

**AVON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY**  
**August 17, 2017**  
**Selectmen's Chambers, 7:00 p.m.**  
**Town of Avon**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**PUBLIC HEARING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Avon Water Pollution Control Authority was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Johansen.

**AWPCA**

Present: Eric Johansen, Chairman  
Tom Armstrong  
Keith Jones  
Lawrence Baril, Town Engineer  
Tim Foster, Superintendent Sanitary Sewer Service

**II. COMMUNICATION FROM THE AUDIENCE** – Mr. Baril welcomed the audience members and requested they sign the appropriate sign-in sheet for their respective street

**III. OLD BUSINESS -**

Mr. Johansen commented that both projects are unique in terms of the types of systems and ultimately the cost. The meetings are held at the same time so the Town can move ahead with both projects – if that is the decision and continued to note it's not meant to compare both projects. Mr. Johansen introduced Mr. Baril who will provide a slide presentation on both projects. *[Mr. Johansen spoke to AWPCA members which he noted is separate from the public hearing].*

2015 – 8 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for School Street

Mr. Baril presented a presentation which included:

- 1) Primary Drivers for the Project: High need area as evaluated within the Sewer Facilities Plan. Road improvements planned within the Capital Investment Program – improve the sight line at the “S” curve and realign intersection at Huckleberry Hill Road. The area is scheduled for significant paving as identified in the Pavement Management Plan, requests from residents, age of septic systems in the area and the area abuts existing public sewer (at the intersection of School Street and Volovski) making the connection to existing sewer feasible.
- 2) The Sewer Facilities Plan – Mr. Baril noted the School Street area is listed as number three on the list.
- 3) School Street Improvements and Pavement – Mr. Baril provided an illustration noting the planned improvements.
- 4) Project Goals – The typical goals for the projects like this include: Provide sanitary sewer service to each residence ideally by gravity, minimize disturbance to environment and resident's lots, locate laterals for each lot with owner input, locate manholes to minimize driver impediments, complete road overlay after all projects are finished (assuming Town budget approval) and provide a cost alternative to the residents who benefit.
- 5) General Project Cost Drivers: Depth of sewer – the deeper the sewer, the greater the cost, size of pipe, number of manholes, existence of ledge rock and groundwater, backfill material, access to existing sewer to connect to – private easement and restoration to current conditions, bidding contractor work load and costs of materials.

- 6) Gravity Sewer Path – Mr. Baril reviewed the illustration noting that gravity is possible yet there were constraints such as the knob on New Road which causes a deep sewer, the issue with blasting close to homes with older foundations, significantly longer construction time and impacts to the neighborhood which leads to higher construction costs and therefore costs to benefitting residents.
- 7) Low Pressure Sewers – Mr. Baril reviewed the pros and cons of Low Pressure Sewers. Pros: Reduces the cost per foot of the areas raised due to shallower sewer, time to construct and material costs are reduced, reduce the impact to entire project area, reduces construction time, reduces amount of clean dry backfill, results in significantly lower assessment, cost of lateral for pumps is lower, route more flexible and will provide basement level access to sewers for some residents. Cons: Mr. Baril reviewed the cons for the project such as it will require all homes to pump up to the sewer, pumps are owned, powered and maintained by homeowners, pumps generally cost around \$4,000 plus installation. The pumps are powered by electricity. If a resident loses power, power to pump is lost unless there is a generator. The systems generally have a storage capacity equal to a day. Mr. Baril concluded the slide noting that gravity is very expensive. A single pump is expensive but low pressure sewers is an economical system. Mr. Baril also noted that low pressure sewer systems are not new in the industry. They are common in lake areas.
- 8) Preliminary Project Specifics – There is approximately 1200 feet of sanitary main, there are 2 manholes for clean-out, 19 service laterals and the depth of mainline is approximately 4.5 feet. During construction the road will be partially closed in a construction zone. Homeowners will still have access to their property but there will be short term (one hour or two) disturbances. There will be temporary pavement over disturbed roadway and eventually (perhaps Spring/Summer 2018) there will a complete road overlay which will commensurate with other roadway projects.
- 9) Current Project Area – Mr. Baril reviewed the illustration which depicts the route - begins at the manhole at Volovski and School Street and then travels west to New Road. The slide included parcels shaded in yellow which are those benefitting properties.
- 10) Work Completed to date – Soil borings were performed and the Town conducted preliminary engineering, identified and evaluated options for the sewer (gravity vs. low pressure), the Town met with a low pressure sewer representative (an eOne vendor) to evaluate their system and get their design assistance. The Town spoke to numerous municipalities that have Low pressure systems, prepared preliminary design and estimates. A Public Information meeting was held in October 2016. Additional work completed to date included finalized design, went out to bid, evaluated bids and prepared for the August 17 meeting.
- 11) The Design – Mr. Baril's next presentation slide included a map of the design
- 12) The bids – Mr. Baril reviewed the four bids received and noted the amount of each bid
- 13) Assessment Estimate – Mr. Baril reviewed the calculations which factor in to the estimated assessment amount for each property. There are soft costs which include field survey, design and borings. Mr. Baril noted the number of properties serviced is 17 but noted there is an asterisk to this number. There are two properties (50 and 51 School St.) which paid assessments when they connected with the Volovski sewer project, 105 New Road could be added although the addition of this property has no effective change to the assessment amount. 70 School Street is a larger property which will have a second lateral stub installation which will result in a deferred assessment. The estimated assessment with a 15% contingency for construction equals \$13,260.
- 14) Other Costs – Mr. Baril explained there are other costs once a homeowner decides to connect and noted the Town of Avon does not mandate connections. The other costs

