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MR. SHIBLEY: Good evening, everyone. Sorry we're running about five minutes late, but I think almost all of us are here tonight to start off the council meeting.

First, I'd like to ask -- call the town council, call the order and roll call. Mrs. George is here -- no, she's not. Okay. Mr. Waters.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Present.

MR. MC GEE: Here.

MS. CARLSON: Here.

MS. BACON: Here.

MR. SHIBLEY: Present. Okay. And then if I could ask Mr. Glen Piette if he could call the roll call for the sewer subcommittee. Excuse me, I believe Mr. Skurka, the Chairman, is running a few minutes late. So we'll go to the vice chairman who will call the roll.

MR. RAPOSO: Here.

MR. PIETTE: Joe Spada? John Colaluca?

MR. COLALUCA: Here.

MR. SACCOCCIA: Here.

MR. PIETTE: Glen Piette, I'm here. And Glen is late.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
Spearman, if you would be so kind to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED)

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you, sir. And also if you could give the emergency evacuation plan, if needed, which we hope not.

MR. SPEARMAN: Okay. In case of emergency, there's exits up in the front, in the middle, and in the back there. Go out there. Follow the exit signs. Takes you right out there.
Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you, Mr. Spearman. Okay. Following the agenda, Item B1, we have resolutions for discussion and action. I guess I'll read it. Resolution Number 1, B1, resolution authorizing the town manager to look into an appropriate place to stop construction of the sewer line on Hazard Street, and have the authority to order construction to stop once the sewer line is satisfactorily constructed to such point. So that is the first resolution that we are handling tonight. And with that, we're going to read the entire resolution, Mr. Waters, or --

MS. CARLSON: Mr. President, I have a question.
MR. SHIBLEY: Let me get my answer first.

MR. WATERS: That's up to you, if you'd like to read the entire resolution --

MR. SHIBLEY: Well, just in case it has changed a little bit from what we had, I think it would be a good idea. Mr. Gorham.

MR. GORHAM: So this is entitled -- this is the resolution, and the president just read the title of the resolution, and here is what it says. Whereas, town council by Resolution 59-17-4874 ordered the contract to construction sewers along Hazard Street to John Rocchio Corporation at the June 26, 2017 town council meeting, and authorized the town manager to proceed with the project; and, whereas, the contracted price of $421,442 is the amount that the town agreed to construct the Hazard Street line and, whereas, the town has determined that it is in the best interest of the town and its residents to determine if there is an appropriate place to stop construction of the sewer line on Hazard Street based on unprotected and unforeseen construction costs, if the town manager determines it is necessary and appropriate; and, whereas, the town council wishes to authorize the town manager, in consultation with the town's consulting
engineers, Weston & Sampson, and the town finance
director, to determine if there is an appropriate
place to stop the project prior to completion; and,
whereas, depending on outstanding expenditures,
excess materials, and other factors once a stopping
location has been determined by the town manager,
the town manager, in consultation with the town's
consulting engineers, Weston & Sampson, and the
town finance director is authorized to act as the
agent of the town to ensure that the construction
is completed in an orderly and satisfactory fashion
up to such stopping point; and, whereas, the town
manager is authorized and appointed as the final
negotiator and signatory on the contract with
Rocchio, including termination thereof to the point
where the town manager determines that construction
of such line should be stopped; and, whereas, the
town manager will report back to the town council
on the final outcome of the Hazard Street sewer
project. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the
town council of the Town of Coventry, Rhode Island,
authorizes the town manager in consultation with
the town's consulting engineers, Weston & Sampson,
and the town finance director to act as the agent
of the town in all respects in executing the Hazard
Street sewer project, including the power to terminate the contract with John Rocchio Corporation and to select an appropriate place in consultation with the town's consulting engineers, Weston & Sampson, and the town finance director, if necessary, to stop construction of the sewer line and to negotiate such termination with John Rocchio once the sewer line has been satisfactorily constructed to such point. And then it just says passed and adopted today. And so that is before the council for discussion, Mr. President.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you, Mr. Gorham. In that the resolution before us has been read, and I know we'll probably have discussion, but I firstly would like to have a motion to accept.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: So moved.

MR. MC GEE: Second.

MR. SHIBLEY: Is there any discussion?

MS. CARLSON: And I wrote this out just so I wouldn't forget anything. Mr. President, I would like to make a motion that the council postpone the two resolutions under Item B until after Item C, Numbers 1 and 2. This will allow council to consider the expert and professional testimony from the town manager, the sewer subcommittee, Weston &
Sampson, and Mr. Angelo Liberti, who is the chief of surface water protection at RIDEM, who was invited to our meeting by Senator Raptakis. We may then consider changes, additions, or stipulations to the two resolutions, and I also want to thank the help we received from our state delegation and I'd like to welcome everybody here. It's great to see such a great size crowd. Thank you. So I'd like to make a motion to postpone discussion and/or action on these resolutions until we hear all the other --

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Later on that will be your, I guess if ours doesn't pass, then you'll have your chance -- another motion. Mr. McGee, you have a comment?

MR. MC GEE: This would be a good time to make my statement. I want to read a little statement I made out concerning this whole situation. Just bear with me. Take me a couple of minutes.

I would like to make a statement about our sewer program. When I took office seven years ago, we already had a sewer infrastructure and a sewer fund and a facility plan in place. Part of our job as elected officials was to maintain the sewer fund
so it will be self-sustainable and to do what we
had to do to continue the growth of the sewer fund
and ultimately the sewer projects. We have
attempted to make the assessments more feasible,
but it is very difficult with the high cost of
construction. The assessment process is pretty
much done the same way throughout most towns and
cities in the State of Rhode Island. As mentioned
on Tuesday's council meeting, if we do not continue
our sewer program, the sewer fund will not be
solvent within a short period of time. The payment
on our bonds will have to be paid out of our
general fund and cause a tax increase to every
taxpayer in town, whether you have sewers or not.

In my eyes that is not fair to those
taxpayers that will not benefit from the program,
which includes approximately 30,000 people.
Furthermore, it is not fair to those taxpayers who
have already paid their sewer assessment and now
would have to pay taxes again. I feel that the
sewer program is right for the Town of Coventry.
However, I hear my constituents' concerns about the
financial hardships that the sewers would cause, as
District 3 is full of hard working, blue collar
families. I hear you.
After last Tuesday's meeting, hearing the discontent and concern, I had a conversation with our town manager and my fellow councilman and sewer subcommittee member Greg Labissonniere, and we thought it would be a good idea to halt the sewer projects until we could do a socioeconomic survey throughout the whole town to re-evaluate the needs and wants for sewers.

I did a survey of the Quidnick area in 2011, sending out approximately 250 surveys with frequently asked questions including sewer assessments. About one-fifth of the surveys were returned, which is 48 out of 257. Hazard Street had four residents for sewers, six against, and three with no opinion. Of the approximately thirty homes on Hazard Street, that made our decision a difficult; but at the time, the minimum assessment would have been $23,000 per household. We decided to put a moratorium on sewers until we could find a more cost-effective way to do it. Fast forward to 2017, the sewer subcommittee decided to combine more expansion areas like Hazard Street with less expensive areas like Tiogue Avenue to make it more cost effective.

I repeat, the decision to continue the
sewer projects was a unanimous decision by the
sewer subcommittee brought to the town council for
a vote by unanimous decision 5 to 0, not 4 to 1 as
told to the taxpayers. To move forward with the
Hazard Street sewer project, the Hazard Street
taxpayers have not been ignored. We are trying to
come up with a fiscally responsible way to solve
this situation, professionally and respectfully.
For all those responsible -- responsibility and
negative comments to fall on the back of Councilman
McGee is totally unfair and unsubstantiated.

I understand that I work for the taxpayers
of District 3 and our community has always been a
great place to raise a family. The values that we
share with our neighbors are the envy of other
districts. Let us stop the negativity and cruel
comments. Let us take a breath and work for our
district, our community, and our town.

To the voters of District 3, I will
continue to be your voice of reason to move the
Town of Coventry forward in a positive manner.

Thank you.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. McGee.

Appreciate your comments as well. Any other
comments regarding the initial motion and second?
If not, having heard the additional motion, would Mr. Laboissionnerie and Mr. McGee care to withdraw the first motion and second?

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Withdraw the second first or the motion?

MR. SHIBLEY: Withdraw the motion.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: I will withdraw the motion at this time to accept this resolution due to Mrs. Carlson's concerns. And if you have any other questions or statements as to things that may or may not be in here, because, I mean, the intent is to stop the project, where it says -- substantially close to where it is now, in light of the information that has come forward. But in respect, I will withdraw my motion.

