. Ryan reviewed the master plan matrix and mentioned there are 30 streets (neighborhood areas) on the list. If we average a street every three or four years and your street is kicked to the bottom, no one in the room will be around by the time it ever comes back. Mr. Armstrong noted his perspective is that it's a static list and may change if it is updated. He mentioned if you are looking for sewers – do so before the road is re-paved.

An audience member noted he works for the Department of Environment Protection and is in the business of regulating on-site systems – all the large scale ones. In Connecticut, I have to sign off on them before they are built. The statement that the WPCA would never come back to our neighborhood is not correct. In the event there is some kind of acute failures in that neighborhood, the State of Connecticut would order the Town of Avon with a community pollution finding or require that the Town abate that pollution problem and the solution would be a sewer extension. We do it all the time. There would probably be clean water fund money to study the problem. There would probably be a combination of grant and loan available to

fund that project. To say this is your last bite of the apple under any circumstance, the WPCA will not be present in your neighborhood again – that's just false. Mr. Johansen replied he understood what the audience member is saying but that's a catastrophic failure in your neighborhood and that's not what we are working with here. Mr. Foster replied that his comments were based on a list they are working from based on norms -it's not going to be still at the top. Mr. Foster mentioned the Town does not have direct access to that neighborhood. Mr. Armstrong commented that the health department is in charge of looking into septic systems. DEEP gets involved when it's large systems. No one is saying you go to the end of the list. There are several other streets that will go before you. There is not a groundswell of support for this system here. There are a good handful of people that do want the system to go forward and I'm volunteering Tim and Larry – if you have problems, the staff will work with you and the health department to see if you can get some reasonable fixes. The key time to go come back again is before the road is re-paved.

Mr. Jim Standish of 60 Paperchase Trail offered a suggestion that a letter is sent to all the property owners and inform them you are on the fence trying to decide whether to cancel the project. Mr. Armstrong stated he is prepared to make a motion to rescind the project. If you want it to come back, come back again more united as to what you want. Maybe there will be some more failures, maybe the cost of the failures will be more or less. Circumstances may change.

An audience member expressed his appreciation to Mr. Armstrong regarding the survey analysis and summary he provided. He suggested another question should be included asking if the project goes through how many people will hook up. An audience member says it's too expensive at a range of \$23,000. Mr. Johansen noted surveys have been sent and consensus has been received. The Board will make a decision – it's not permanent but it's the decision for tonight. Mr. Bob Bernaduci of 41 Paperchase Trail commented on the survey noted there were so many options and offered suggestions for future surveys.

An audience member inquired about the ballpark figure for the sewer project for Winding Lane Stony Corners. Mr. Johansen replied noting there are many factors involved and the Board does not have control with the numbers when the bids come back. Mr. Johansen also commented about prior comments that were presented as estimates and reiterated the Board does not have final costs of the project until the project is complete.

An audience member noted the Board did not hear from about 15 people from a total of 44 property owners for the survey. Mr. Armstrong replied there are about 42 parcels in the project and about 12 surveys were not returned. Mr. Armstrong suggested residents can go back and talk to each other. Maybe something will change in the future. Mr. Baril replied to a question about whether the past two projects came in under or at cost noting that one project came slightly above cost (approximately \$700 which the AWPCA absorbed) while one project came in at cost.

Mr. Ed Fisher of 27 Hurdle Fence noted the debate has continued for an hour and 45 minutes after the initial comment that the Board was planning to cancel the project. Mr. Fisher made a motion from the floor to cut off the debate and the Board votes on the project. Mr. Armstrong agreed with Mr. Fisher's comments.

Mr. Johansen expressed appreciation to everyone's attendance at the meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Armstrong made a motion for item 2016-8 to rescind so much of the action taken to contract with Suburban Sanitation for the South bid, Phase 1, Hurdle Fence and Paperchase Trail be rescinded. In other words, the work will not go forward on those two streets. The motion, seconded by Mr. Ryan, received unanimous approval.

Mr. Armstrong noted it's been a frustrating process but would like to note the one person has stood out above and beyond – the woman who granted the easement and he greatly appreciates her effort to do so in what he feels has been in a fair and constructive manner.

Mr. Johansen expressed his appreciation to the Board and reviewed a potential suggestion for future projects. Put a project out to bid, the number comes back, get a firm a number, divide it up, lock in that number, put out a survey with a yes/no at this number and we agree to cap it at that number. He noted the surveys are not binding but at least something is returned but also noted he can't control what is discussed in the neighborhood. We capped it so there are no unknowns and gave everyone a chance to say yes or no. Mr. Ryan commented about how the process should not be delayed. Mr. Baril noted a contingency is always placed in a bid package and agreed with placing a cap, sending surveys and stay with a decision. Mr. Armstrong recommended the Board look at the 10-year payback policy and take a note from the contractor who won the bid for Stony Corners to find out how many connections he is making. Discussion continued regarding feedback about the project and additional suggestions for future sewer projects.

Mr. Baril provided specifics for proposed construction on the easement at 30 Paperchase Trail and discussion continued with clarification for next steps such as comparing the bids received for this portion of the project, communicating with the homeowner regarding terms and conditions and keeping track of the expenses. Mr. Baril requested from the Board direction to construct the sewer through 30 Paperchase Trail. Mr. Johansen confirmed there's direction but also noting Mr. Baril has already received the authority from before – it just hasn't been taken away – for Mr. Baril to move forward with 30 Paperchase Trail.

2015 – 6 Research on Low Pressure Sewer Systems – Members discussed potential language for new regulation and Mr. Armstrong noted the latest draft noting there should be a public hearing. Mr. Baril noted the AWPCA handbook is under review with the Town Attorney which should be included with the proposed regulation change for low pressure sewers.

2017 – 3 Annual discussion to establish sewer use (EDU) rate
A motion was carried to raise the sewer use (EDU) rate from \$350 to \$365
(See agenda item number 2017 – 4).

VI PLANNING & ZONING MATTERS – None

VII COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF – Mr. Baril noted he has gone out for a cost of service analysis RFP and noted he has two written proposals and provided feedback regarding the firms' experience working in Connecticut and the scope of work. A draft motion was prepared by Mr. Ryan giving Mr. Baril directive to enter into a contract with Raftelis. Mr. Johansen inquired about the process for increasing the scope amendments. Mr. Baril reviewed the Town's purchasing protocol.

MOTION: Mr. Ryan made a motion for Mr. Baril to enter into a contract with Raftelis. The motion, seconded by Mr. Roy, received unanimous approval.

Mr. Baril provided an update on communication with the Town of Farmington regarding the proposed amended intermunicipal agreement.

VIII COMMUNICATION FROM MEMBERS – Mr. Johansen discussed the best solution for members when replying to Town staff confirming one's attendance for AWPCA meetings. The possibility of adding a member to the Board was discussed given the importance of having a quorum.

IX OTHER BUSINESS – None

X ADJOURNMENT –

MOTION: Mr. Ryan motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. The motion, seconded by Mr. Armstrong, received unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Essex, Clerk