

22 MAR 24 AM 8:43

SALLY DUPLICE
TOWN CLERK

TOWN OF STONINGTON

BOARD OF FINANCE MEETING – SOLID WASTE & PUBLIC WORKS CIP

Board of Education District Office Conference Room

Wednesday, March 2nd, 2022

7:00 PM

A meeting of the Board of Finance was held on this date at the Stonington District Office Meeting Room. Members present were Chairman Tim O'Brien, Michael Fauerbach, Deborah Norman, Lynn Young, David Motherway, Bob Statchen and Chris Johnson.

Chairman O'Brien called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

Public Comments: None.

The Chairman requested a motion to approve an emergency bid waiver request from the Director of Finance for \$50,750 worth of repairs to the old Board of Education Office. Lynn Young made the motion, David Motherway seconded.

Emergency Bid Waiver Request from Public Works Department (Repairs to BOE Office): Mr. Sullivan suggested the emergency bid was due to an unforeseen incident of a snowplow damaging the old BOE District Office. James continued, stating this necessitated an immediate bidding process per the procurement policy, as long as the waiver was addressed at the following BOF meeting. However, the Town would only be responsible for the first \$10,000 of the \$50,750 repair total, with the remainder to be covered by insurance. Mr. O'Brien called for questions and there were none. The motion was unanimously passed.

Budget Presentations

Solid Waste Department: John Phetteplace, the Director of Solid Waste, gave a presentation on behalf of the Solid Waste Department providing an overview of major budget changes and operations. The first item of note discussed a tipping fee increase for the first time in over 12 years; the previous long-standing fee of \$58/ton will increase to \$59.25 for the 2023 fiscal year. These waste disposal costs are subsidized by SCRRA at \$12.84/ton and will remain at this rate to help offset the \$72/ton tip fee total. Mr. Phetteplace discussed internal funding options – such as the Tip Fee Stabilization Fund – explaining that he is still reviewing methods to help manage SWD costs.

John spoke on the food composting pilot project (completed last September) going extremely well. The pilot project is the first step in SCRRA applying for a composting facility, resulting in the SWD applying for a \$550,000 grant to begin food collection in April. John explained that food waste makes up to 30% of the waste stream – a substantial amount of tipping fee weight – and provided further specifics on regional waste and tipping fee logistics. Mr. Phetteplace

summarized, noting a great deal of money would be saved by removing and composting food waste overall.

John suggested the state uses the Town's food waste pilot as an accurate indicator due to Stonington's compliance with recycling and other reduction programs. However, the Town is temporarily avoiding a fiscal crisis due to a 10-year contract with Lisbon (securing reasonable tipping fees for next eight years) but noted high costs with transporting food waste over the next year until the local composting facility is online. Some of these costs should be subsidized by the state and Federal grants; Mr. Phetteplace stated there is still a good deal to be worked out, citing what the Town funds and what SCRRA subsidizes respectively.

Ms. Young inquired as to where the money for the Tip Fee Fund came from, and John described a 25-year energy share contract that was paying the SWD a .28-29¢/ kW generation rate (with the true rate being .03-04¢/ kW), with the remaining savings being allocated to the fund. There was additional discussion with the Board, referring to outside municipalities having to cover enormous tip fees, whereas the Town utilizes cost-saving strategies (recycling, composting and reducing waste) along with additional aid from SCRRA.

The Chairman applauded John's approach, citing his approval of the Solid Waste Department's fiscal approach while freeing up funding for pilot programs. John reiterated that if the SWD doesn't start making plans for the next eight years, they'll potentially be faced with skyrocketing disposal fees, to which SCRRA has helped tremendously in this aspect.

Mr. Phetteplace detailed new expenses resulting in a large increase for disposal fees and commercial collections. Over 30 new commercial customers now require the SWD's services, increasing the Commercial line item by \$72,400 (of which approx. \$60,000 in Commercial fees have been collected, which aren't shown the line item). Regarding the Disposal Fees, there was a 400-ton increase in tonnage so far this year, leading to an anticipation of an additional 1,200-tons for the YTD. However, John noticed that this increase has leveled off in the last few months, so the 1,200-ton figure may not be accurate, but he should budget for it accordingly. There's also an issue with residents disposing additional waste at the Transfer Station in lieu of using the [paid] yellow trash bags.

There was additional discussion about the line item, with Mr. Fauerbach requesting clarification on certain aspects of it. John said he'd consult with Mr. Sullivan to clarify the projections, and there was additional discussion regarding yellow bag/commercial rates and revenue.