MS. CARLSON: I'd actually like to include both motions in my motion because I'd like to get more information, but also -- I meant, sorry, resolutions -- got too many motions up there -- because I think, yes, we have to halt this project, absolutely; but there are other -- probably other ways we can explain it and put some more information out there before we vote on these motions -- resolutions.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. McGee, would you care to withdraw your second on the initial --

MR. MC GEE: I would not care. I think this is a good resolution. I think we're going to stop the project, and we can still have discussion after the resolution. But I do not want to withdraw my second.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. So --

MS. CARLSON: I'm not throwing the resolutions out. I would just like to get more discussion. I agree with the intent of the resolution. Plus we just got the new revised one when we sat down. So I didn't -- I haven't even -- and I know --

MR. SHIBLEY: All right. Thank you, Mr. McGee. I guess it's -- motion has been withdrawn. So the second is sort of like not germane. Thank you for the legal jargon at this time. All right. So at this time, the motion -- presentation before the B1 and B2. Okay. That motion has been made, right, you agree, all right, to move the public forum ahead of B1 and B2. We have a motion and a second at this time, and all in favor of that motion.

(VOICE VOTE: PASSED)
MR. SHIBLEY: That's 4 to 1. Okay. So at this time, Mr. Waters, I guess we have Weston & Sampson starting off on this one; is that correct?

MR. WATERS: Yup. We will have -- just for the audience, we will have a presentation. This is similar to the presentation that was done back on September 25th at the town council meeting by our engineers, Weston & Sampson. Mr. Nichols will be leading the presentation. You can see visuals on either wall, followed by our finance director, Bob Thibeault. He'll be doing a historic presentation on the finances of the sewer program overall; and then after the two presentations, it's my understanding that we'll have the public forum, at which there'll be an opportunity for the public to come forward and ask questions. Our town solicitor, Nick Gorham, will be moderating that public forum to help maintain order. We do have a microphone over here, correct, yup. So if you have questions at the end, you can come up to the microphone and then we'll go from there. So at this time --

MR. SHIBLEY: If I could just --

MR. WATERS: Do you want to -- to help keep order, do you want to limit questions to two
or three minutes?

MR. SHIBLEY: Well, we haven't gotten through the presentations yet. I think that's probably a good idea, but let's -- the presentation -- incidentally, let me just precede the presentation with the general intent of this meeting tonight was informational. That's why we're having this meeting. In between scheduling this informational meeting to the residents that are concerned, the town manager decided it would be not a bad idea to go temporary, stopping the sewer project, and I think he talked to all council people, and I think basically we're in agreement with his idea, a total stop on Hazard Street up to the point where they can cut it off.

Again, that said, that's where we're leading up now to the informational part of the meeting. I must say, however, my opinion, sewers are a good thing. I only have to drive by my neighborhood today, and I see a septic system being put on residence at the corner of Laurel and Princeton, big septic system going in. I also heard yesterday morning that two houses down, they need a big septic system project going to be done in the near future. So I would love sewers in Oak
Haven. I've said that for 38 years that I've lived there. Unfortunately, we're not on the high priority list. Okay. And we're probably -- I don't know if we'll ever see them in Oak Haven, but they're going to spend, spend, spend on putting in the septic systems that, at best, will be temporary, where sewers are permanent. Okay.

Mr. Nichols, are you here to start that informational hearing now and project? Go right ahead. Please bear with us so we can get through this.

MR. NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So for those of you who don't remember me, I'm Kent Nichols with Weston & Sampson. With me tonight on my left-hand side is Tim DeGuglielmo who has been the principal author of the more recent versions of the Coventry wastewater facility plan. I actually wrote probably the bulk of the original plan that we put together back in the '90's, early 90's, and spent a lot of time at that point studying various sections of Coventry and the sewer needs. So I think we're actually pretty well prepared to answer a bunch of questions. In the interest of time tonight, we're going to go through a very quick summary of the facility planning process and kind
of the history of where we've been with sewers in Coventry. As I said, we're going to do that relatively quickly for two reasons. One is I know a lot of you may have already seen my summarized presentation at one of the past town council meetings. I'm actually hopeful that maybe a few of you actually came to our public meeting when we did the facility plan when we actually did this and we tried to get people to be interested and come out and talk about sewer planning. And you -- so you may have also seen it either in front of the sewer subcommittee or actually at our public hearing that we did back when we did the facility plans.

And so the first question is what is a sewer facility plan, if we could click the slide. Ed, how does that work? I just wave to you? Good. Okay. So the first thing is a little discussion of why we do facility plans, how that works. Facility planning is a historic thing where the town takes on a challenge, in this case a utility challenge, dealing with where to extend sewers to and has to make some decisions, where does that happen? It's not random. We try to make good decisions with that using physical, geophysical, sometimes ground conditions, and some calculations and engineering
judgment, and we also take into account a
collection of data to the degree that we can
capture information from the public and from as
many sources of physical information as we can.
That means DEM's records and other places like
that.

In the case of facility planning in
Coventry, facility planning actually dates back to
shortly after the Clean Water Act was passed in the
'70's. The state started to take on this
opportunity to look at what needed to be done to
protect water resources in all areas; and believe
it or not, there are a lot of places that had
sewers going back, you know, into the 1800's when
they were dense cities, but most places like
Coventry didn't have any real sewers at all. And
if they did, they were limited to some of those
very densely developed mill neighborhoods, and they
were just pipes that went out to the river. So the
goal at the point in the '70's was to figure out,
well, where should we extend infrastructure to and
why. The '70's culminated, late '70's culminated
in a facility plan by C.E. Maguire for Coventry
which was done circa 1977. That was predated
actually by the 208 regional area wide management
plans that were done by the state and Federal
governments. It kind of pre-did that and said
there are certain areas of various towns in all
states that will eventually need sewers. So
Coventry actually undertook it in the mid to late
'70's, they finished their first facility plan.
That facility plan pretty clearly showed areas of
eastern Coventry that needed sewers. Thereupon, on
a pretty regular basis, the town took to refine
that plan, to revisit that plan, to see if there
were other things made. As most of you know, we
did not build a serious large scale system of
sewers in Coventry in the 1970's. We also didn't
do it in the 1980's. We did, at some point in the
late 1980's, the town did vote for a couple of
sewer extensions that were done circa 1988, '89.
And honestly there was a couple of facility
planning steps in between there.

In general, the goal of the facility plan
is to make sure that the information that's
presented and used to make decisions is current and
is relevant to the decision-making process. It
revisits the physical information as much as it
does the cost of sewers as well as has anything
changed; do we have a need to change the approach
that we've used.

So in the case of Rhode Island DEM's regulations, they actually, in order for us to stay current with their funding program for sewers, the state revolving fund loan program, the town has to complete a reaffirmation as a minimum or an update to the facility plan every five years. And so as you look at the schedule, starting in the '70's, there was a plan done in the late '70's, one done in the early '80's. I think the first one that we were involved in was done in the '80's. It was kind of revisited with some isolated studies through the period of the '80's. We then -- the first one I was involved in personally to a great degree was undertaken circa 1992, culminated in about 1995. We then revisited that again circa early 2000, the 2003 facility plan. Reaffirmation was notable because that's when the fast track sewer project was built including the interceptor down Tiogue Ave. and Sandy Bottom Road and up Washington Street to West Warwick. Again, revisited in 2010; and most recently we presented an update to the facility plan in 2016.

So there have been a lot of opportunities through that time to try to collect information. I
would say the thing that's most notable in that facility planning is the areas, the principal areas that we've been discussing for sewers in Coventry have not changed significantly in that period of time. There are a number of areas that have been captured in the prior facility plans that, little by little, we've actually decided probably can be handled with onsite wastewater treatment systems or OWTS's to use the term that DEM uses, and those -- or septic systems for what most people would say. Those systems we felt like had advanced enough that we could take some areas off safely and frankly the process of building sewers has been very slow in Coventry. So we just haven't extended out to too many places over that period of time. But as you can now see, there's been a pretty long history of the facility planning.

So one thing I thought was of note and I presented this at the last meeting, this is actually a photocopy of a figure from the 1977 facility plan, again, offered by C.E. Maguire at the time, and as you can tell, probably a little hard to read this, but if you look really closely at those areas outlined in gold and yellow, those are, pretty much, all the areas that we're
continuing to discuss for sewer extensions in
Coventry at this point in time. Over a period of
40 years, very little change in that. Flip to the
next one, if you would.