include a connection charge currently a \$2,500 charge. The connection cost for the homeowner to hire a contractor varies on numerous variables that factor into this cost. Once the homeowner is connected, there is an annual sewer use fee, currently the charge is \$365 per year/per home. There is also a \$50 permit fee paid by the contractor. The contractor will also include the fee in their estimate to the homeowner to abandon the existing septic system. Mr. Baril reiterated his earlier comment noting that residents are not required to connect just because there is sewer available. Once the homeowner is ready to connect, the sewer connection charge needs to be paid before a permit can be issued.

- 15) Possible Project Schedule – Mr. Baril reviewed the project schedule. Should Mr. Baril receive the approval from the AWPCA to move forward with getting the contract signed, it has to go before the September 7, 2017 Town Council Meeting. Mr. Baril continued stating that if the project is awarded at the Town Council Meeting, construction may begin in September 2017 with a completion date in November 2017. He noted that if the project is not awarded at the September Town Council meeting, construction will not start this year given the potential for snowfall.

Mr. Baril reviewed the frequently asked questions slide which answered such common questions as whether a resident is required to connect, questions regarding how the assessment is determined and costs to connect. Mr. Baril explained that there is not a typical assessment amount and reviewed prior sewer project costs. Additional questions addressed were pump ownership/maintenance, locating laterals and next steps.

Mr. Baril concluded his presentation and Mr. Johansen invited residents to ask questions and suggested they make sure to state their name and address.

Mr. Joe Minkos of 105 New Road introduced himself and his wife Michelle. Mr. Minkos inquired whether his house will be added to the project. Mr. Baril replied noting their property is on the periphery and noted the mailing was sent as a courtesy. Mr. Minkos asked why he was just receiving notice for the sewer project. Mr. Baril explained he should make a decision within a couple weeks if they want to be included in the project. Also, the project was originally just for School Street and the two properties on the east side of New Road. But there was interest from another party, the Town decided to extend the manhole into New Road which provided accessibility to Mr. Minkos and their neighbor to the south. Mr. Baril clarified since it was done as a courtesy, they could choose to opt out and the assessment fee would not be applied. Mr. Minkos replied they have a new septic. Mr. Foster added that many times the Town receives calls after the fact for interest. Mr. Baril noted the current design does not show a lateral to 105 New Road. After clarifying with Mr. Baril, Mr. Armstrong added the homeowners are out unless they act to be included within 45 days in writing. Mr. Foster responded to Mr. Minkos' question that Mr. Minkos' property can opt to come in and explained what the values would be which is the benefit assessment and would not need to connect. The property would have a safety lateral. Mr. Minkos acknowledged his answer and Mr. Baril replied to his question regarding clarification in the term benefit assessment. Mr. Minkos inquired about the loan terms for the benefit assessment and Mr. Baril noted that section will be handled at a later time in the meeting. Mr. Armstrong clarified noting the benefit assessment would be paid if he opted in to the project within 45 days but one would not need to pay the connection fees for the pump if they choose not to connect. There have been reports on School Street of septic systems failing and have not been able to sell their home. Mr. Armstrong noted that some people choose to pay the assessment but not connect right away. Mr. Baril noted the payment terms is under the AWPCA purview, typically there is a 10-year payback period with a low interest rate.

