

AVON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY

April 13, 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. Ryan.

AWPCA

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

Absent: Eric Johansen, Chairman
Keith Jones, Member

II. MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING – March 9, 2017

MOTION: Mr. Armstrong made a motion for approval of the March 9, 2017 minutes. The motion, seconded by Mr. Ryan, received unanimous approval.

III. COMMUNICATION FROM THE AUDIENCE – *Audience Comments will appear under the Public Hearing agenda item, 2016 – 6.*

IV. NEW BUSINESS –

V. OLD BUSINESS -

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

Mr. Ryan introduced Mr. Baril, Town Engineer, who provided a slide presentation. Mr. Ryan encouraged residents to hold their questions until the end of the presentation and to offer their name and address when posing a question.

Mr. Baril began his presentation noting the South project is the section that will be the main focus. The project will be looked at as a whole but it has been split into two pieces – the North and South projects.

Slide Presentation:

- 1) Primary Drivers for the project – Mr. Baril noted the Sewer Facilities Plan identified numerous areas in Town and ranked them based on eight or nine categories. Winding Lane /Stony Corners area was listed as one of the top quarter of areas in Avon that looks to have sewer brought in. Additional drivers include the petition signed by area homeowners, age of septic systems, high ground water in the area and the area is within a reasonable distance to connect to existing public sewers. The AWPCA gave directive to the Engineering Dept. to explore sewer extensions in the area.
- 2) Project Goals - Mr. Baril noted the goals include providing gravity sewer to first floor connections and trying to catch basement service to many, minimize disturbance to the environment, locate manholes to minimize driver impediments, determine interest and

- feasibility to bring other utilities (public water and natural gas) to the neighborhood, complete road overall after both projects are finished, assuming Town budget approval.
- 3) Work Completed to Date – Mr. Baril explained what has been completed to date: Performed field survey and office survey to identify property ownership information, performed soil borings to identify presence of ledge rock, soil types and ground water depth (which can impact the cost of the project), prepared preliminary design, met with Avon Water Company and CNG to discuss the project and solicit interest, identified and evaluated routes to connect to existing sanitary sewer and met with property owners to determine accessibility options. Mr. Baril reviewed the sewer route noting the project goes from Winding Lane to Stony Corners and will impact three different individuals' lots with the sewer. He further explained this means the Town will need permission from the homeowners and there is a cost associated with this. Discussion of project goals continued noting preliminary cost estimates were prepared for the public information meeting. The Town went to bid twice, the most recent in January 2017, which resulted in an \$81,205 savings from the previous bid.
 - 4) Project Specifics – The Town looked at the project as a whole, which is approximately 5,050 linear feet of sanitary main, 27 manholes, 52 service laterals, and depth of mainline between 5 ft and 15 feet, three residences may need to pump. Mr. Baril noted that his staff will meet with each homeowner to identify where the lateral stub should be. The road will be partially closed during construction in a construction zone. Mr. Baril noted that because the neighborhood is in a loop, the contractor has more flexibility and does not have to manage traffic in the same way which results in a less expensive project. There will be temporary pavement over disturbed roadway and a complete road overlay after both phases are finished (assuming Town budget is approved). Mr. Baril emphasized this cost is not paid under this project. It is paid through the Town budget under the pavement management program.
 - 5) Combined Projects Area – 52 Homes – Mr. Baril's slide included a map which illustrated the two projects – The North side (in blue) and South side (in orange). Mr. Baril noted that the project to be discussed (primarily) for the meeting is the South side project. He noted the sewer routes for phase 1 and phase 2.
 - 6) South Project Specifics – The South project is approximately 2,367 ft. of sanitary main, 13 manholes, 25 service laterals which means 25 benefitting properties, depth of mainline between 5 ft and 15 ft, it's very likely no residents will likely need to pump, road will be partially closed, temporary pavement over disturbed roadway which gets the sewer to the existing area via an easement.
 - 7) South Project Bids Received – Mr. Baril explained the Town went out to bid in January and the bids received were in a range of approximately \$395,000 to \$809,000. Mr. Baril noted it's a broad range but the Town was encouraged that if the prices were charted, the first six bids received as noted in the slide are close in price which means the contractors are bidding the project. Mr. Baril noted that the Town is familiar with the low bidder – Simscroft - Echo Farms who has done work in the Town of Avon for many years. Mr. Baril noted the Town is comfortable with this number and that is what will be presented.
 - 8) Potential Project Schedule – Mr. Baril noted that if the AWPCA decides to award the project that evening, the next step is it goes to Town Council for approval to enter into a contract. Mr. Baril has not experienced a time where the Town Council has denied such a request. If the award is granted, construction would begin in late May 2017 with a potential construction completion date of August 2017.
 - 9) Potential Project Schedule – Mr. Baril explained the North Project Schedule but noted there are variables to the schedule because the North Project does not have to happen but if the South project is done, it seems logical to do the North project. The design has