We did undertake a goal of trying to
refine that plan as much as we could. So going
through the later facility plan, starting in the
circa '95 plan, we broke the town up into areas and
actually back when we did this, these sub areas
were actually used to do some analysis. And one
thing that's been discussed is a questionnaire. At
the time this was done, we actually sent a
questionnaire to every home that was in these
service areas, and we compiled those back. We
actually used the sub consultant to compile those
back into a database of what people thought, both
to get input on what people felt their septic
systems were capable of and how they were
functioning, but also to try to collect people's
opinions on sewers, which sewers aren't always
popular, but we wanted to try to get that
information. And that factored into the equation
originally. As each subsequent update and
reaffirmation of the facility plan proceeded, we
started little by little to take their results.
So what you'll see is some gray blobs in this figure. Those are actually areas that we've since taken out of the equation that, right now, don't appear to actually need sewer long term and they're not figured into the plan. The big picture for Coventry has always been to try to get the densely populated areas in eastern Coventry, particularly areas around the lake and around the rivers, to be served by sewers at an eventual point.

So what did we do in the last facility plan. This is kind of a quick summary of kind of where we were. We had built a few sewers already, and I'll talk about the areas of town that had been sewered up until this point in time. One of the main things we do is we recheck the flows to see where we stand. So for those of you who hadn't heard, Coventry actually made a decision back in the 1980's to join the West Warwick regional system. West Warwick had a facility plan that actually showed that they could build a very sizeable wastewater treatment plant down on Pulaski -- I mean, down on Pontiac. And they actually built a facility that was large enough and eventually could be upgraded to allow some capacity
for Coventry. So at that point in time, Coventry made the option of, instead of building its own plant that originally would have been located along the shores of the south bank of the Pawtuxet River, we actually ended up joining the West Warwick regional facility; and Coventry purchased at that time 2.25 million gallons a day of sewer capacity, average daily flow basis, which is actually quite a bit. It's enough certainly for all those areas I've shown you, enough to service and long-term treat, treat to a very high level and discharge cleanly to the environment, the effluent from all those areas in eastern Coventry.

But as I said, the facility plan moved slowly; and over time, we found that the needs were changing slightly. So we rearranged the flows a little bit here and there. At the end of these processes, we did see that areas like Contract 6 and 6A, which was the Lakeside Drive area, the area bounded by Tiogue Ave. and Arnold Road and Lake Tiogue were pretty high-needs area. That was done. In addition, the town decided that they could get a grant, a little bit of grant money to help institute the sewers up on Industrial Drive all the way up to the town hall. So that was kick-started
a little bit. And then the other thing is we actually made provisions in there for the town to make an acquisition of the Woodland Manor force main, which actually runs from the Woodland Manor development way out on Nooseneck Hill Road, all the way to the West Warwick line. And long term, it had always been envisioned to be a better fit for the town to own and maintain. It had previously been privately owned.

So with that, we also had utilization of those lines planned, and we decided that this facility plan adopted in 2016 would help us kind of guide the program forward as we see it. So -- so one thing that happens in the facility plan and this goes back to the original plan and has been updated each time is we talk a lot about physical conditions in the planning area. We talk about why we might actually need sewers and what actually governs the need for sewers in these areas. A lot of the criteria are about what's happening in the ground. And the reason we do that is because septic systems, once you have a septic tank at the end of this, the real treatment in a septic system actually occurs in the ground in the leaching system that goes beyond your septic tank. Most
people think my septic system is running really well if I can flush my toilet and my system never backs up, but that doesn't necessarily govern what makes a septic system function well. What actually makes it function well is a zone of unsaturated ground below the septic system discharge field and then a zone of saturated below that which allows the biology to establish and do some treatment in there.

Things that contribute to making areas not suitable for septic systems include shallow groundwater, shallow bedrock, extremely steep slopes, specific type of soils. Glacial till tends to be very tight. It doesn't really percolate well. Some other types of soils tend to be very loose. Good gravels and sands are very nice, and they drain well for a septic system, but the water doesn't stay long enough to give good treatment. So soil suitability is a big issue. We also looked at things like if you were in proximity to a wetland, very close proximity to a water supply or really small lots where the actual construction of a compliant septic system doesn't really work. So we worked through all those issues as well.

So in the end, Coventry had been through a
process of building sewers, and I'll kind of go
back through the history a little bit; but for
those of you who kind of followed along the
discussion, we started by building very small
inlets of sewer all along the West Warwick border.
A lot of those were built privately. Some of those
were built by the town. Things like in the 1980's
we built small extensions to some industrial and
commercial facilities. The Victor Electric sewer
up in Harris is a good example, what was at the
time the Cal Chemical line that extended a small
pump station down at the very southern end of
Arnold Road. The line that served the North Road
Terrace Housing Authority property off of Tiogue
Ave. right near the West Warwick line, but there
was principally never really a substantial sewer
system in Coventry.

So that changed most drastically in the
early 2000's, circa 2003, the town began to
identify an opportunity that came about when West
Greenwich was entertaining the location of the
Immunex Bionix project which then later became the
Amgen facility; and at that time, there was a need
to extend some additional sewer service to get a
very large quantity of wastewater from that site
back to the treatment plant in West Warwick. And so Coventry entered the negotiations for that; and through negotiation was offered a grant of approximately $6 million from that group, a little over $6 million to buy their portion of what would be the Town of Coventry's main interceptor sewer.

And basically what happened at that point in time is, and I apologize for the map, but at the end of the session, we also brought a big board up that we'll put up in the front if anyone has a real -- Tim's actually already assembled it -- which actually will show you all the lines in Coventry if you're interested. But this map kind of color codes them. Essentially what happened is at the end of Hopkins Hill Road, we picked up flow from the Amgen facility. We brought it all the way down to Tiogue Ave. We ran it down to Sandy Bottom Road. We built a new, large-scale pump station; and if you ever drive down Sandy Bottom Road, you see that big pump station every day you drive by there and that station then pumps up around the corner to about Knotty Oak where it goes back again by gravity down Washington Street all the way to the West Warwick system, continues to flow by gravity pretty much all the way through there down.
And that system principally allowed Coventry to
have access to what we call the lateral sewer areas
in the town, the areas that had always been
identified as needs areas but that we couldn't
previously treat because Coventry had no principal
sewer system.

So the sewer program kind of most recently
after that we culminated in a few sewer projects.
We did Contracts 4, 5, 6. Recently, the town did
Contract 7 which, as I said, was the Industrial
Drive area up to the town hall. And then we had
designed a Contract 8, which was Quidnick; and I
think as Councilman McGee had said earlier, there
was a stopping point where we kind of said well,
Quidnick is looking very expensive because --
mostly because of a lot of rock. So we set
Quidnick aside. And, honestly, everything had been
set aside until we restarted with the Arnold Road
pieces. And the two Arnold Road pieces are notable
because they were driven primarily by the town's
decision and vote to reconstruct the roadway and
the challenge is we did not want to dig up a newly
reconstructed beautiful roadway to put sewers in
after maybe five or so years, and Tiogue Lake being
as sensitive as it is, that thought process was
let's get some sewers in under the ground. So we ended up doing the Northern Arnold Road and the Southern Arnold Road projects which are essentially complete at this point in time and you've seen a lot of construction out there. What you see out there right now is actually the road reconstruction because the sewer work is done.

So, again, just to revisit existing planning areas in the town, 2016, they, as I said, do not look vastly different from what was done back in the earlier days of the sewer program. The areas that we have proposed for sewers in addition to that hazardous part of Quidnick, portions of the areas along both sides of Hopkins Hill Road, the additional in-fill areas, down along both sides of Arnold Road, in particular the areas lying close along the lake where there's water quality issues in the lake to be thought of. Those primarily include the West Shore Drive and the East Shore Drive areas. And then a number of other small in-fill areas both along the south branch of the Pawtuxet and, as I said, pieces of Quidnick that we know the soil conditions and rock quality issues are up there.

So with that, I think I will wrap and pass
back to Bob. All right.

MR. WATERS: All right. Did you want to put up our finance presentation, please. Our finance director will now go over a little bit of the finances of the current sewer fund, particularly the borrowing that's outstanding as well as some of the options for going forward and what the status of the town sewer fund is currently. Bob.

MR. THIBEAULT: Thank you. Hi. My name is Bob Thibeault. I'm the finance director for the town. As the manager stated, I'll be giving a brief presentation on the finances of the sewer program from its inception to today. And you can follow along on the walls as you do with Mr. Nichols.

When the sewer program began in 2004, the following funding sources were utilized to start that program: $6 million -- $6 million grant from Immunex, which is now Amgen; a $6 million tax anticipation note; and a $3.4 million loan from the state Economic Development Corporation. The town has expanded the program over the years by securing the following loans: $3.2 million, Rhode Island Clean Water financing agency loan, 2006; 5 million
in 2007; 2.9 million in 2009; 2.4 million in 2012; 2.1 million in 2013. The Economic Development Corporation tax anticipation notes were retired and rolled into a loan in 2013 at almost $8.2 million and this calendar year, $1.2 million loan from All American Financing.