Mr. Motherway asked about the \$300 spent on the Advertising Budget, and John explained it was spent on printed items (such as composting pamphlets), while noting the advertising budget for the food program would come directly from the grant.

Ms. Young inquired if the food composting program would be a weekly pickup schedule, to which John discussed several iterations the program underwent before concluding that weekly pickup would be best. DEEP will cover the initial food program costs and depending on the success of the program will adjust the schedule accordingly. John projected if the food composting pilot is successful, the SWD will introduce a small fee the following year to cover

the green [food] bags. The Board had additional questions about recouping composting costs, leading to discussion about recycling markets starting to recover – another potential revenue source, with the SCRRRA recycling contract being renewed in April.

Mr. Phetteplace noted the SWD has \$30,000 set aside for a storm event as a contingency, which will be addressed during deliberations. John reiterated that despite last year's 400-ton overage, if in the next few months collections remain relatively flat, then SWD may be able to deduct \$20,000-30,000 from disposal fees.

Moving on to fuel costs, John indicated the diesel and unleaded fuel costs **did** increase but remained relatively stable, as fuel rates were higher this time last year **and** he reassessed how much fuel SWD uses. There was additional discussion pertaining to **rising** fuel costs (due to the Russia/Ukraine conflict), and how to best prepare for them.

Mr. Phetteplace concluded by speaking about the residential collection costs, **observing** a 20% annual increase in the last year of a four-year contract. **However**, the residential collection costs continue to be well below market value. John outlined that \$258,000 (of the forthcoming grant) was budgeted for food collection costs, with an additional **\$85,000** transportation supplement as well as labor costs. The Chairman called for questions **pertaining** to Solid Waste operations, to which there were none.

John presented the Solid Waste CIP requests **to the Board**, **beginning** with an "A" bucket request for a new front wheel loader to be funded at **\$29,000 over the next five years**. SWD currently relies heavily on the use of two loaders, and **after the five-year** funding period one will be traded in for a loader. Mr. Phetteplace provided a **plan to implement** a wood chip composting project to lower costs spent transporting wood chips off site. Mr. O'Brien called for questions regarding the SWD CIP request; **there were none**.

Ms. Chesebrough took a **moment to recommend** a Stonington Times article which commemorated John and the Solid Waste Department's efforts, while Ms. Young noted that SWD has, "**saved us a fortune**." There was additional feedback given about the upcoming food composting and clothing recycling programs, and Mr. O'Brien praised John for "**setting up a model program for the entire state**." Mr. Motherway requested specifics on bag distribution for the food **pilot** program; John explained that the first two bags would be mailed to everyone, and once a **distribution system has been settled on**, the remaining 50 bags would be available for pickup.

Public Works Department: Barbara McKrell, the Director of Public Works, Chris Greenlaw, the Town Engineer, and Tom Curioso, the Highway Supervisor began their DPW presentation.

Barbara opened with a personal anecdote about mentoring about mentoring a young man, Nate Bocelli, who quickly progressed through several DPW positions and taken on various department challenges over the years. DPW was assigned with the task of maintaining the athletic fields, and Nate took on considerable responsibility, overseeing the field projects while at the same time mentoring another employee, thus continuing to improve DPW's success.

Barbara continued, describing an enthusiastic engineering intern who is providing internal work that would typically cost \$100/hour for outside consulting. Other complex DPW projects were outlined, such as providing the pad and conduit for the Lobster Trap Tree at the Stonington Town Dock, becoming an internet sensation. DPW also developed the public disc golf course at Spellman Park (supporting Human Services) which required large trucks, backhoes, tractors and brush hogs. Ms. McKrell noted that she understands funding limitations, but is respectfully requesting replacement of DPW equipment, to continue to improve the Town and provide crucial infrastructure.

Barbara made a point to note that under DPW CIP Requests, her team **spent** time prioritizing requests by importance. There are two active projects at the top of **the** list that are crucial: the South Anguilla Road Bridge at \$90,000 and the Washington Street **Drainage** Improvements at \$51,000.