been done and it's ready to be bid, with AWPCA's directive, Mr. Baril would go out to bid for the North project in April or early May. Mr. Baril described the potential schedule - award the project in June 2017, begin construction in August (when the South project is completed). Mr. Baril noted the Town would not have two contractors on the street at the same time. When the South project is completed, the north project could start. If the construction isn't completed by August, Mr. Baril suggests not beginning the North project this calendar year but wait until Spring 2018. The Town does not want a project going on in November due to potential snow. If the North project started in August, 2017, a construction completion date of October 2017 is possible.

Mr. Baril explained that the Town reached out to the gas company and the water company. In both cases, they need to have a critical mass of residents who are interested to assist or commit to using their services and helping to pay for the mainline installation. The water company does not put water in on spec, which means they are not going to pay for the mains and connections; rather benefitting property owners will have to pay for it and commit to connecting. Mr. Baril recommends to residents that if they have a strong interest in water, they should contact the water company. Bob Wesneski is the president of the Avon Water Company, is easy to reach and will welcome the interest. The gas company has already canvassed the neighborhood. Many of the residents should have received notifications from the gas company in January because they reached out to the two neighborhoods the Town is looking at sewerage (Paperchase/Hurdle Fence and Winding Lane/Stony Corners). They have determined that there is economy in combining those two into one larger project. They don't typically require payment for the mainline but they have to receive a critical mass, approximately 70% (Mr. Baril believes) willing to convert to gas before it's worth their while. Mr. Baril recommends residents to contact the gas company. They held a public information meeting in January which Mr. Baril attended. He mentioned there were about 10 to 12 residents who attended out of the 115 or so who were invited. Mr. Baril invited residents to call his office for a contact name at the gas company.

Once the sewer, and possibly the gas are constructed, the Public Works Department will likely mill and overlay the roadway. This could happen in summer of 2018 (based on the assumption the sewers are built in calendar year 2017). The Town wants the sewer trench to settle through at least one winter before its final pave. Once the sewer construction is completed, the final costs will be compiled from which the assessment will be determined. It is typical practice of the AWPCA that it's a very linear relationship between costs and assessment to beneficiaries. Mr. Baril explained that everyone who benefits shares in a pro-rata cost of the sewers. If the sewer costs \$500,000 and there are 50 residents who benefit, each resident pays \$10,000 as an assessment. Mr. Baril stressed to residents not to remember the \$500,000 figure as he is using that figure as an example. There will be a public hearing to be held on the assessments, perhaps in Winter 2017/18 and to levy assessments with a potential date of Winter/Spring 2018. It has been typical practice for the AWPCA to allow a 10-year payback period.

10. Assessment Estimate – Mr. Baril reviewed the assessment estimates for the sewer construction project, including the soft cost estimates such as the field survey, borings (actual), legal and easement costs (estimate). After dividing the total cost estimate (\$871,629 to \$916,415) by the number of properties services (52), Mr. Baril noted an estimate assessment range of \$16,757 to \$17,623. The numbers are estimates.