The town also has annual loan obligations to the Town of West Warwick as governed by the intermunicipal agreement between the two towns for sewer services, and those are as follows: 2003, a $20.9 million wastewater facilities upgrade at the plant in West Warwick of which Coventry's share is 22.2 percent. 2004, Upper Maisie Quinn interceptor upgrade project, $3 million of which Coventry shares 27.39 percent. 2005, lower Maisie Quinn pump station force main project, $7.7 million, Coventry's share is 27.39 percent. 2006, upper Maisie Quinn interceptor upgrade project, an additional funding of $500,000 was needed to complete that project, of which Coventry's share again was 27.39 percent. 2007, Clyde interceptor project, $1.675 million, of which the town's share is 44.2 percent. And 2015 a phosphorous removal upgrade project at the West Warwick treatment facility, $12.5 million, Coventry's share of that
is 21.38 percent.

The town's FY '18 debt service for sewer-related bonds, both its own issue and West Warwick's issue, would be $2,593,369. Up until about Fiscal '12, the realized revenues were pretty sufficient to pay debt service and other expenses without making any major impact to the fund balance. Since Fiscal '12, fund balances trended downward as noted below. FY '10, the fund balance was $3.97 million. FY '11, 4.7 million; FY '12, 5.4 million; FY '13, 3.3 million; FY '14, 4.2 million; FY '15, 3.9 million; FY '16, reduced to 1.48 million. Fiscal 17 preaudit subject to change fund balance is 2.4 million. The source of all those numbers from Fiscal '10 to '16, our annual audited financial statements with the exception of Fiscal '17 which is pre-audit.

Per the trust indenture between the Town of Coventry and Wells Fargo Bank and Rhode Island Infrastructure Bank, formerly Rhode Island Clean Water, the annual fund balance must be 125 percent of Coventry-issued annual debt service. For Fiscal '16, fund balance was only 106 percent of the annual Coventry-issued debt service. Fiscal '17 the pre-audit fund balance is 167 percent of the
annual Coventry-issued debt service.

Major reasons for the downward trend in fund balance are as follows: The 2012 Rhode Island Clean Water loan, the annual debt service on the loan is exceeding the assessments billed by approximately $47 1/2 thousand a year. Some of the individuals have paid their entire assessments upfront; but as we continue to bill, the debt service exceeds the annual billing that we're sending out. The 2013 Rhode Island Clean Water loan, the annual debt service is greater than the assessments by over $160,000 because we're currently not billing any assessments on that 2013 loan. The 2013 loan is the loan that, in part, help construct Arnold Road North, was constructing Hazard Street and whatever other projects that we'll move forward at that point.

In 2013, the tax anticipation note that I previously mentioned, that data from 2004, was converted to a bond where previously we were paying just interest on that note, we're now paying principal and interest because it's a full bond and that -- that's an additional $364,000. The 2015 West Warwick phosphorous upgrade is an additional 187,000 plus. 2016, we had to take a one-year
prior period adjustment for change in construction
progress which was $1.4 million. Prior to
tonight's town council vote which I assumed was
going to take place before this presentation, the
vote -- prior to the town council's vote this
evening to re-evaluate the sewer program, which the
vote is taking place after now, the following
actions were to be utilized to improve the health
of the sewer program's fund balance: Mandate
physical hook-ups for all prior and future
projects. Construct sewers using the unused $2.2
million from the 2013 Clean Water loan. Sewer
Arnold Road south which would stay dry until
Contract 9, which would potentially be Briar Point
would be completed and then the Briar Point area
and the Arnold Road South line would then become
active, allowing us to assess.

Current options that could be considered
to improve the financial health of the sewer
program are as follows: Continue construction in
neighborhoods that want sewers. Inquire about
restructuring existing debt. Revenue anticipation
notes or fund balance stays -- stayed below the
previously mentioned 125 percent and general fund
pays a portion of the sewer fund debt service with
voter approval at the financial town meeting.
Again, a fund balance stayed below the previously
mentioned 125 percent. And that's my presentation.

MR. WATERS: So what everybody heard from
our town engineer, sewer consulting engineer, as
well as our finance director, as a sort of the
history of the town sewer program, as well as sort
of the financial situation which the fund balance
for the sewer fund is currently -- which is not too
positive, one of the main drivers that the town
council considered in 2016 when reinitiating the
sewer program was to help the fund balance of the
sewer program. If action hadn't been taken in 2016
to re-initiate the program, then the general fund
would have to subsidize the sewer fund and that
means that the town would have to charge taxpayers
an amount of money that would help offset the
expenses of the sewer fund.

So in 2016 when the town council heard a
presentation from our sewer engineers as well as
our finance director, part of the consideration was
what areas of town would help -- are dense enough
to bring more customers on line as well as keep the
cost of sewer assessments low, as well as the
environmental considerations. So those were some
of the things that the council back in 2016
considered when re-initiating the project. Again,
it's never easy to face a $20,000 sewer assessment;
but, unfortunately, that's what it cost. From my
understanding, it's similar cost to installing a
new septic system. But that's -- I'm guessing I'm
over simplifying that. It depends on what type of
septic system you install.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you, Mr. Waters and
Mr. Nichols. I thank the sewer subcommittee for
coming out tonight and I thank the council for
being here. This information has been conveyed a
few times. I don't think the information is
changing. And, again, 40 years on the sewer
program in Coventry and we have a very, very small
percentage of areas and streets in our town that
will even ever see sewers or have experienced some
sewers. And in the future, as costs go up and up
and up, it's probably going to be very doubtful
that most of the town or if even some of the town
may see sewers in the future.

However, we have done some sewer work.
The sewer work that has been done has been good,
and, again, I only have lived in Coventry 38 years.
I know we're not the City of Cranston. We're not
the City of Warwick. We're not the City of West
Warwick or the Town of West Warwick. We're the
Town of Coventry. We've got varied acreage, 64
square acres and not everybody is even thinking
about sewers. Of all the years we've been doing
sewers, this is, to my recollection, the first time
there has been a question on it, an outcry -- well,
2011, I wasn't on the council and I didn't read too
much in the papers. So let me qualify that. Maybe
the first time that I've been on the council three
different times over 35 years, and this time we're
facing it.

So what I'm going to do now is, and,
again, we were going to vote for the two
resolutions first, and I think -- I think we're
going to go that way. But before that, we do
have -- in that we've moved up the public forum and
the information program from our town engineers,
sewer engineers, and our town finance director, and
our town manager. So what we're going to do is
open up some question time, but we are going to
limit it and I don't know, is Mr. Warzycha there
with a -- do you have a timer?

MR. WARZYCHA: Two minutes or three
minutes?
MR. SHIBLEY: I'd say -- I'd say -- we'll start with three minutes; and if it gets too over cumbersome, we'll go two minutes. You've got the time, and Mr. Spearman, are you around to call on people? Okay. Let me -- Mr. Gorham has pointed out and we would appreciate the noise being held down. Three minutes is what we did on our financial town meeting, and we do it every year, and three minutes, believe me, is -- I consider more than fair, and I majored in communication at the University of Rhode Island. So we're going to go -- Mr. Gorham is going to handle this, and Mr. Spearman. It will be three minutes and Mr. Warzycha will time it. And if it becomes too much, we'll go two minutes, and then we'll call for a vote. Mr. Spearman. What's that? Are you doing it?

MR. GORHAM: The only rule I think is we're just going to --

MR. SHIBLEY: Listen up, please.

MR. GORHAM: I think the rule is we're going to let people speak and express their ideas on what they've heard and the two resolutions; but if you could focus on the resolutions, I think it would be most helpful to the council because they
are going to vote on them. So that and the three
minutes, I've been the moderator for the town
financial meeting for the last couple of years. We
do the three-minute rule and there's rarely any
dissent. People find that to be a reasonable
amount of time to speak. So we'll just play it by
ear. If somebody has something extraordinary to
talk about, we can always try to extend the time.
Otherwise, it's three minutes. Just give your name
and address and, you know, try to keep your
comments directed toward the council and the town
manager.

MR. SPEARMAN: We're going to use this row
here. So anybody who has anything to say, just get
in line. If there's room -- time for -- to come
back again, you can also do that. Take three
minutes and try to refrain from any, you know,
insulting remarks or anything to the council, and
they will do the same for you. They will do the
same for you. Okay. You can start now.

MS. WHITTINGHILL: Kate Whittinghill, 586
Old Main Street, Coventry. I have a question.
Very simple question. Where does $20,000 come
from? How did you get to that number, please?
$20,000 assessment. I'm asking the question.
MR. WATERS: For sewer assessment?

MS. WHITTINGHILL: How did you get -- yes, to the 20,000 for the sewer assessment, please. Thank you.