Moving on to operating, Barbara addressed a significant **increase** to the Highway Equipment line item for \$8,200 to cover the cost of a mower rental. This will allow DPW to have **two** mowers running simultaneously, and keep the roadside edge **continuously cut**. Barbara noted that the one mower recently failed, drawing an increase in resident **complaints** living near the roadside. Mr. Motherway questioned the cost of purchasing a new mower, **and** Barbara explained this includes the \$700,000 DPW Equipment request, **the #1** priority on the DPW CIP chart. This includes a small flail tractor attachment (which **enables roadside** mowing), **and** Ms. Young questioned if DPW has a tractor for the flail. Mr. Curioso stated **they have** a mid-size tractor they would use with the flail, in conjunction with the larger mower. **There were** additional questions posed about the flail/tractor functionality, which Tom **elaborated** on.

Tim asked if the \$8,200 **rental** in **the** budget was **redundant** with the purchase of the new flail, and Tom stated it will **take** time to **get** the flail – **so** the rental ensures they can keep mowing before the flail is delivered.

Michael requested **clarification on** the General Repairs and Maintenance budget, questioning if the \$78,000 **increase will** cover **the** costs through next fiscal year. Barbara disclosed that if DPW gets new equipment approved, the Repairs and Maintenance budget could be sufficient, but it may **also** increase later. Ms. McKrell noted that DPW requested repairs for several of the large trucks, **due to** diesel engine **upkeep** and exhaust system maintenance.

Moving on to **Engineering** expenses, Mr. Greenlaw started by thanking the Board for funding the Engineering Intern position last year, citing the ROI had been tremendous. Chris continued, announcing this has **especially** helped Engineering catch up on the MS4 Stormwater requirements, providing a detailed overview of the department's progress.

Mr. Greenlaw outlined Engineering budget increases and decreases of 2022/2023; Engineering Services is requesting a new full-time Assistant Engineer position, estimated at \$72,836. To help offset this expense, Chris planned to reduce the Phase II Storm Water Requirements cost by \$45,000.

Mr. Greenlaw defined the role of the Town Engineer: 30% of his time is used for planning, zoning and wetland applications, 35% is devoted to state permits, another 30% is used on CIP projects and management, with the remaining 5% spent on public questions and responses. With 65% of the Town Engineer's time spent undertaking continuous budgeting and CIP duties, of which an Assistant Engineer would manage. Chris noted that many of these tasks are done with the help of consultants, and the Assistant Engineer would help lessen these outside costs. Partially funding the Assistant Engineer's salary by offsetting the Storm Water Requirements should help cover costs by lessening consultant fees.

David had a question about the Professional Services line item, and if there was any impact on the \$20,000 budget by fulfilling the Assistant Engineer position. Mr. Greenlaw advised holding the line item as is, being a catch-all for all other special projects in the pipeline and covering costs for bridge experts, surveying, etc.

Mr. Fauerbach requested clarification that the Phase II Storm Water project wouldn't be delayed or negatively impacted by the proposed reduction, and Barbara reiterated this will allow Engineering to complete work traditionally outsourced internally. Furthermore, the cost of hiring Civil Engineers has recently skyrocketed, and the department is trying to build their in-house expertise to offset outside engineering expenses. Mr. Greenlaw discussed additional Engineering expectations and the onboarding process related to new role.

Mr. Statchen asked if there are other ways to quantify the savings that would result in department efficiencies, such as receiving additional funding for additional projects. Mr. Greenwald explained that he and Barbara had investigated additional funding mechanisms, citing the Holmes Street Seawall. Their method had the Engineering Intern researching and applying for grants, with a potential ROI paying for itself pending grant approval. Ms. McKrell specified that the grant provider contacted them, verbally proposing a \$50,000 Seawall grant pending a \$50,000 match used for advanced investigation. Bob stated he reviewed the department narrative and suggested if there were supplementary examples of further cost-saving practices that could be useful information. Barbara noted a shortcoming with Engineering staff often prevents them from properly assessing (and thus maintaining) infrastructure items – leaving Engineering in “reactive mode” instead of “proactive mode.” Lynn agreed: this is an expensive, less-than-ideal approach to infrastructure maintenance. Chris provided an anecdote about using an outside consultant who missed several key preventative maintenance issues (on an unrelated project) that an internal Engineer would have spotted, reaffirming the idea that a new Assistant Engineer is ultimately a cost-saving measure.

Mr. Motherway inquired about the proposed Engineer salary of \$82,050, compared to the spreadsheet cost of \$72,836. Mr. Sullivan clarified that the \$82,050 figure includes pension, health insurance and other benefits. Ms. Young asked if an Assistant Engineer could be found at this salary, and Chris presented the challenges of finding a competent Engineers – but a competitive salary could help find a viable candidate. The Chairman recognized the proposed salary won't guarantee they'll find an ideal Engineer, but the department had done its due diligence. Mr. O'Brien called for additional questions and there were none.