11. Other Costs – Mr. Baril reviewed the costs associated with connecting to the public sewer. The connection charge which is currently \$2,500 must be paid to the Town prior to securing a permit to connect. Property owners will then hire a private contractor to make the physical connection and do the work necessary to disconnect their septic system and connect to the Town’s collection system. These costs vary depending upon several factors including length, depth, impediments such as trees and rock, landscaping and restoration requirements. Once connected, there is an annual sewer use fee paid which is currently set at \$350, but is re-evaluated annually. There is also a sewer permit fee of \$50 which must be paid to acquire the necessary permission to connect.

12. Mr. Baril reviewed the Frequently Asked Questions portion of the presentation and noted a homeowner is not required to connect unless the Farmington Valley Health District requires connection due to septic system failure. He also reviewed the costs associated with connecting to public sewer, the process of Town staff meeting with the homeowner to locate their lateral stub and the next steps. Should the AWPCA approve the project, a letter to homeowners in the South project will be sent from the Engineering Department requesting a date and time to meet with the homeowners to determine the location of the lateral stub. If the AWPCA approves the project, the next steps also includes a recommendation to Town Council for award and ultimately construction begins.

Mr. Bari concluded the presentation and invited the audience to ask any questions they may have. He also requested that audience members state their name and address.

Mr. Armstrong noted one clarification that if the AWPCA goes for installment payments, should they approve it, Mr. Baril is correct further describing the interest rate that is charged to homeowners for the installment payments is often derived based on the cost to bond this project -- what is the interest the Town pays. The Town does not typically bond rather the Town pays for projects like this one out reserves. The statute provides for “a reasonable rate” which in the past, the practice has been close to the bond rate. Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Baril for confirmation in Mr. Armstrong’s following comment that the public hearing is really on the South project. Mr. Baril clarified the public hearing is for the entire project. Mr. Armstrong noted that at the end, the AWPCA may choose to close the public hearing but for those in the North project, there will be another public hearing when Mr. Baril goes out to bid for that project. Mr. Baril confirmed Mr. Armstrong’s comment as correct. Regarding the South project, if the AWPCA chooses to close the public hearing, it would be the residents’ last opportunity to comment. Mr. Armstrong noted the AWPCA needs their feedback.

Mr. John Pearson of 78 Winding Lane inquired whether this is based on the design plan of last July. Mr. Baril confirmed Mr. Pearson is correct.

Mr. Bob Casey of 81 Winding Lane inquired if something can be done with the wires, perhaps putting them underground since the road will be torn up. Mr. Baril responded that while that’s a great idea, it will probably triple the cost of the project.

Ms. Susanne Farrah of 88 Winding Lane inquired whether there will be a staging area for the contractor. Mr. Baril responded there will be a staging area which is usually determined by the contractor who makes arrangements through a homeowner. Mr. Baril added that the road

will be closed for through traffic at various times during construction but a homeowner will not lose access to their property. Mr. Baril continued to review the construction scenario noting there may be an instance (for a short time) where the contractor's truck is parked in front of a resident's driveway and the possibility of having to park one's car on the street and walk to their home. Ms. Farrah also inquired about the potential of tearing up the driving. Mr. Baril indicated the sewer is designed in the street and there is a lateral stub that runs from the mainline sewer to the right-of-way line. Mr. Baril offered background information regarding definition of right-of-way noting the Town owns 50 feet of the right of way, which averages 13 feet from the road edge on either side. The contractor will stage in that right-of-way. He will not stage in a driveway apron in front of the driveway. He will not dig up a driveway unless a resident requests a cut across the apron for access to the lateral due to landscaping challenges.

Mr. Alex White of 158 Winding Lane noted he's on the North side and inquired about the threshold of making the North side happen. Mr. Armstrong responded with a potential approach, similar to what Mr. Baril took, combining the costs of the North and South side – assuming that the both sides and the Authority votes to have sewers go in. There's always a possibility to go with the South side first, the AWPCA may decide not to construct the north section - the Authority will listen to the residents in the area. Mr. Armstrong provided an example – if the north side construction costs were deemed excessive, and the residents complained, the AWPCA may opt to not move forward with the North side. This would result that the Authority would assess the South side based on the South side costs. The advantage of connecting to the North South – if we choose to combine it, the South side is not assessed anything until we choose to assess the entire project. It can always be assessed sooner because the residents are free to use it. It's a self-serving unit – gravity flow. There is a possibility the residents may not want the North side connected – for whatever reason that may be. If the Authority is of the like mind, and agrees and proceed to assess the South side. Mr. Armstrong noted the Authority would like to hear from the South side residents to determine whether they are generally in favor of the project or have they had failures in the past. He has heard anecdotal comments about they wouldn't call Stony Corners if it weren't Stony, i.e. poor leaching ability. Mr. Armstrong offered his personal opinion and mentioned he believes it's a good price but does want to hear from the residents.