MR. THIBEAULT: The current ordinance calls for assessment -- the cost of construction must be covered by assessments. The assessments are based on design flow. So, for example, a three-bedroom house would be 115 gallons times 3 would be 345 gallons times the rate and that would give you the assessment. So it's not a $20,000 number. It's the cost of construction applying the formula as given in the ordinance, and that's how we come up with it. It's not an arbitrary number. It's a calculated number.

MS. WHITTINGHILL: No. I understand it's not an arbitrary. Did it used to be per foot on the frontage of the property? Can I ask what changed that?

MS. HOULE: It's never been per foot. It used to just be a basic number per house, per residential unit, or a certain dollar amount per thousand of commercial value, but that wasn't fair. So we did it based on DEM gallons per day, and we would take the entire contract, figure out the
cost, then take every single property, figure out
the gallons per day, and basically divide the
entire contract by the total gallons per day and
then you multiply it.

MS. WHITTINGHILL: And get an average
number. Thank you.

MR. LE BLANC: James LeBlanc, 43 Hazard
Street. I just want nobody to be misled tonight.
Mr. Waters, you said it's going to be $20,000. So
if I owned a home on Arnold Road and it was a
four-bedroom home, the calculation would be 115
gallons per day times four bedrooms is 460 gallons
per day. And Mr. Thibeault can confirm, but the
price per gallon is $64. So my four-bedroom home,
the assessment would be $29,440. Now, after the
loan that the town would provide me at 6 percent
over 20 years, the interest alone would be $21,180.
So the total of the assessment would be $50,620;
and when I flush my toilet, I still would not even
be connected. So you would have to pay an
additional five to seven thousand dollars to
connect as well. So when Glen Skurka did his
presentation on June 23, 2016, he wanted to give
homeowners an option to connect to sewers. This is
mandated on us. This is America, not Russia. We
should get options.

MR. HETHERMAN: My name's Tom Hetherman. For the purpose of this meeting, it'll be 110 Arnold Road, although I live at a different spot in Coventry. I think the problem, from what I'm hearing here, is actually the resolution that was pushed in 2015. For instance, on the section of Arnold Road that I live -- that has the building on, it's $835,000 being divided by 43 properties. When you really figure it out, the pipe is sized to carry the whole other section of Arnold Road. So the pipe -- the engineering firm, I would ask this, is obviously larger at the end going up to Route 3, correct?

MR. NICHOLS: You're at the northern end of Arnold Road?

MR. HETHERMAN: I would assume so. I'm right down near Route 3.

MR. NICHOLS: So if you front on the section of gravity between, Tim, Montana --

MR. HETHERMAN: I'm on a force main.

MR. NICHOLS: Between Montana and out, your pipe would be sized for the area south of the causeway. But if you're on the low pressure sewers, that pipe is not sized for the higher.
MR. HETHERMAN: So basically at my house or my building, we're sized to be carrying that whole load up above, correct?

MR. NICHOLS: The gravity sewer side and the upper end is sized higher. The low pressure sewer is not.

MR. HETHERMAN: I would just question, before from the calculations, if it were based on the percentage, $35 per thousand, we would be $7,700. Now I'm at $29,000. You want me to get an engineered plan. You want me to submit money to the Town of Coventry, to the Town of West Warwick to move forward with all this. The question still remains whether or not, because I'm zoned residential, it just seems like where did the thought go into this because how did we get from 7,700 to $29,000 in such a short period of time? I don't know of anything else which has gone up almost 400 percent. Can somebody answer that? I understand construction costs have gone up. They haven't gone up 400 percent. So I would say it's the way you're looking at it and billing it is where the issue is, and I would like to see you repeal the way that was done in 2015.

MS. HOULE: My question to you is where
did you ever get 7,700? That was never a price.

MR. HETHERMAN: It was $35 for a commercial rate, correct?

MS. HOULE: But it was $35 per thousand --

MR. HETHERMAN: Yes, and my property, I can do quick math is $220,000 which comes out to $7,700.

MS. HOULE: 220 times 35 is only $7,700?

MR. HETHERMAN: You want a calculator? You can do it if you'd like.

MS. HOULE: Yeah, because -- I'm sorry.

MR. HETHERMAN: So somehow it's gone up 400 percent or pretty close to it, and I haven't even hired the contractors to come hook up. This is just --

MS. HOULE: They are minimums back then as well. So I don't see how it went up that much.

MR. HETHERMAN: I'm going by your numbers. I didn't make these up.

MS. HOULE: Now it's just based on -- now it's just based on gallons per day.

MR. HETHERMAN: Which, if you really want to do gallons per day, I'm glad you said that because it's an accounting firm. We have two toilets and we have two sinks. It's maybe about 21
gallons per day.

MS. HOULE: Right, but when we go on the DEM website and we look up 110 Arnold Road, it shows 345 gallons per day.

MR. HETHERMAN: Okay, and that matters to me how?

MS. HOULE: I mean, that's what it shows. That's what it shows, that you're designated 345 gallons per day.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Your question has been noted.

MR. HETHERMAN: Noted, but not answered.

MR. SHIBLEY: Right. All right. Next.

MR. EARLY: Good evening. My name is Richard Early, 50 Leisure Way, Coventry. I have written concerns for the town council if they would be interested. The CliffsNotes are first, we are all for Mother Nature. It's the money that is the concern. My sewer assessment has gone up a hundred percent in the last seven years. And this year for 2016, my sewer assessment is ten times that of the water. So I think we should have enough money to take care of it. Thank you.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you. Next, please.

MR. WILSON: Eric Wilson, 48 Hazard
Street. I'm going to open up with two quotes from current members of the town council. I've said before and I'm saying again. It's in regards to the fire district debacle that happened in this town. June 2015, Providence Journal --

MR. SHIBLEY: Excuse me. Try to keep it pertaining to the --

MR. WILSON: This does pertain.

MR. SHIBLEY: Fire districts, it really doesn't.

MR. WILSON: Terry McGee, District 3, stated it is not the town council's job to save the district from poor management. Glen Shibley, yourself, the Council President --

MR. SHIBLEY: Sir --

MR. WILSON: -- the district's own residents -- the district's own residents voted against giving any more money. So how in the blue blazes would any council give it to them now. It wouldn't be right politically or financially. We didn't get a chance to vote -- we didn't get a chance to vote --

MR. SHIBLEY: We're going to make it much shorter if it is pertaining to the resolution --

MR. WILSON: You supported the taxpayers
then --

MR. SHIBLEY: Not fire district. Not fire districts, all right. So -- and you've talked to the council a few times. Please continue. We'll give you two more minutes.

MR. WILSON: You can reset that for me, by the way. Town council made those statements in support of the taxpayers. What happened? Now, I'm being cut off short. Skip that. Why was the assessment fee left out of our initial notice, especially on Hazard Street where it's so astronomical? Was it the town's intent to complete the project and bill the residents after the fact? A surprise $20,000 bill for something I did not vote for, for something that town council decided to force upon me? I assume that the state revolving fund with the state account funded by tax money for town projects. Call me naive. Not a state account funded directly by the residents. So who is it that failed to notify the residents properly? Because if I failed in my job, I'd be fired on the spot. We were not notified.

At the September sewer committee meeting, I pleaded with the town to adjust the procedure in notifying residents months in advance, if not
longer. That notice should include the estimated start date for the sewers, the estimated assessment fee, whether it's projected to go up or projected to go down, the average cost to have a licensed plumber tie you in, as well as loan options. About three weeks later, over four weeks into when ground broke on Hazard Street, keep checking the clock, I received a notice mentioning assessment fee. Still did not include the assessment fee clearly because this would happen. The blow back.

Now, another thing I want to bring up but I don't know if you're aware of this, there's a significant amount of ledge on Hazard Street. The vibrations from those heavy machines from about 7 A.M. to 4 P.M. is constant nonstop and intense. Who's going to be responsible if a resident's foundation was damaged, if the structural integrity of their home is compromised? What if the vibrations created lead dust? A lot of those houses are old. I have lead paint in my house that I'm dealing with. What if it created lead dust? You talk about environmental concerns. What about that, in the air, in my house, around my daughter, in the ground, in the groundwater. You're claiming that my system is polluting the world, the ground.
I have no proof of that. It passed all tests when I bought my house. It's still functioning to this day. So prove to me how that's polluting the ground. Speaking of lies --

MR. GORHAM: Mr. Wilson, it's three minutes for the next person. Can you just try to wrap up so the next person can speak, please.

Thank you.

MR. WILSON: And it's been mentioned about the evils of social media at previous town council meetings as well as today. Social media is the only outlet providing residents with information, and we all know who's responsible for that. I checked on that page. The -- what was it called -- the residents against mandated sewers Facebook page is the one being referred to. It's photos, videos, and documents with the town's letterhead on them.