Barbara spoke on the Facilities operating budget, detailing a significant increase in last year's budget, but noting very few changes to this year's line items. Ms. McKrell explained that due to Covid-19 and other setbacks, the budget is very tight, with an uptick in material costs for Highway and Facilities. Barbara recognized a \$15,200 increase in the Highway Garage #1 line item, to provide her with a rental trailer office for her, the Engineer and staff to work on site. The trailer would also allow DPW to vacate their Town Hall offices while providing a central workspace at the Highway lot. Barbara explained that the current DPW office area doesn't have enough space and provided examples of compromises the department must make. Lynn asked how much the trailer would cost outright, and Ms. McKrell was unsure. Mr. O'Brien was curious about the trailer size, and Ms. McKrell said it was a 44' x 12' sales office trailer.

Mr. Fauerbach inquired if the trailer was a long-term solution, and Barbara stated the goal is to spend all her time in the trailer along with her team. In her current office, she's limited to a static standing desk in a "bull pen" configuration, having to work while accommodating the general public. A facility assessment was done to help establish the best location for a new facility and salt shed to be constructed in phases. The facility estimate came to \$7M, with the trailer on-site for the next three years, pending approval. Ms. McKrell suggested that she's not opposed to the purchase of a trailer, either. Lynn asked Barbara to investigate the cost of purchasing the trailer, and report back to the Board, having nothing to do with the \$7M facility estimate.

Ms. Young had some questions regarding the Facilities narrative and what was being spent on the West Broad Street school. Tom outlined the details of the school maintenance, with the heating system being the biggest issue (among a few minor things). Ms. Chesebrough noted that the tenants share a good deal of maintenance costs, while citing some examples.

Lynn had a follow-up question regarding the Old Mystic Former BOE Admin building, and if the building is worth saving. Danielle explained that based on the BOF's recommendation, it makes the most sense to continue using it for much needed storage. There were additional questions from the Board about DPW maintenance line items, entailing the Borough playground, the Veteran's Memorial and Former BOE Admin Building. Mr. O'Brien called for any questions, of which there were none.

Moving on to the Highway CIP Requests, Mr. Greenlaw spoke about the Town-wide Drainage Improvements – an ongoing project which funds reconstruction of problematic drainage systems, helping to reduce icing, flooding and property damage. Chris recognized that \$100,000/year is a daunting cost and prepared a line-by-line overview detailing the benefits of each project. For pending projects, Highway expects over \$300,000 to be spent on both small and large projects – repairing basins and sub-street level culverts, for example. Lynn asked if the Coogan Blvd. – Culvert Rehabilitation fell under this spending, and Mr. Greenlaw cited this project was excluded from CIP funding, after a newly updated sufficiency assessment.

A handout was distributed to the Board charting ongoing DPW projects and the basis for funding them. Mr. Fauerbach inquired if the current budget line item of \$136,000 was the account balance, and Chris explained that it was, but the department intends to use all of it. Mr. Greenlaw noted material shortages postponing the Taugwonk Road project, and the amount of

administrative work required to ensure delays are kept to a minimum. Ms. Norman asked if the budget is being spent on other in-progress projects, with Lynn asking a follow-up question if any of the \$136,000 is committed. Ms. McKrell expanded on the challenge of managing multiple projects, detailing the amount of work that goes into finding the lowest bid, while still paying for works in progress. Ms. Young reviewed several items on the handout, requesting clarification if everything on the handout had been committed, with all \$136,000 spent, or if there will be additional requests that aren't outlined on the sheet. Ms. McKrell indicated that all \$136,000 is accounted for, and the department is constantly faced with new repairs as they come up – citing various catch basin failures as an ongoing issue. Ms. Chesebrough summarized, stating on average about \$80,000-100,000 is needed per year, with Barbara noting in the past, the account was funded \$25,000-50,000 historically.

Michael asked how critical the Riverside Drive Fail Cross Culvert project is at a cost of \$200,000. Chris explained that with this project alone costing over \$136,000, DPW will opt to request funding in \$100,000 increments to build up the account over the next few years. There was additional discussion about various grants and other expenses relating to the project, with the Chairman explaining this will be a multi-year project that won't require the \$200,000 being spent this fiscal year.