Mr. Brian Capouch from 107 New Road inquired about valves considering his property is at the bottom of the hill. Mr. Baril explained there are flow check-valves that keeps the system from flowing backwards and further explained the system is high-quality and has check valves at the pump station and the curb stop. Mr. Capouch inquired who is financially responsible if there is a failure. Mr. Baril responded that if it is a check-valve problem at the curb stop, the Town would pay for the failure but the homeowner would be responsible if the failure is at their pump or lateral or if the failure is caused by the homeowner such as flushing items that should not be flushed. Mr. Capouch inquired about if there is an increase in property value after connecting to the sewer. Mr. Baril replied that every situation is unique and further explained that the Town Assessor does not increase the property value for tax purposes. However, a realtor may say one's property value has increased because some people are not interested in owning homes with septic systems.

Mr. Bob Casey from 81 Winding noted he is in the mortgage business and commented on FHA loans relative to sewer availability.

Ms. Deborah Micheller from 59 School Street inquired if everyone on School Street must do this. Mr. Johansen replied that in terms of the benefit assessment, yes. He noted that if the project moves forward, everyone is charged that. You don't have to connect but the assessment would be required for everyone on the street.

Mr. Minkos inquired why the Town is doing the sewer project. Mr. Johansen explained the sewer facilities plan which was conducted to identify those neighborhoods in Town in need for sewer. Mr. Armstrong noted the School Street area was rated number 17 – the highest on the chart. Mr. Johansen replied to Mr. Minkos' question on how the project began. He noted the Town does not have a mandate to put in sewers throughout town, even in the high priority areas. A lot of it comes from residents who have concerns.

Mr. John Noonan from 61 School Street inquired about pump ownership. Mr. Baril noted that because of limited resources with the Town, the Town will not own the pumps. Mr. Foster replied to Mr. Noonan's question about losing electricity and generators. Mr. Foster noted that the approach will be up to the homeowner if they want to have an emergency support for their house. However, the Town strongly urges that the control panels for the pump stations have a socket where an emergency generator connection can be made. Mr. Baril noted that each resident's generator would run their own pump and noted the effluent keeps moving – it pumps the whole line. Mr. Armstrong replied to Mr. Noonan's question about costs for contractors to connect and suggested for neighbors to get together and perhaps work out a deal.

Mr. Baril replied to an audience member's question noting the presentation will be available on the Town's web site. Mr. Foster offered the web site for eOne. Mr. Baril also encouraged residents to call the office should they have any questions about the meeting rather than rely on a neighbor who may have misinformation. He referenced a prior project that was cancelled due to misinformation.

Mr. Mauro of 60 School Street inquired about the next steps. Mr. Baril reviewed the timetable and Mr. Armstrong replied to Mr. Mauro's question that the AWPCA doesn't need a vote from residents. Mr. Armstrong noted he was planning to convey to the audience earlier that he is inclined to go forward and to affirmative do the project together with the Chair's cap on that, which he is saying is a cap on the Paganelli quote plus 5% which means that if the project

comes in below Paganelli's cost, the residents get the benefit. If it comes in Paganelli's cost plus 5% and above, the residents don't pay the above. Mr. Armstrong said he is inclined to vote in favor of going forward with the project. The benefit assessment would not incur until almost 2018. Mr. Armstrong mentioned if he were to be on the Board at that time, he will be inclined to do a 10-year time to pay but noted the Board consists of five people and Mr. Armstrong is one person. He asked residents to let him know if someone is strongly opposed.

A resident inquired what would happen to residents who are told they can't put in another septic system if the Board does not approve the project and noted a quote of \$60,000. Mr. Armstrong noted that should the Board vote against the project, he would urge his colleagues to postpone the vote and perhaps you could rally your neighbors for signatures. The resident noted that at some point, residents will need permission to replace their septic system.