There's no lying. There's no slander. There's no nothing. It's just facts. That's there. So how do you respond to that? Exactly. Oh, and the whole change order debacle from last time, too, about no one being -- certain people, excuse me, not being informed about change orders, things being made on the spot to tie in to this street or do that, add more funds --
MR. GORHAM: Mr. Wilson, I asked you to wrap it up and --

MR. WILSON: I have a cell phone. I have a cell phone and you probably all have contact information of each other. You can send a text out.

MR. GORHAM: We had a rule at the beginning --

MR. WILSON -- keep people informed.

They're on the committee so they can express their opinions in regards to a change order.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Thank you. Again, next gentleman.

MR. PERRY: Hello. Joe Perry, 14 Larchmont Drive, Coventry. I'll make this short and sweet. For me, it's -- I don't like the word "mandated" for anything, Okay. When it comes to my government mandating me to do something, I don't like it. But somebody like me, I have one child, okay. I'm married. My son is, you know, another year or two, he's going to be driving. I have to come up with money for a car. College will be coming up in few years, but it's not just me. I can probably take the hit. I don't like it. It's a bitter pill that I do not like to swallow, but
it's the people across the street from me who have
three children, who are barely making ends meet to
keep their Caravans running, okay; and you're
throwing like 20, 30, 40 thousand dollars at them
and expecting them to cough up with this money when
they have not just one like me, they have two more
children that they have to bring through college
and pay for -- help them get through life, okay.
Or it's an elderly person living on the other side
of the street who is living on a fixed income and
you are forcing them to, you know, dish out all
this extra money. Those are the people that I'm
concerned about. My relatives -- I mean my
friends, my neighbors, okay, that live here in
Coventry and, you know, really for this not to be
our decision as members of the community, you know,
is really unfair, and it's an atrocity. Okay.
That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. ROBIDOUX: Kenneth Robidoux, 21 York
Drive, Coventry, Rhode Island. It only cost
between 5 and $15,000 to put a septic system in.
You will not be paying usage for that water every
single year. You will not carry on every single
year. If I sold my home, I don't think I should
have to put $20,000 down and connect to a sewer for
somebody to buy my home. This is my town. I'm a taxpayer here. My taxes have gone up at least $5,000 since I've moved here, and I vote every year for my taxes to go up. Now you want to force me to pay this money for something I do not want. That's all I have to say.

MR. BOOD: Ron Bood, 15 Florida Avenue.

You said in your presentation that pretty much nothing has changed from the original plan going back 40 years ago. Well, I just, you know, a lot of things have changed back then. First of all, you use -- say the main reason is for pollution around Tiogue Lake and the Pawtuxet River. Pollution in the -- both Warwick systems are ten times cleaner than when you first proposed these things. Tiogue Lake is trout waters. Pawtucket (sic) River -- I mean, these waters are cleaner now than they ever were. So that's not a reason. In addition to that, you give a presentation and you say-- you show the debt that you've incurred for the last 10, 20 years on the sewer system with less than 8 percent, 10 percent of the people connected as of this date. And you're dumping that assessment pretty much onto the people all off of Arnold Road in District 4 to pay for the debt that
you've already incurred. And with the prices that
you're mentioning for the cost of the sewer system
and your goals of 80 percent of Coventry, you're
talking billions of dollars, well over a billion
dollars that you're putting on the taxpayers of
Coventry without them having a right to vote on it.
If that was done legally, I propose that something
has to change in this charter and things got to be
looked at differently because you shouldn't be able
to make a decision for billions of dollars and put
that cost on the taxpayers of Coventry.

MS. SEWCHUK: Hi. Jennifer Sewchuk, 32
Hazard Street in Coventry. I wanted to first
address Mr. McGee from the statement that you made
earlier when we started. I did request a copy and
reviewed the letter that you did send out in 2011
because, as an educated homeowner, I remembered
getting your letter, the survey. I assure you that
the decisions that were made then to not proceed
with the project had you proceeded with the project
then, Mr. Shibley, you would have seen this kind of
response. The reason that you did not was because
it never started based on the surveys that everyone
had returned. I am confused as to why when you
state that everyone on the council voted and is
aware, why Mrs. Carlson and Mrs. Bacon frequently shake their heads no. So I am wondering are you all aware every day of the changes that are happening with what's going on with this project. That concerns me that you're still shaking your head no when we are being told sitting right here tonight that you all are aware. That really concerns me. And the information also in that letter was not -- did not say this our assessment would be 23,000, it said it would be 12,900, okay, which is different than the 6,600 that was paid out in Western Coventry. So, again, even at that amount, 12,900, people had concerns about it and now you're talking 20 to 29,000. The rate that you offered for your loan back then was 8 percent, which now is 6, but still twice what you're paying. So I just have a lot of concerns as to where the -- even making the motions and all of that, it just seems like things happen quickly and we have two council women who are sitting and shaking their heads and I find it very distracting when I'm speaking, when you, Mr. Shibley, continue to just look at the clock.

MS. SERPA: Good evening, everyone.

Representative Patricia A. Serpa, 194 Kimberly Lane
in West Warwick, Rhode Island. However, I do represent a section of Coventry that is under consideration for sewers. Mr. Gorham, you asked that we focus tonight on the resolutions, and I'm doing exactly that. Number 2 is specially problematic to me. I think it's very poorly worded and I'm wondering, frankly, how this committee is going to gather the socionomic (sic) demographic information in any area. What is your plan? I think these people have a right to know how you're going to gather that information. Do you have access to the U.S. Census? Are you going to send them a mailer because frankly if I got a mailer from the Town of West Warwick asking for my household income, it would end up in the recycling bin. If someone came to my door asking me for my household income, I would say thank you very much, but I'm really not interested in disclosing that to you.

So what is your plan to gather that socioeconomic information? How are you going to gather it? And then, say, under the best of circumstances, you do have a good way of gathering it and you determine there are 20 houses, I don't know, pick a street, Eleanor Drive, and six people
on that street make over 150,000 a year and the
others make under 40. So in someone's mind, they
will determine that the higher-end people can
afford the sewers, and the lower-end people cannot
when, in fact, you don't know the entire
socioeconomic condition of that family that you
consider higher end. So in my humble opinion,
Number 2 is poorly worded. I don't know how you're
going to execute it, and if someone could
elaborate, I think these people have a right to
know that. Thank you.

MR. RAPTAKIS: Leo Raptakis, 2080
Nooseneck Hill Road. Couple of questions and a
couple of comments. I think from the beginning of
this whole project about installing sewers in
Coventry over the last 40 years has not been well
thought out. I think in reality if these
resolutions do pass tonight that you should form a
study commission and start from where this sewer
project starts for Coventry, whether it's for today
or for the future from A to Z. I think that has
not happened. We don't have a clear, concise of
what the total cost of installing sewers in the
Town of Coventry. Second of all, we've had a lot
of comment about there's been large septic systems
installed up in Oak Haven. That's not the way to go. Well, individuals spend $15,000 on the average three-bedroom home, install a brand new septic system if their cesspool or older septic system has failed. I'd like to hear from the installers to tell us the integrity of how long a system lasts, and I believe the average brand new system that is installed today is going to last at least 25 to 30 years. I think we should get that information directly from the installer. So $15,000 times 50 -- for 50 years, it's two systems, it's only going to cost you 30,000 over 50 years, not a minimum of $32,000 to install the sewers which makes -- the math doesn't make any sense. Number 2, we have DEM here who can probably answer a lot of the questions that folks might have, that it's not mandatory to install or connect to sewers unless there was a state grant or Federal grant. I've only seen one small grant of $209,000; but in this handout which I think, councilman, there's about 20 questions, it states that it's mandated. That's totally false. It's not mandated, unless there was a Federal grant or a state grant and that grant should help defray the costs, not add to the cost to the homeowners.
Another question is why is the town charging double? If you're being charged 3 percent to borrow the money, why isn't it 3 percent? So I'm asking tonight that in the resolution, we cannot charge not 1 percentage point or a half a percentage point over what the town borrows. So that should be out. Also, I think we should also ask a geologist to come into Coventry and determine really what areas really do need sewers if we pick a point. I saw a map earlier from a presentation and there's sewers needed on Coventry Drive, Ada Court. There's another one up on Hazard, there's another one on -- it's piecemeal. That's not a well thought out proposition. And, lastly, somebody made a comment that we need to keep connecting in order to make this sewer project whole. It reminds me of a Ponzi scheme. That's what it does. Thank you.

MR. LOWELL: Mike Lowell, 390 Fairview Avenue and, no, not the Mike Lowell from the third baseman from the Red Sox. If I had his money, I wouldn't have to worry about sewers. So, anyway, my street is not getting sewers right at the moment but I've been told by the town that I will be eventually getting sewers. My questions are, from
my understanding, this has been put before the town as a referendum many times, and it has been voted down by the citizens. Many things that need to be voted on by referendum such as a new police station or capital improvements, the schools, things like that, which cost many millions of dollars have to go before a town referendum, why would something like sewers that cost many millions of dollars not go before the town as a referendum? Also, my parents have lived at their house in Scituate for 45 years. When they built the house, they put in a septic system, which is still running perfectly fine today. Thank you.