Mr. John Pearson of 78 Winding Lane has been looking at doing a construction project and has an entire septic system line designed but has not put in the ground yet. A series of test pits have been done. Mr. Pearson noted that according to the Board of Health for 78 Winding Lane and the surrounding area, they were very surprised how well the leaching was. After 61 years Mr. Pearson noted his system is in good shape. Mr. Armstrong asked why he was putting in a system. Mr. Pearson noted his foundation would have been on top of the distribution box. Mr. Armstrong inquired whether the project is for new construction. Mr. Person noted it is for an addition.

Mr. Joe Milheiro of 82 Winding Lane requested clarification on the depth of the lateral stubs and the price ranges mentioned based on depth – some that are 5 and some that are 15. Mr. Baril reviewed his earlier comment the depth in the mainline sewer is between 5 and 15 feet. The primary goal is to catch first floors by gravity. The 15 feet depth is in Stony Corners. There is a rise in Stony Corners and then it drops off. The rise, results in bucking the grade (the grade goes up and the pipe goes down), that's why it gets deeper there and then shallower. The purpose for Town staff to meet with residents individually is to find out where the septic system is located, the distance between where the lateral stub could be and the vertical difference. There's a minimum slope the Town hopes to achieve. Residents have

choices for the route of their lateral. For example, if a septic system is behind a house this often results in a longer run, more expensive to connect, and potential problems to connect to gravity. Mr. Baril continued to explain that if one does not have a finished basement, an alternative may be to re-route one's plumbing in the basement and have it go through the front of the house which will save money in terms of the construction costs outside.

Mr. Chip Lyons of 134 Winding Lane inquired about what happens to one's existing systems. Mr. Baril clarified Mr. Lyons' question noting the question is what does one do to their septic system should they decide to connect. If one wants to connect, the authority for septic systems in Avon is the Farmington Valley Health District (FVHD). The FVHD requires, at the time of connection, to pump the tank, crush and fill the septic tank. Mr. Lyons also inquired about the process of the assessment should the project move forward and one sells their property. Mr. Armstrong gave an across the board type of example. Potential scenario – If Mr. Baril is on target with the construction costs, the benefit assessment will likely come in between \$16,757 to \$17,623. Everyone who benefits will be assessed. If a resident chooses to connect, they are also obligated to pay the connection charge and permit fee. The current AWPCA regulations allow for up to 10 year installment term for paying the assessment and the Authority can approve such an installment payment. If a resident using the installment option chooses to sell their property, the remainder of the payment principal and any accrued interest is due upon sale. Mr. Armstrong confirmed Mr. Lyon's statement that he would be responsible for paying the balance at closing. Mr. Armstrong concluded by noting there isn't a pre-payment penalty.

Mr. Armstrong noted the ranking of sites that the Authority follows for needing sewers, 17 is the highest number and noted the area in discussion is number 16.