Mr. Scott Miller from 51 School Street noted his property is part of the asterisks and inquired about when the determination is made to vote or not, are you making a vote based on the number of systems or taking into account the asterisks? Mr. Armstrong noted the vote would be to approve the contractor going forward. As Mr. Baril has said before, how Mr. Miller's issue is decided would not come up until the benefit assessment in 2018. Mr. Miller asked if the benefit assessment includes the design of the sewer system and what the value was. Mr. Baril noted it does not include the design costs but it does include the borings. Mr. Miller's question asked if the \$194,000 from Paganelli includes any of the re-paving that is associated with the street. Mr. Baril noted yes, it includes temporary paving for the trench area but not the full overlay. The Town will handle the overlay.

Ms. Sally Noonan from 61 School Street inquired about benefit assessment and how it affects people if they opt in or out. Mr. Johansen noted that the only option residents would have, once the project is completed, is whether they want to connect or not but the benefit assessment will be charged to everyone on the street.

Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Capouch's question about his property at 107 New Road that there is a manhole coming around at the intersection of New Street and School Street and a lateral line that stubs just off the manhole to Mr. Capouch's property.

Mr. Johansen inquired from the audience if anyone is strongly opposed to pay the required benefit assessment should the project move forward. Mr. Joe Bordieri from 50 School noted his property is one of the asterisks. Mr. Johansen replied to his question noting the benefit assessment is not done until after the fact. Mr. Bordieri noted his property is already hooked up and paid his assessments already. Mr. Johansen replied that the Board will discuss the matter as it's an asterisk – it's an individual situation. It will not affect the cost or how the Board moves forward. Mr. Johansen replied to an audience member's statement about losing power with a pump noting that the Town has done a lot of research and has a high level of confidence in the systems that are being proposed to go in and required for this system. A resident shared his experience with his pump noting it is efficient and it works quite well. There have only been a few maintenance issues. – one needs to do the maintenance. He provided information regarding the location of the check valve. He concluded by noting his eOne system has been in place since 2003 and it works well and the maintenance costs have been about \$1,500. Mr. Foster added that he is on a pump system in Massachusetts where the Town owns the pump. He has lived there for 11 years and the Town has been there once and estimates electricity to be approximately a \$1 a day. Mr. Foster noted the system for Town of Avon will be a pre-packaged engineered system with a control cabinet, the capability to hook up a generator and

alarms. The cost to run gravity sewers down School Street and down to New Road are astronomical as would be a pump station. The cost effective solution to the neighborhood and area is the design the Town of Avon came up with which is the most economical for the resident. Mr. Foster recognized the cost but noted the cost incurred if a resident does not have an option and needs a new system, the range could be from \$40,000 to \$60,000. Mr. Foster noted he believes the eOne system will work fine. A mechanical failure can take place but there are repetitive checks. Mr. Foster noted residents need to take care of what they have—putting down grease and diapers will create a problem.

Mr. Johansen noted that unless anyone else had any specific comments, he would like to close the public hearing. Mr. Dan Morgan of 75 School Street expressed he would like to see the project happen. The School Street portion of the Public Hearing was closed. Mr. Johansen expressed gratitude to the residents for coming out and noted the meeting will continue to the Winding Lane portion of the meeting.

#### 2017 – 7 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for Winding Lane and Stony Corners North

Mr. Baril noted the public hearing is open for Winding Lane Stony Corners North and directed residents to the sign-in sheet and encouraged residents to include their email address for updates. Mr. Baril began his presentation noting how the project was split into two pieces to stay below the prevailing wage limit. Residents from the South project were also invited to the meeting as there will be implications from the North project to the South project.