MR. AIELLO: David Aiello, 24 Coventry Drive. I've sent everyone an e-mail on this side. I've heard back from Mrs. Bacon, Mrs. Carlson, Mr. Waters, appreciate it. Took you a little while, but you did it. Mr. Laboisonniere, I checked my spam folder. You haven't responded to me even though the last meeting you said you did. You responded to everybody. That's not true. Whatever. My question is, someone, I think it might have been you, Mr. Laboisonniere, last time, septic systems fail. You said that. Septic systems fail. Now, do sewer systems fail at all,
like the pipes that go in the ground because you said they don't. Is that true? And my other question, my other question, before you cut me off because I know you will, my other question -- my other question is, this was supposed to be a question and answering session. Everyone's asked questions. I haven't heard answers. If you could please respond to us, everyone would like to hear that. Thank you.

MR. LOPES: My name is Christopher Lopes, 46 Woodmist Circle. I think the sad reality to part of this is we all still have septic systems. Mine failed recently three months ago. I had to pay $14,000 to get my whole yard ripped up and my system somewhat expanded so that way we could withstand this. If I were to get an assessment added to that, you're talking about people in this room might have systems that are in the process of failing or will eventually fail, you're going to have to put more money into it. I'm saying if I have $15,000 in the tank already, and now you put an assessment upon me of this 20,000 plus dollars, how does that -- how does that go with the people; how do we afford on top of that if we've already had to address our system while you're in the
process of going through all this?

    MR. SHIBLEY: Again, new systems, if
7   they're approved, then it's a ten-year deferral.
     
    MR. LOPES: I wasn't aware of that. That
8   was part of the question I'm going to get to
9   because my concern would be when I went to the
town, all these things had to be filed and
documented. No one ever said wait a second, you
know what, if you put a thousand dollars into your
system now, you might be able to get two more years
out of it. A ten-year deferment, I'm still going
to be paying this for -- the $20,000 that I had to
take out of my 401(k) loan to afford it, I'm still
going to be paying that in ten years.

    MR. SHIBLEY: Next.

    MR. SNOW: Kevin Snow, 36 Edward Street,
Coventry --

    MS. CARLSON: Excuse me, excuse me. I
thought this was going to be a session where if
taxpayers had questions, we were going to provide
answers? I don't understand what's -- this is like
-- well, okay, I'll tell you what, when you come
up, if you have a question, can you wait for -- to
see if we can get you an answer because this is
like public comment at a council meeting where you
comment and we don't answer. So give the experts a chance to answer so you get some satisfaction tonight. Thank you.

MR. SNOW: Kevin Snow, 36 Edward Street, Coventry. A couple of my questions that I had were asked by Senator Raptakis and Mr. Lowell. The first being, and we never heard any answers, so if I'm the first one that maybe can get some answers that would be great. We're being charged twice the percentage rate the town is for the sewers. Why? Why? Can somebody answer that?

MR. SHIBLEY: If you'd listen. Bear with us.

MR. WATERS: The town ordinance says 6 percent in the ordinance. That's why we charge 6 percent.

MR. SNOW: We're being charged double -- we're being charged double that you're being charged. Why is that? It doesn't seem very fair to me. It also doesn't seem to me that the president of the sewer committee is also an employee of the contractor doing the work, that doesn't seem to be brought up. Would anybody like to respond to that?

MR. WATERS: Sorry. What's the question?
MR. SNOW: The president of the sewer committee is also employed by D'Ambra Construction which is doing the majority of the work.

MR. WATERS: So what's the question? Why is he an employee of D'Ambra Construction?

MR. SNOW: It seems like it's a conflict of interest. Why is it -- am I an idiot or -- I don't think I am.

MR. WATERS: I don't think you are either.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you.

MR. SNOW: Is that a conflict of interest?

MR. SHIBLEY: No, it is not.

MR. SNOW: That's not a conflict of interest? In what country is that not a conflict of interest? I thought this was where -- I thought I was the first one to see questions answered --

MR. SHIBLEY: We're trying to answer but --

MR. SNOW: If I'm talking loud, I'm trying to speak up so you can hear me.

MR. SHIBLEY: All sewer contracts go out to bid and generally it's the lowest bidder, if they do the best work. And it doesn't matter who's where. What we like is people -- if I can talk -- what we like is knowledgeable people on our sewer
subcommittee that know what's going on and we've had good people for years. I -- always two council people, and -- out of the seven members and we try to get a random selection, three residents, individuals that know and volunteer and it's not, you know, not easy work and try to come up with a plan and listen to the engineers and take into consideration the needed areas with DEM and the cost, and costs only go up. And I remember when it was $6,600 sewer hookup and, unfortunately, it was too low. They came up with that figure and then it went to 12. I remember when it went up to 12; 12, 9 or something, and that was too low.

MR. SNOW: Was it mandated at that point?

MR. SHIBLEY: I'm not exactly positive. I can't remember, but I think -- yes, it was. Now it's gone up more, and I thank you for your question. That's with the resolutions, we're going to try to look into this.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Mr. President, one thing that we're going to -- I mean, a lot of these question are all with the stenographer as well, too, and we certainly want to use a lot of those questions to come up with viable answers and a study committee. That's the whole idea, the
resolutions that we were looking to stop the project to re-assess how we're going to move forward with this program. And we can do that, that's the whole point of getting questions, et cetera. Maybe you can't get an answer directly right now and some of them we have, some of them we don't have. But we certainly want to get all of the questions answered, and they'll be on the stenographer's record, and we will all get copies of that question. We have our own. Mrs. Carlson has written out a bunch of them. We've submitted questions of our own, and those are the answers that we need to try to come up with to find solutions to the whole program, but we're not avoiding questions again -- we want to answer those questions. Is everything going to be immediate? Certainly not. But we'll try to answer what we can. We can't do it when everybody's yelling and screaming and then shooting, you know, numerous questions at us at the same time. And --

MR. SHIBLEY: Just stated, that's the whole reason for the two resolutions tonight, the town manager has recommended. Talked to each council person, and I think we're all in agreement with it.
MRS. CARLSON: No, no, no.

MR. SHIBLEY: At least that's why we're here tonight with the resolutions. All right. Next.

MS. BACON: Excuse me. Excuse me one second. Do you mind? I just want everyone to be aware, I was not consulted by the town manager or anyone else on the council and I don't believe Karen Carlson regarding these two resolutions. Actually, they've been --

MS. CARLSON: Until today.

MS. BACON: Until today. I mean, I'm just -- so I just want everyone to be aware, we did not -- we were not consulted about that at all.

MR. MC GEE: Mr. President, if I may, just to answer the last gentleman's question. He mentioned something about the head of the sewer subcommittee working for D'Ambra Construction. Glen Skurka works tirelessly on the sewer subcommittee. He was instrumental in trying to rewrite the sewer ordinance. He is a civil engineer. He has a wealth of knowledge. These bids go out to a competitive bid. It is no advantage. To say that there is a conflict is absolutely wrong because this is competitively bid
and there is no advantage to this contractor as far as knowing the price of the bid. The guy has a wealth of knowledge --

MR. SHIBLEY: Let's hold down the noise. You've got a councilman talking. Have some respect. Next.

MS. CASTELLI: Lisa Castelli, 15 Chopin Street. My first question is to my councilman, Mr. McGee, you did a survey in 2011. What does that have to do with 2017 in our area? There's been numerous new people in my neighborhood off Hazard. Actually, I am new to the area. So I never got -- there's -- I can name about four or five houses that are new. So I don't understand what that survey has to do with today.

MR. MC GEE: I sent a survey out in 2011 because at the time -- it is correct. The survey did state that at the time, there was a $12,900 assessment. However, because we knew there was ledge there, it was going to cost much more and it was going to be a minimum of $23,000. This was back six, seven years ago.

MS. CASTELLI: So why would you come up that road when you knew it has that much ledge and it could possibly cost more than that because
they've been digging in one area for four weeks?

MR. MC GEE: Our thought process was that we wanted to combine areas such as the Tiogue area that had a lot of sand and that was less expensive to do, combine them with the Hazard Street area to keep the cost down, because we knew that the cost was going to be up there in the Hazard Street area. Now, my point is when we sent out these surveys, unfortunately, one-fifth of the residents that I sent the surveys to did not respond.

MS. CASTELLI: But that was it 2011.

We're talking 2017.

MR. MC GEE: I'm sure there's been some houses that have changed like yourself. I'm sure there has been some changes as far as ownership of the house, but I handed out a sheet of frequently asked questions and it talked about the assessments, it talked about the price of the assessments back in 2011. Granted, it's all changed and everything; but to say that you were not aware of assessments is just false.