Mr. Garrett Williams of 7 Stony Corners inquired about the ratio of total project cost and benefitted residents is based on combined North / South project but it's two separate projects, two separate contractors. If the North portion doesn't get done, it could be assessed separately. What happens, either way, if one of the projects goes as planned and the other project doesn't. Does the other half of the project float the difference in that ratio as part of the assessment meaning if South happens on budget and on schedule and North goes 50% over, all people who got done on the South, now they make the balance for the over run for the North project or vice versa. Is that correct or could they be assessed separately? Mr. Armstrong summarized Mr. Williams' question noting the question is what happens if the South project goes forward and the North project does not. The Authority has costs for the South project. Mr. Armstrong prefaced his next comment noting it's his personal opinion that part of the project is an easement, the easement benefits both North and South. Mr. Armstrong would not, in his personal opinion as one member, not assess the full easement to the South side. It has yet to benefit the North side. Mr. Armstrong noted the Authority tries to do the best they can – coming up with something that is fair. Currently, what Mr. Baril seems to project, the South side might be cheaper than the North side because of possible pumping and it's a deeper area. Mr. Armstrong noted if one looks at the project, it's one project that maybe too big to swallow as one project. There is a benefit from doing the project this way. The State has prevailing wage law which comes in to play if the bid comes in over \$400,000. There is a set scale the Labor Department has to say that all the contractors have to follow. This bid was below \$400,000. The South side (if the North does not go forward) will be assessed based on the costs incurred on the South side. Mr. Williams understood Mr. Armstrong's comment but responded asking that it's more if the North project does not occur, if it goes grossly over budget, whether it runs into winter, or it's a different contractor, at the end of the double project, the total project assessment is split

among the South and the North projects and the South basically ends up paying more for something that is not affecting them. Mr. Armstrong noted that's a true statement. Mr. Armstrong noted the potential project is a circle – it's a circular area. For convenience of the Town, the Authority is trying to do the lower half of the circle first which can happen as it's the closest to the gravity out-fall. It would probably be the Authority's practice to take an average but can't say that as there isn't a vote yet. The action taken would happen after the construction is complete. Mr. Baril added that the project was designed as a single project and noted the reason the project was split in to North/South due to the State's prevailing wage requirement which forces municipalities to meet certain prevailing wage rates which are federally mandated which are generally higher than most contractors pay for parts of their labor force. There are some contractors who pay the prevailing wages regardless of the size of the project. Those are typically the larger contractors. The Town learned that one of the reasons why the original project came in high because it was prevailing wage and that was driving the price up. Both projects - Winding Lane/Stony Corners and Paperchase/Hurdle Fence were split due to prevailing wage. Mr. Baril noted that what the contractors told the Town was semi-true – prevailing wage does apply and it may have had an impact on some of the contractors but not all of the contractors. By splitting into two and re-bidding the Winding Lane / Stony Corners, the low bid is \$81,000 less expensive. The project costs increased for the Paperchase/Hurdle Fence project. Mr. Baril noted his goal is to save the residents money by re-bidding the project.

Mr. Andy Case of 64 Paperchase Trail inquired about the benefit to the homeowner if the project ends up costing more, in terms of assessment and the actual connection, perhaps around \$30,000 to \$40,000 in total and whether the Town takes this into a benefit assessment. Where is the cost benefit to the homeowner? Mr. Case mentioned he assumes it benefits the Town if the homeowner connects but questions if one doesn't have to connect, and it costs more to do that, where is the benefit? Mr. Baril provided clarification -the \$2,500 connection fee is a fee which covers the cost of maintenance of downstream. Mr. Case noted there are a lot of associated costs with the project and wondered why a homeowner would want to pay the assessment for something a person will not use. Mr. Case inquired about the cost benefit analysis to the Town. Mr. Baril replied noting it's not a cost benefit to the Town. Mr. Baril noted that septic systems are under the authority of the Farmington Valley Health District. Mr. Baril mentioned someone can get a septic tank repaired or replaced for \$10,000 to \$15,000 which depends on one's lot soil conditions and circumstances. Mr. Baril spoke to someone who said she was told a figure of \$60,000 to replace her entire septic system.

Mr. Armstrong noted that one part of the cost is the connection construction costs. The cheapest way to get it in on the low end of the \$3,000 to \$6,000 range is to get together as a group which will offer a lower cost vs. a single person who wants to connect two years later. Mr. Armstrong noted that if the Authority moves forward with sewers on the South side, the benefit assessment is due and owing, likely on an installment basis with minimal interest but one doesn't have the connection costs involved. Mr. Armstrong noted if a resident doesn't connect they don't have a connection cost. It's dependent upon each homeowner if they will incur both costs.