- 1) Primary Drivers for the Project – Mr. Baril noted there is a high need area based on the Sewer Facilities Plan and a moderately high priority for roadway improvements as identified in the Pavement Management Plan, the petition received from area homeowners, the age of the septic systems, high ground water in the area which was proven by soil borings and the area is within a reasonable distance to existing public sewer – this will make connection to existing sewers feasible.
- 2) Project Goals – Mr. Baril noted a project goal is to provide gravity sanitary sewer service to first-floor connections at every residence, minimize disturbance to environment, locate manholes to minimize driver impediments, determine interest and feasibility to bring other utilities to the neighborhood, such as public water and natural gas. It was determined it wasn't feasible for the public utilities to extend service to the neighborhood. At the end of the project, the Town looks to complete road overlay after both projects (North and South) are completed (based on Town budget approval).
- 3) Work Completed to date: – Mr. Baril commented the Town contracted and began construction for the South project area with an anticipation completion of this work within the next three weeks. The field survey was completed along with soil borings, office survey and preliminary design, met with Avon Water and CNG to discuss project and solicit interest, identified and evaluated routes to connect to the existing sanitary sewer which included meeting with property owners to determine accessibility options, went out to bid, bids were evaluated and prepared for the public information meeting. Mr. Baril noted the slide presentation will be on the Town's web site.
- 4) Combined Project Specifics – Approximately 5,050 feet of sanitary main, 26 manholes, 52 service laterals, the depth of mainline is between 5 ft and 16 ft, there are three residences that may need to pump, the road will be partially closed to help expedite construction, there will be temporary pavement over disturbed roadway and paved in several stages. The complete road overlay will occur after both projects are completed (based on Town budget approval).

- 5) The Combined Projects Area for South and North – Mr. Baril provided a map which illustrated which parcels are included in the North and South projects. There are 27 benefitting homes in the North project and 25 benefitting properties for the South project.
- 6) North Project Specifics – Mr. Baril noted there are approximately 2,627 ft. of sanitary main, 14 manholes, 27 service laterals, depth of mainline between 5 ft. and 15 ft, road will be partially closed during construction, temporary pavement over disturbed roadway, utilizes the sewer access provided by the current project.
- 7) North Project– 2017 – Six bids were received. The low bidder was Champion Maintenance Contractors and Mr. Baril noted the company was not a qualified contractor. Mr. Baril responded to an audience member’s question noting the contractor was not qualified because they made a huge mistake on their bid and the reference list did not match the type of contracting experience the North Project presents. The next low bidder is GEG Construction and noted they have good qualifications and the Town checked their references. Mr. Baril noted the range of bids.
- 8) Assessment Estimate – Mr. Baril provided figures for the current project under construction (\$395,000) and the North Section bid (\$538,000). Additional soft costs with 52 properties served, the approximate benefit assessment range is \$18,295 to \$20,124. Mr. Baril noted the prior benefit assessment estimate was less (\$16,757 to \$17,623) noted the Town does its best to predict the industry but unfortunately the numbers came in higher on this bid than the Town hoped. Mr. Baril responded to a question noting the current contractor chose not to bid for the North project due to prevailing wages. Mr. Baril noted that typically the AWPCA allows a 10-year payback period with a very low interest rate - usually tied to the bond rate. The bond rate for previous projects percentage was between 2 and 3 %. It’s up to the AWPCA, normally the AWPCA has allowed no penalty for pre-payment.
- 9) Other Costs – Mr. Baril reviewed other costs associated with the project - at the time of connection from the house to the Town’s sewer. The current fees are subject to AWPCA revision. Mr. Baril also noted that residents are not required to connect just because there is sewer available. If residents decide they don’t want to connect to the sewer, they don’t pay the other costs such as connection charge, the connection cost (paid to the contractor hired by homeowner), annual sewer use fee and sewer permit fee. The benefitting property owners will pay the assessment (if levied).
- 10) Potential Project Schedule – Mr. Baril reviewed the potential schedule should the AWPCA approve the project. If the AWPCA decides to move forward with the project for the August 2017 AWPCA meeting, they will need to request from the Town Council to make an award to a low qualified bidder. If the Town Council approves the project, construction may begin in September, with a goal of completing construction in November. The project will not be completed this year if the project is not awarded in September. Mr. Baril noted the potential for snow which would create dangerous conditions for construction. The road would be slated for re-paving in 2018, assuming DPW’s scheduling and budget.