Barbara addressed the Public Works Equipment request, providing a revised list and spreadsheet to the Board. The Board asked questions about the use of department-specific equipment, the cost of replacing several large trucks, and the reasoning behind an electric Ford F-150 Lightning purchase. Barbara posited there are a lot of transportation tasks that don't require a large truck, with Tom noting the expense falls in-line with the new green initiatives. Mr. Statchen stated that he thinks it's a proactive move, and there are Members who appreciate an alternative fuel approach. Ms. McKrell explained DPW has been put on a list for the F-150 Lightning six months ago, and there was speculation among the Board it may be over a year before the truck is delivered. Lynn asked about the charging station requirements, and Tom noted the Lightning is charged with a standard 120V outlet, but a rapid charger may be acquired at some point.

Mr. Johnson inquired about the Ford Transit request (a utility-style passenger van), and Barbara specified it will replace a 2006 Ranger pickup that can be difficult to transport large equipment with. Michael asked if an adjustment in trade-in value could potentially offset some new vehicle costs, and Mr. Curioso suggested that when it's closer to the time of purchase, he'll be able to provide a more accurate estimate. There was additional discussion about vehicle trade-in prospects, with Mr. Curioso indicating he will follow up soon.

Bob noted the 2006 Dump Truck replacement value was \$205,000 and asked for specifics about its current life cycle. Tom explained the Dump Truck has undergone maintenance to prolong its life but is starting to be overcome with severe rust issues and wouldn't recommend it for everyday use indefinitely. Ms. Young recalled another recently purchased truck the cost \$205,000 but remembered a \$165,000 estimate when the truck was first proposed. Tom suggested that despite requesting the most bare bones model the DPW could get away with, \$205,000 is the current market rate for the truck.

Circling back to the F-150 Lightning, Mr. Motherway asked if a Ford Transit could be used instead, saving roughly \$20,000. The Chairman clarified that Transits are designed for tradesmen and provides several advantages that a truck can't. Bob noted that DPW currently has 12 trucks with four of them out of life cycle – asking if a truck were to die tomorrow, how this impact operations. Mr. Curioso explained they do have a spare truck as a contingency, but something like a blizzard can disable much of the fleet – even being a challenge for the F-550. The Chairman asked if there were additional questions; there were not.

Ms. McKrell brought up the DPW Office Trailer CIP item, reiterating it's a 44' x 12' office trailer to be kept at the DPW Garage. Mr. O'Brien asked if the trailer had a bathroom; it does not. Ms. Young requested confirmation the first-year rental cost is \$25,000, and Barbara projected that the first cost for mobilization could be under \$10,000 – but a \$10,000 estimate was needed for CIP item eligibility, with the rental cost being under the Operations budget. Bob inquired about the one-time cost for the trailer, and Ms. McKrell outlined this cost covers set up, communications and electric.

The next CIP items were Road Maintenance – Major Maintenance and Road Maintenance – Capital, a Pavement Management prerequisite that forecasts \$1.2M should be spent to maintain the current road rating of 77.3 – a C+ rating (down from a previous 78% rating). Ms. McKrell elaborated, stating DPW has used funding very efficiently and economically thus far. Barbara outlined several treatments (such as a chip-seal treatment), and Capital reconstruction that will prolong road life by 20-30 years. Barbara requested \$900,000, with State and County Road providing \$300,000 – totaling \$1.2M. Lynn asked about ARPA funding expended on roads, with \$700,000 spent on ARPA funds to repair a piece of Al Harvey Road, with an additional \$350,000 to complete the road last year. Ms. Young asked if the \$1.2M is enough keep roads maintained around the current 77-78% rate, which Ms. McKrell stated it should be, before outlining detailed operating procedure of town road maintenance, which utilizes cutting-edge maps, metrics, and GIS systems. Mr. Fauerbach inquired what the annual theoretical limit is for the DPW budget, to which Barbara stated with current workload and staff, they cannot fully utilize more than the \$1.2M budget allows. There was additional commentary from Barbara and Mr. Greenlaw about various project planning and expenses for the fiscal year. The Chairman called for additional questions; there were none.

Ms. McKrell shared some good news – a DPW Radio Replacement line item of \$98,999 was funded and was no longer being requested from the Board. Furthermore, Barbara noted the \$100,000 ADA Compliance Improvements (providing ADA ramps) request is funded by a State grant, providing \$230,452. Ms. Young requested confirmation the DPW requests were \$200,000 less because of this funding, and Barbara confirmed this was correct, and provided additional details about the funding.