Mr. Tim Foster, Superintendent of Sanitary Sewers, the Town of Avon, mentioned he could clarify any questions regarding the assessment value and noted he has met with residents with similar concerns and acknowledged it's a large number. Mr. Foster shared feedback from a recent meeting regarding a resident who had a 15 year old septic system and noted the resident was unsure about the maintenance before he bought the house and the resident does not have room to replace his system should it go bad. Mr. Foster noted the range of the

connection fees based on variables which is why the Town does a site visit with residents. A resident responded that it will cost him a lot to take down trees and rip up his driveway which may cost more than to replace his system. Mr. Baril noted that if a resident's system fails, they don't have to connect and noted the FVHD is the authority for septic systems. Mr. Foster noted the current connection charge of \$2,500 is one of the lowest in the Farmington Valley. The connection charge rate is under discussion now and may be raised. Mr. Foster noted a resident can pay the connection charge even if one doesn't connect right away. One can pay now and then connect later. Mr. Foster concluded by noting the \$2,500 connection fee, depending upon the Authority, can increase to \$5,000 in a year.

Mr. Casey inquired whether there's a ballpark figure for each linear foot to connect. Mr. Foster replied a ballpark may be \$50 per foot and Mr. Baril noted it can be more.

Mr. White of the North side, 158 Winding Lane supports the project.

A resident noted that there are 40 residents/parcels of land on Winding Lane - 15 appear to be in the South and 25 appear in the North. The resident inquired if the road will be ripped up twice. Mr. Armstrong responded that possibly yes. Mr. Baril replied yes, sort of and explained that if the project was bid as one project, it wouldn't look any different than what will happen. The resident noted he is on the North side and reviewed the route he will take home and confirmed with Mr. Baril there are two phases of construction on his street. Mr. Baril hopes the projects are contiguous and will happen in 2017. Mr. Foster noted that what the Town hopes is that the Town can put the North side out to bid and the contractor who is the low bid on the South side says they can go from one project to the next. Mr. Baril confirmed the resident's comment that it is basically economy of scale.

Mr. Paul Matsikas of 170 Winding Lane noted he is in favor of the project and requested additional information on those properties that may need to pump. Mr. Baril noted that if a homeowner's home is below the street, it is possible that house will need to pump. Mr. Baril continued to note it is to be determined based on the homeowner's circumstances such as the septic tank location. Mr. Baril explained the pumping system and noted there are benefits and downside to have a pump system.

Mr. Robert St. Jean of 108 Winding Lane noted he is in favor of the project. He mentioned there are two neighbors not here due to school vacation week and they are also in favor of the project. Mr. Baril noted there are two letters in the members' packets from residents.

Ms. Susan Namerow of 38 Stony Corners, also noted the Pinkerton's of 39 Stony Corners are out of town and they wanted Ms. Namerow to speak on their behalf noting they are in favor. Mr. Baril noted that Ms. Namerow is on the outskirts of the project.

Ms. Kristine Pearson, 78 Winding Lane, in favor of the project.

Mr. Joe Milheiro, 82 Winding Lane, in favor of the project

Ms. Tabaszewski, 97 Winding Lane, in favor of the project

Mr. Chris Knopf, 25 Winding Lane, in favor of the project

Mr. Bob Casey, 81 Winding Lane, in favor of the project

Mr. John Cowan, 111 Winding Lane, in favor of the project

A resident from 24 Winding Lane, in favor of the project

Mr. Baril urged residents to ask any questions they have from the Engineering Department and encouraged them to call so there isn't any misinformation transmitted. Mr. Foster supported Mr.

Baril's comments and reiterated how important it is to obtain the right information and not to hesitate contacting the Engineering Department. Mr. Baril added he could help coordinate a group meeting (use the Town's conference room or contact the contractor) to possibly obtain a group rate for offsetting construction costs.

Mr. Foster replied to a resident's question noting the mainline needs to be constructed, tested, and accepted and all ready and then the customers can come on board. There would be a list of those parcels who want to connect. The Town wouldn't be part of negotiating cost.

Mr. Baril responded to a resident's question that at the end of the lateral stub is a stake, painted green at the top. The Town locates the lateral and does tie-offs so the contractor knows also.