Mr. Baril reviewed the frequently asked questions slide which answered such common questions as whether a resident is required to connect, questions regarding how the assessment is determined, costs to connect and next steps. Mr. Baril explained that there is not a typical assessment amount and reviewed prior sewer project costs. A public hearing will be conducted after the completion of all construction and related activities (approximately the winter of 2017/2018 to levy the assessments). Mr. Baril concluded his presentation by noting the slide presentation will be available for residents on the Town’s

web site. Mr. Johansen encouraged residents to state their name and address when asking a question.

Mr. Tom Diecidue of 146 Winding Lane noted he is aware he is one of the three houses that may need to pump. He learned from Town staff that a system would be designed that he would not need a pump but still noted three residences on the slide for possibly needing to pump. Mr. Baril responded that this will change once the lateral location for Mr. Diecidue's house is determined and there is a true estimate of the lateral line. Mr. Diecidue inquired about receiving the final assessment number and whether the number ever gets blown out of the water or ever goes beyond. Mr. Johansen noted the discussion earlier the AWPCA conducted about concerns on some of the other projects and the potential for escalating costs. The AWPCA voted at the beginning of the meeting that going forward, the costs that the AWPCA received from the Town Engineer plus the cost of the easements, soil borings, the fixed costs going into the project, the AWPCA decided to hold those costs with a 5% potential contingency and that the project won't exceed that cost. It could be that exact cost but it won't be more than the 5% and the contingency won't be charged until there are overages. Mr. Armstrong noted it would be 5% of the \$538,000. Mr. Diecidue commented he started the process two years ago, noted the costs are a little disappointing but encouraged the AWPCA to push the project through. It's a golden opportunity and noted it would cost a lot more than \$20,000 to put in a new septic system plus the disturbance of properties.

Mr. Alan Minkus of 43 Winding Lane inquired about prevailing wages and how the projects were bid. Mr. Baril noted it's up to the contractors to determine whether they need prevailing wages. If they believe their estimate can be below \$400,000 – they don't have to worry about prevailing wage. The Town, in the bid spec, put the prevailing wage rates which are established by the Federal Government. It's up to the contractors to determine whether it's a prevailing wage project or not. Mr. Baril reviewed the bid history of the projects relative to prevailing wages. A letter from 1984 was referenced by Mr. Minkus that he received from the Town of Avon mandating for the installation of engineered systems.

Mr. Alex Kawa of 105 Winding Lane noted he lives in the South project. He inquired about the goals and budget estimates for both projects and whether they are in the same ballpark. Mr. Baril replied the estimates are different for both projects but acknowledged they meet the same goals. Mr. Kawa inquired if there were ever opposing opinions taken into account on the project. Mr. Baril replied that there have been three public information meetings and residents have an opportunity to speak up during that time. Mr. Kawa asked what opposing opinions were received. Baril noted there was a gentleman in the back of the meeting. Mr. Armstrong added that there was overwhelming support from the South project to go forward – most support Mr. Armstrong has received since being on the Authority.

A resident from 114 Winding Lane inquired about the difference between the North and South pertaining to costs and financing. Mr. Baril noted what the AWPCA has talked about doing in the past is combining both projects into a single project for the sake of benefit assessment.

Mr. Baril responded to an audience member's comment that letters were sent to both North and South residents because there are implications to the cost for each resident.

Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Jim Hepburn's question (58 Winding Lane) regarding the expected bid amount the Town would receive for both projects. Mr. Hepburn inquired about the effect on the South project should the North project not move forward. Mr. Baril noted that once the South project is constructed and they complete their testing, the South residents will be able to connect. Mr. Hepburn inquired about the petition the Town received. The originator of the petition, who was present in the audience, provided specifics.

Mr. Paul Ferla of 22 Stony Corners inquired how much (estimate) homeowners could save to band together and get bids for connections. Mr. Baril acknowledged there could be a benefit by having more than one home using the same contractor but an estimate might be 20% to 30% savings.

Ms. Betsy Rollins of 135 Winding Lane inquired why the project is not part of the infrastructure considering all the taxpayers for the Town. Mr. Johansen replied noting that all the sewers in the Town started the same way – by an authority or a developer. There is a distinction in the State law requiring Towns to form water pollution control authorities to manage that independently. It's not a function of the Town. Mr. Johansen continued and noted that in fairness, only the people who are paying for the service are the ones who are using it as opposed to the taxes. The paving truly benefits who lives in front of the street but also everyone else who drives on it. The sewers only benefit you when they get put in for your use. It's required by law to be an independent function.