The Stillman Avenue Retaining Wall Replacement CIP was addressed (a \$15,000 request), with Ms. McKrell explaining the wall is in danger of failing and will require an outside consultant to initiate the project. Lynn asked if the \$15,000 was specifically for initiating it – Barbara confirmed it was. There was discussion pertaining to the wall's location, and differing opinions between property owners in the project vicinity. Mr. Motherway requested clarification about

the property dispute, with Ms. McKrell explaining the wall is technically Town property which structurally supports the sidewalk. Lynn asked what happens if the easement isn't approved, and Barbara stated that with enough time, the sidewalk and surrounding road will fail.

Moving on to the Bridge Replacement & Structural Improvement Fund, Mr. Greenlaw cited this was a previously funded item, and provided an overview of the 17 Town bridge structures requiring work – a \$40M total cost. The funding of this account will facilitate interim structures for safety while extending the life of bridges overall. Chris quoted several recent bridge projects in which multiple towns shared funding to effectively complete projects. Mr. Greenlaw elaborated on the use of funds (using the Holmes Street Bridge as an example) so that the Highway Department can continue ongoing maintenance, rather than needing to replace bridges outright. Lynn inquired what this fund would cost if bridges shared by towns were excluded, with Chris stating this is a complicated answer, referring to a newly made Asset Management Plan outlining specific repairs and replacements needed for the next 25 years. Mr. Greenlaw distributed a paper copy of this “living” bridge maintenance spreadsheet.

Mr. Statchen asked how much money is currently in the Structural Improvement Fund, and Chris disclosed that approximately \$50,000 remains. There were questions from the Board about metrics, proposals and initialisms used in the provided spreadsheet. Ms. Young asked for the purpose of the FLBP (Federal Local Bridge Program) cost of \$10.9M for 2026, and Mr. Greenlaw explained this is a guideline for potential Federal grant funding – a rate of 80% of the total estimated annual cost of \$13.7M needed in 2026. Chris continued, noting the Asset Management Plan requires an amount of necessary inspection and repair to ascertain bridge life cycles, but considered it a document of great importance for future planning. Barbara stressed the importance of the Engineer's role, noting assessments like these weren't available until Chris took the initiative to make them. There were questions pertaining to the document's relationship to certain CIP line items, and Chris explained this “road map” doesn't directly correlate to current CIP requests.

Chris now discussed the Pawcatuck Pumphouse: Roof Replacement & Masonry Repair line item (\$70,000), presenting an overview of the Pumphouse's history and its importance in storm water/river management. Mr. Greenlaw noted the account was previously funded, with a brief detail of the upkeep procedure. Ms. Young asked how often the pumps get used, and Mr. Curioso reported instances of their use and effectiveness during notable storms.

The South Anguilla Road Bridge was the next line item (\$170,000, increased from \$90,000), with Chris explaining the full replacement of the bridge would be \$230,000. The bridge included in the Inland Wetland application, which involves replacement of deteriorated parapet walls and railing, along with recommended deck surface replacement. Chris outlined the significant cost increase, entailing getting a wetlands permit, replacement of the membrane, maintenance control devices, consulting fees, etc. – but noting the \$170,000 is a final figure, including contingency and incidental costs.

The Chairman noticed a discrepancy regarding repeating page numbers and differing CIP costs. Mr. O'Brien reviewed with Mr. Sullivan to clarify the correct projections. In summary, Mr. Greenlaw concluded the \$170,000 figure for the South Anguilla Road Bridge is adequate.

Chris proceeded to the Washing Street Drainage Improvements (another previously funded account at \$18,000), and requested an additional \$51,000 for the project, currently at 90% completion. Mr. Greenlaw outlined the work, including excavation, drain pipe placement and entailing Amtrak review and approval. The Chairman called for questions; Michael asked if Engineering was certain these requests didn't fall under discretionary spending. Ms. Chesebrough confirmed these are crucial projects, many of which have been previously committed.

Chris addressed the Bridge Engineering and Design Fund item (\$50,000), of which the Asset Management Plan was crafted from, cataloging and identifying problematic bridge elements. Mr. Greenlaw reiterated the importance of the Plan, which will be used as a guide to keep things "marching forward" on the design side. There were no further questions from the Board.