Mr. Baril confirmed a residents' question they could use the same contractor as the contractor to connect a homeowner's home but noted the resident is not obligated to use the same contractor. A follow-up question followed asking if the Authority could put the North and South together so the residents can work together with the same contractor with the hopes that the connection charges could be as minimal as possible. Mr. Foster replied noting that could work only if the same contractor is awarded the North and South projects and he also added the Town hopes the contractor is aggressive enough to go after the North project also (if they want to go into the North project). Mr. Baril noted the bid was only for the South project and to combine the projects would entail going out to bid which would delay the construction date to July. Mr. Baril noted the bid was not done as one project due to prevailing wages. Mr. Baril mentioned \$81,000 was saved by going to bid for the South project a second time which worked out well. Mr. Ryan agreed. Mr. Armstrong noted the intent is to call another public hearing for the North side while the project is on-going before your contractor is off the road. Hopefully the Town will know who the contractor will be for the North side before the contractor has left the street.

Ms. Michelle Williams of 7 Stony Corners inquired about the construction hours for the project. Mr. Baril noted that contractors typically want to work Monday through Friday, 7 am to 3:30 pm. The Town has ordinances regulating the hours they can work. Depending upon a favorable weather forecast, the contractors may work until 5 pm.

Mr. Ryan invited if anyone had any additional comments. Hearing none, Mr. Armstrong made a motion to close the public hearing with a clarification there will be another public hearing for the North project. The motion, seconded by Mr. Roy, received unanimous approval.

MOTION Mr. Armstrong made a motion that the AWPCA request the Town Council to authorize the Town Manager to enter into contract to construct the Winding Lane Stony Corners South Project with Simscroft. The motion, seconded by Mr. Ryan, received unanimous approval.

Mr. Armstrong noted he did not hear any opposition but heard a substantial amount of support for the project. He added it's number 16 out of 17 on the needs matrix. He also is aware there have been a couple failures, someone is going in for a new system and Mr. Armstrong believes this gentleman is also in favor of the project as it avoids having to put in a new system.

Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Foster's question that according to Town Attorney, there's a chance to extend the contract for the contractor to include the North Project. The bid was an item based project rather than a lump sum. Mr. Armstrong inquired if there's an option to ask the contractor if they were amenable to increase the project to include other costs recognizing there's a possibility the project may

go over prevailing wages, etc. Mr. Baril noted he believes the contractor is a prevailing wages payer anyway and would like to verify with the Town Attorney first before approaching the contractor.

2015 – 8 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for School Street - Tabled for next meeting

2016 – 4 Potential Sewer Connection Charge Increase – Tabled for next meeting

Mr. Armstrong requested that Mr. Baril go out and solicit bids for the cost of service charge and gather feedback for the May meeting. Mr. Ryan supported Mr. Armstrong's request.

2016 – 8 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for Paperchase Trail South – Mr. Ryan noted this agenda item will be discussed at the May 11, 2017 meeting.

2017 – 3 Annual discussion to establish sewer use (EDU) rate

Mr. Armstrong noted there will be a public hearing and inquired to Mr. Baril what the increase tax rate will be for the Town. Mr. Baril explained the two different tax increases the Governor is planning and the effect on the Town of Avon. The sewer rate could increase by \$10 to \$15. Mr. Baril noted the public hearing will be for the May meeting. Mr. Armstrong mentioned there may be input at the May 11 meeting that may change the potential increase. Mr. Foster noted the Town's cost to the Town of Canton is \$52,000 per 121 connections which equals \$429 per connection. Mr. Baril noted a potential change would be how the Town of Avon is getting paid from Canton as opposed to how the Town pays to get that effluent treated. Mr. Baril further commented that the Town of Canton should be adjusted uniquely. Mr. Roy recalled reading about a budget item relating to placing a meter in Canton. Mr. Baril explained the letter Avon received from the Town of Canton whereby Canton wants to reduce their effluent to Avon by taking a portion of the flow coming to Avon now and pipe it to Canton's pump station. Mr. Foster noted they plan to redirect a portion of their flow to the Shoppes in Canton. Some of the streets on Secret Lake will still come to Avon. This will allow the Town of Canton to save money in a short period time. It will reduce what Avon is taking. Mr. Foster noted a meter will be placed in Secret Lake which will meter Canton's flow into Avon. Mr. Baril mentioned the Town will work with Canton to change the intermunicipal agreement and will also make changes to the Town of Farmington's intermunicipal agreement which will make it more equitable. Mr. Foster said there should be a way to offset the Canton bill. Mr. Baril agrees and noted it will be covered in the intermunicipal agreement. Mr. Armstrong noted the annual charge of \$350 doesn't take into consideration the intermunicipal imbalance. Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Roy's question that there are about 5,200 connections (includes commercial accounts). Mr. Roy mentioned it wouldn't be correct to penalize 5,000 people for 100. Mr. Armstrong explained he is suggesting using a differential figure of $\$50 \times 200 = \$10,000$. Mr. Baril explained the current net loss which he plans to correct in the intermunicipal agreement rather than the EDU rate charge.