An audience member asked if the boring profiles were different on the North side compared to the South side and why the project is 20% over budget or estimated. Mr. Baril responded noting there are a few factors including the timing of the bids, only six bids were received and noted the low qualified bidder is coming from Springfield, Massachusetts. Mr. Baril noted he wishes the numbers were lower.

Mr. Mike Stinchon of 51 Winding Lane inquired about the two prices for the two projects and asked if they are static – will that stay at \$395,000 and move and increase? Mr. Baril noted the project is 90% completed and there have been change orders. The Town is looking to reduce the number even further which will lower the price by pulling the pavement portion away from the contractor. The Town will work with Galasso to pave uneven pavement. Drainage work was also pulled and moved to Public Works (saved a little under \$15,000). There was more water than the soil borings indicated on Stony Corners which made the pipes to change from plastic to ductile iron pipe which increased the price to \$15,000. Mr. Baril continued and noted he believes the Town will be able to reduce the \$395,000 amount and will reduce it for the North project also by reducing the paving number. The numbers will be different a little bit one way or another than the presented numbers and that's why the AWPCA decided to put a cap on it to alleviate the concerns some people are having.

Mr. John Pearson of 78 Winding Lane inquired about the system design for the South project. Mr. Baril acknowledged his question that the system design will be built as designed. He commented that the South side will be able to connect in about three weeks after the construction is completed and the series of tests are done.

A resident noted he was aware of a home that the sale was contingent on getting a new septic system installed or reducing the sale of the home.

Mr. Mike Reynolds of 135 Winding Lane inquired about long term real estate sales and values if sewers are in place. Mr. Baril noted that the Engineering Department receives calls routinely from realtors asking about sewer availability for potential buyers. Mr. Baril noted the question is what risk is one willing to take when they sell their home? Mr. Baril noted a prior sewer project on Deepwood Drive where there was a resident who installed a new septic system two years prior to the sewer project which cost \$50,000 but he was still interested in having the sewers come through his neighborhood.

Mr. Armstrong asked if residents could raise their hand if they are in the North Side of the project.

A resident from 158 Winding Lane noted his support for his project. Mr. Johansen noted the AWPCA will take a vote and invited the audience members to speak up if they are against the project. A resident from 58 Winding Lane noted he is not in favor of the project and commented about a neighbor's house who installed a new septic system ten years ago, are now facing an assessment and their house is for sale.

A resident from 43 Winding Lane noted he put in an engineered system which works properly. He spent 8% of the cost of his house on it.

A resident from 25 Winding Lane is in favor of the project.  
A resident from 105 Winding Lane is in favor of the project.  
A resident from 135 Winding Lane is in favor of the project.

Mr. Baril recommended residents to call the Engineering Department should they have any questions about the project to avoid misinformation communicated in the neighborhood.

A resident requested the contractor start at 7 am and not 6:30 am. Mr. Baril acknowledged his concerns.

A resident inquired about financing for the 10-year payback. Mr. Armstrong noted it's in the regulations.

A resident asked for a list of contractors. Mr. Baril noted his office has a list of contractors and encouraged residents to call his office.

Mr. Baril responded to a resident's question that school busses will need to coordinate with the contractor to guarantee 100% route access.

Mr. Armstrong moved to close the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johansen made a motion to approve the School Street sewer project with Paganelli Construction Corporation as the contractor with a bid of \$194,206.50, the benefit assessment not to exceed that amount plus 5%. The motion, seconded by Mr. Jones, received unanimous approval.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johansen made a motion to approve the Winding Lane Stony Corners North sewer project with GEG Construction as the contractor with a bid of \$538,279, the benefit assessment not to exceed that amount plus 5%. The motion, seconded by Mr. Jones, received unanimous approval.

**MOTION:** Mr. Johansen made a motion on a non-precedential basis for the matters that were addressed tonight, the Board will approve a not to exceed benefit assessment equal to the base cost plus 5%. The motion, seconded by Mr. Armstrong, received unanimous approval.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT –**

**MOTION:** Mr. Johansen motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. The motion, seconded by Mr. Jones, received unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted,  
Suzanne Essex, Clerk