The Holmes Avenue – Wall Replacement project cost of \$25,000 was addressed, and Barbara indicated she anticipated a \$50,000 grant to begin the project. This required Docko Engineering to assist with the assessment, who determined the seawall is a layered, 100-year-old wall built on marsh, with soil underneath it not suitable for construction. The wall is composed of two upper and lower layers, with a crumbling foundation supporting the underlying walls. Many residents have contacted the DPW to request the wall be rebuilt, with the study determining the entire wall is needing replacement. Current estimates reflect reconstruction could be up to \$1M, but it was recommended that \$92,000 be spent on hydrographic studies and further assessments first. The wall isn't at immediate risk of failing, but the \$25,000 request will cover an investigation to help prepare a reconstruction plan. Mr. Motherway asked if the \$25,000 partially pay for the investigation, and Barbara confirmed it would. Ms. Young asked when the project would take place, Ms. McKrell indicated it wouldn't happen for a while, but a long-term plan is needed. Barbara explained \$25,000, plus a \$50,000 grant, and another \$22,000 from her Operational Budget would be spent to facilitate the Docko assessment. The Chairman called for additional questions, and there were none.

Regarding Noyes Avenue – Wall and Road Replacement project (\$425,000), Barbara explained that Noyes Avenue is a town-accepted road, with the road wall comprised of stone and concrete, suffering from deteriorating bayside elements, resulting in failure of both the wall and roadway. This project will require design and permitting, as well as a new scour wall and roadway section. Ms. McKrell detailed further setbacks and current upkeep, with the current solution utilizing plastic barricades to prevent drivers from passing through. Ms. Young inquired about the total study cost, and Barbara estimated it to be \$25,000. Ms. Young stated that she's had to fix seawalls before and questioned if \$425,000 would be sufficient, Ms. McKrell said that it should be, with the factored in cost of road repair as well. Mr. Fauerbach asked if the urgency of this increased, as it's a designated "C" item but has moved up the DPW priority list, and Barbara

stated that this is now considered an environmental issue they have been dealing with for over 10 years. There was further discussion about the Noyes Avenue task, and various design/engineering estimates. Mr. O'Brien asked for an estimate on what a study may cost, and Chris estimated 10% of projected costs, around \$42,000. Barbara estimated studies would be closer to \$75,000, factoring in the length of the wall.

The Engineer discussed the Boat Pumpout Facility at Town Down projects, projecting a \$21,853 cost. The Town of Stonington owns and operates this dockside pump, which is in need of replacement, along with hoses, electrical controls, etc. DPW has applied for a DEEP grant that may cover up to 75% of the costs, with Mr. Sullivan's noting the presumption of this grant funding can be seen in line separate line item. Mr. Motherway inquired if the pump needed replacement because it's not operating at efficiency, with Chris clarifying that it's operational, but isn't likely to last much longer. Lynn asked if the pump could be rebuilt as a cost-saving measure, with Chris detailing it's a single pump with no redundancy. There were no additional questions on this matter.

Barbara introduced the Town Hall – HVAC Replacement and Human Services HVAC Replacement – Phase II CIP items (\$300,000 and \$100,000), describing the recent ARPA grant which covered \$1.2M for Town Hall, and \$340,000 for Human Services. Barbara mentioned when PWD applied for the ARPA grant, these two estimates were the best guess, but after further refinement will need more (as noted in the CIP request). Lynn asked what happened to the built-in contingency that was provided for this renovation, and Ms. McKrell mentioned the contingency has still not been spent; Ms. Young suggested striking \$400,000 from the item. Michael asked why the Board of Selectmen reduced the Town Hall HVAC estimate from \$602,898 to \$300,000, and why it wasn't completely taken out in lieu of the ARPA fund. Ms. McKrell explained the original ask was what the second estimate indicated, combined for both facilities. Mr. Statchen requested what the final cost would be for everything, to which Barbara wasn't sure as it is pending an assessment. This assessment is utilizing an HVAC engineer, who is currently evaluating both facilities and will provide insight as to what needs immediate repairs and what can be postponed. Bob asked where the \$1.2M figure came from, and Barbara stated that the initial estimate was far too low; roughly four years ago an HVAC estimate was done, a bid was put out, and Barbara was informed by the vendors the estimate wasn't accurate. Mr. Statchen asked if the estimate was too low due to inflation and other market factors, and Ms. McKrell noted they were half the cost of what they should have been – disregarding several aspects, such as employee relocation, the overhead and design involved. Lynn asked if the estimate started off too low, and then grossed up for correction, inflation and ARPA funds flowing to the project, which Barbara confirmed it was. Ms. McKrell explained the original estimate was \$1.2M was recalculated to \$1.8M, with Lynn observing the estimate is up by 50% and by no means a firm number. Furthermore, the Human Services HVAC estimate of \$340,000 went up to nearly \$800,000. Ms. Young asked if this was a result of ARPA funds chasing HVAC, or if the estimates were that far off, and Barbara reiterated the first estimate was done by a mechanical engineer, who didn't include all necessary costs. There was additional discussion about the HVAC estimate setbacks and what had happened. Mr. Statchen asked for a reminder regarding the contingency funds, and Lynn explained the project included a 15% contingency