VI PLANNING & ZONING MATTERS – Mr. Baril provided feedback regarding his meeting with Town Staff and the developers for the Avon Town Center project which included conversations relating to moving soil.

VII COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF – None

VIII COMMUNICATION FROM MEMBERS – Mr. Roy noted a plan should be in mind for the meeting on May 11 as there's a lot of discussion and dissention. Mr. Ryan asked should the Authority wait to hear from everyone on that particular day -- one can't speculate. Mr. Baril noted there have

been three public meetings on the project thus far and there hasn't been a 100% consensus positive nor negative. Mr. Baril mentioned there was some quiet discussion of negativity and there were people who are not in favor of the project who attended previous meetings. It's unfortunate the same people didn't come to the last meeting – the public hearing. There are about 15 who have indicated their dissent. Mr. Baril noted survey results are coming in, approximately 8, and the results will be tabulated. Mr. Baril reviewed some of the surveys received. Mr. Foster noted people are making interpretations and Mr. Baril added that there have been erroneous information dissipated and will clarify the misinformation at the May 11 meeting. Mr. Foster continued noting the Town has gone through the due process, the public hearing was held, the decision was made to move forward with the construction of the south end portion of the project and the contractor has been notified. There are options – scrap the whole project or move forward with just the South project and not build the North or build it all. Mr. Ryan stated the project was voted yes and questions why there isn't a shovel in the ground. Mr. Armstrong suggested a letter is sent to the residents noting when the meeting is in May and perhaps include corrections of misstatements. Mr. Armstrong noted that if there is a motion to rescind if the vote varies, it will need to be mailed (majority vote). Mr. Baril clarified Mr. Armstrong's comment noting there may be a certain process to follow if the motion is rescinded and explained the steps Mr. Baril will follow after the May 11 if the members rescind the vote. Mr. Baril further explained it's the assessment which residents are concerned about (not the construction) and there is a year to work with to discuss possible scenarios such as an assessment cap. Mr. Roy commented about how the petition was started which requested the Town to look into the feasibility and cost of construction and approximately 20 people signed the petition. The residents know from public record the assessment is 2 ½ times the normal going rate in Town. Mr. Baril noted this is misinformation. Mr. Baril noted that seven years ago, on Deepwood Drive, in a different zone, the assessment was \$12,700. Mr. Roy commented that's a far cry from \$25,000. Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Roy's question regarding the cost of the Haynes Road sewer project, which was a private project and not assessed. Anyone who wants to buy into that, it is a cost of \$16,000. Mr. Roy commented it went from a request of a feasibility to a vote from the Board. Mr. Baril noted there have been three public meetings. Mr. Roy acknowledged Mr. Baril's comment and said he is forwarding to you what has been forwarding to him. Mr. Foster noted in his opinion the Authority already made a decision to construct the south end of the project. It's a done deal in Mr. Foster's opinion and offered suggestions regarding the approach for the May 11 meeting and noted how simple comments can get carried out of proportion.

Mr. Armstrong requested that the low pressure regulations is included on the next meeting's agenda in preparation for School Street.

IX OTHER BUSINESS – None

X ADJOURNMENT –

MOTION: Mr. Ryan motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. The motion, seconded by Mr. Roy, received unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Essex, Clerk