tied to the ARPA funding and noted this required future discussion. Bob pointed out that the Board still doesn't have an accurate HVAC estimate, and Mr. O'Brien reminded everyone that as long as the quote comes in when Engineering thinks it will, there should be enough time for the Board to make adjustments after the Public Hearing. Mr. Statchen asked Chris to share the newly updated estimate figure; Chris stated the preliminary schematic design estimate came in at \$2.8M, with Town Hall at \$1.89M and Human Services at \$720,000. Ms. Young asked if it makes sense to put off the HVAC repairs until a later date, and Mr. O'Brien advised that this would be discussed during Deliberations. The Director of Finance asked for clarification, asking if the \$300,000 and \$100,000 would be coming out of the projects, and Lynn said she suggested it, but it should be left in until Deliberations.

Moving on to the Pawcatuck Pumphouse: Fire Suppression Line Abandonment (\$25,000), Chris explains this fire suppression system was constructed by the ARMY Corp of Engineer, penetrating through the earthen dyke prior to entering the Pawcatuck River. The system previously served needs for fire protection for the two Mechanic Street mills prior to the municipal water system. Lynn proposed it should be filled with concrete, and Barbara explained that the suppression line is ten feet below level, and they need reasonable assurance before a grouting option like the one Lynn proposed could be undertaken. This funding would determine what lies beneath the abandoned line and help establish a potential fix for it. There were no further questions pertaining to this item.

Ms. Greenlaw addressed the Pawcatuck River Levee Gate Repair CIP item, a \$25,000 cost, outlining the levees general function to the Board. Army Corp of Engineers provides an annual assessment of the gate and has identified rust on the gate joints that need tending to. Chris explained this is a one-off, custom levee, requiring a specialist to provide a unique repair approach. There was some discussion among the members about the gates function, how often it's used and so on.

The West Broad Street School Repairs \$50,000 item came up next, with Ms. Chesebrough explaining this is included as part of the ongoing contract with the Town, that will continue for another three years. Ms. Young asked if the repairs still entail exterior maintenance, lawn care, etc. and Mr. O'Brien stated they do. Bob asked for clarification regarding the \$30,000 to 50,000 increase from last year, with Barbara explaining that a \$20,000 reserve from an account offset last year's cost.

The next item, MS4 - D.C.I.A. Projects (\$150,000) was approached, with Mr. Greenlaw provided a general overview this provision, noting its implementation from DEEP is designed to prevent unnecessary storm water runoff during significant storm events by means of retrofitting existing stormwater systems. There were additional questions from the Board about the scope of the project, with Chris fielding them. Chris concluded the DEEP Clean Water act mandates that we accept storm water runoff is intercepted, cleaned and infiltrated accordingly. There was discussion between Tim and Lynn about potential solutions, with Mr. O'Brien providing his expertise in dealing with water treatment from his business perspective. The Chairman called for any final questions, or if any items had been overlooked; there were none.

Auditor for Fiscal 2022: Mr. Sullivan stated to the Board he needed to do a bit more research before he could make a recommendation.

Previous Minutes: The Chairman called for a motion to approve the 2-2-22 Meeting Minutes. Ms. Norman motioned, Mr. Fauerbach seconded the motion, the Chairman requested any addenda or corrections that needed to be done. Mr. Fauerbach explained there were a few typos to review with the Secretary after the meeting.

The Minutes were unanimously approved.

Correspondence: Mr. Sullivan addressed a new email from the Tax Collector that he would distribute to the Board. Michael summarized, the Town is in good shape with 99% of Real Estate tax collected, and 97.8% of Motor Vehicle taxes had been collected.

Liaison Reports: There were no Liaison Reports to be shared.

The Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn, Ms. Young motioned, Ms. Norman seconded, motion passed unanimously at 10:16 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin Eckert

Board of Finance Recording Secretary