MS. CASTELLI: It is false because I didn't live in Coventry then.

MR. MC GEE: There's probably -- there may be a few houses, I don't know how many, but there
may be a few houses that are new, but if anybody's been there over five years --

MS. CASTELLI: There is twenty -- there is quite a few. My point is then why don't you send out a new form giving the real assessments and take a survey on that.

MR. MC GEE: That's why we have decided to stop the program and send out surveys and get some more feedback and get some, you know, ideas because with all the discontent and --

MS. CASTELLI: My next question is why doesn't -- you put this to an all-day referendum and have the town vote and not be mandated. And my third thing -- my third point is you're saying this gentleman works for the construction company. How do we know he didn't go in and know the bids and went for a lower bid to get that job? Don't tell me it's a con -- not a conflict of interest. This is Rhode Island, and I see how the politics works because right on this council you got two women here that didn't know anything about what was going on.

MR. MC GEE: On a competitive bidding process, nobody is privy -- it is open -- they open up the bids at a meeting. Nobody knows that the
bids are. It is not done --

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay, next, please.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: My name is Lisa Nockowitz, 21 Beach Street. If we do or you choose to suspend the program tonight, what happens to the money that's already been spent as far as the general taxpayers are concerned?

MR. WATERS: So any debt service that cannot be paid by the sewer fund will have to be paid by the general fund. So the council will have to appropriate money from the general fund to cover that.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: Do you have a sense for what that may be?

MR. SHIBLEY: Excuse me, there is a person at the mike -- there is a person at the mike. Go ahead.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: Do you have a general sense for what that repercussion might be?

MR. THIBEAULT: Lisa, what we did is we had a discussion with our -- the gentleman who we work with when we issue the bonds, and one of the discussions we had is out of all the possibilities that I mentioned earlier was refinancing the debt. There's also a possibility that we -- any of the
unused funds that we have received that we haven't expended yet, we could possibly return to Rhode Island Clean Water. So there's a variety of options that just go beyond taxing the general fund. When we get into the situation where the fund balance becomes low, then that's another discussion; but for the immediate, right now, we have several options to deal with the money we haven't spent from the 2013 A loan, which is about $1.2 million.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: That you have or have not spent?

MR. THIBEAULT: We have not. That's the money --

MS. NOCKOWITZ: My question was for the money that has already been spent for Arnold Road South, in particular, I'm assuming that money needs to be starting to be paid back somewhere. And if we're not going to have any assessments, how is that money going to be paid back?

MR. THIBEAULT: The sewer fund balance can probably cover that expense. We won't know until we have the final audited numbers; but if that's not the case, then we'll consult with the manager and others, other finance professionals, to see
what our options are. Most notably would be we can ask to restructure the debt to make the payments lower so we're not in a position where we're using fund balance.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: So is there any --

Mr. McGee suggested prior that perhaps it would land on the taxpayers of the town.

MR. THIBEAULT: As I discussed previously, that would be one of many options, but I would consider that an option of last resort.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: Okay. And this resolution says suspend temporarily. Do you have any sense for what temporarily means?

MR. WATERS: Temporary, not permanent. The idea is to, as I stated in my press releases, to have the council take a step back and re-evaluate the program to see if there's a better path forward and to take in all the feedback that we have gotten from the residents.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: I mean, there are people who are trying to make decisions on purchases of homes, replacement of septic systems. And so it would just be helpful to know if it's going to be six months, a year, whatever it might be.

MR. SHIBLEY: Mrs. Nockowitz, I don't
think you'll have the answer right now. That's why temporarily fits the bill until we find the answers. You can't say 30 days, 90 days, 50 days, a hundred days because we don't know how long it's going to take to find the answers out, and then sooner or later a decision is going to have to be made, whether assessments go out, how long they get to be to be paid, whether the town help picks up the bill, split 50-50. There's a lot of things to consider. This, again, is not a new thing, sewers, and Arnold Road has been done now and it's completed. And the bill is going to have to be paid, yes. So that's -- temporary I think is a good word. It's not trying to hide anything or --

MS. NOCKOWITZ: I'm not insinuating that you are trying to hide anything.

MR. SHIBLEY: No. I'm just saying that some people might think that. Temporarily, we don't know the answer.

MS. NOCKOWITZ: I'm just looking for some sort --

MR. SHIBLEY: We don't know the answer, but thank you. Okay. Yes, sir. Next.

MR. TEFFT: How are you, sir? I take my hat off for a little respect to you, I hope you
show a little respect.

MR. SHIBLEY: You're a gentleman, sir.

MR. TEFFT: I live at 400 Tiogue Avenue. Ronald Tefft. You know, I hear about Tiogue a lot because I live on Tiogue and if I'm recollecting like four, five years ago, the DEM inspected the lake, the water quality in Pawtuxet River. It was good enough they put trout in it; but now all of a sudden, our sewers are failing and you want to put all these new sewer lines in there and you're going to have an assessment, and I guess I'm not sure it's based on road frontage or what, but what about the people. I look around here. People -- there's people older than me here and a lot younger and I'm on a fixed income, how am I going to afford this?

MR. SHIBLEY: Again, that's what's got to be looked into. I understand Tiogue Lake has gotten better over the years because, again, I've only been around almost 40 years. I know it wasn't so clean before and that's a credit to the town and DEM and the Lake Tiogue Association have been working diligently to try to keep that lake clean and the whole idea of sewers is to continue to keep it clean because, you know, that's vulnerable area, all around the lake. That's my district, that
District 4. I wish they'd come to Oak Haven.
Again, I can only say that, but we're not going to see it. You try to protect the water, but I appreciate -- and that's what we're going to look into. All right. Thanks.

MR. TEFFT: Like I said, I'm wondering the elderly people here like myself and the young people, how are we going to afford this? When you're on a fixed income, we pay enough fire tax, town tax, insurance on our property and on top of that, you want to charge us interest. You know, I'm not rich and --

MR. SHIBLEY: I understand what you're saying.

MR. TEFFT: And the younger generation, they're not going want to come to Coventry.

MR. SHIBLEY: I understand. Again, I am retired. I don't have a job. My wife is retired. And I understand, and I'm not as old as -- let's put it this way, my father-in-law -- but I understand the concern, but sewers have to be paid for. They're not free. All right. But, thank you.

MR. TEFFT: It would be nice, like I heard a gentleman on Channel 12 said he spent $12,000 to
put a new system in, the town okayed it. Now, they're saying he's going to have to mandatory tie in there. You know, what's the story with that? I feel bad for that poor guy.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you.

MS. DELIBERIS: Karen Deliberis, 49 Read Avenue. I'll just read something. My numbers are rough so if the young lady right there would like to recalculate, you can do so. A 20-year loan at 6 percent will be $34,389. 34,389 divided by 20 is 1719.45 a year. 1719.45 a year divided by 12 is 143.29 a month. If I had to live on my disability check of $800 a month, how am I going to do that? Can you tell me that?

MR. SHIBLEY: No, I can't.

MS. DELIBERIS: And what about the 93 year old woman that lives on Coventry Drive, a widow, who we all know, Mr. Laboissonniere, cannot afford that. And I would like to know, Mr. Waters, who looks for grants? Why are there no grants? What's up with that? Grants don't get paid back.

MR. WATERS: I don't know why there aren't any grants left.

MS. DELIBERIS: Who looks for them?

MR. WATERS: I've talked to our Federal
delegation, and there's no Federal money available.

MS. DELIBERIS: And who is your Federal
delegation? If other towns and cities are finding
the grants, why are not we?

MR. WATERS: I'm not aware of other towns
and cities --

MS. DELIBERIS: One of the richest cities
or towns is Lincoln. They pay $1800 for their
assessment. Why is that? Why is that?

MR. WATERS: We can look into that. If
there's grants available --

MS. DELIBERIS: You need to find more
money. You're paid for this position. We elected
these people here to work for us, and only two of
those people up there really care about us.

MS. ELDERKIN: Hi. Sherry Elderkin, 979
Victory Highway. I'm having a really hard time
wrapping my head around how you're doing the sewer
assessments. So you're telling me that a
90-year-old woman or man who live in their house
that they bought when their children were little
whose now children are all grown and that house may
be a five-bedroom or a four-bedroom house is going
to pay the same exact as somebody who is actually
utilizing that sewage waste. Is that what I'm
understanding; is that what I'm hearing? I did ask a question.

MS. HOULE: Yes. The sewer assessments are based on when the line goes by, and the connection is the sewer use.

MS. ELDERKIN: How is that fair to that 90-year-old woman or 80-year-old man or woman, whichever, that is living in their family home that they've had all their lives and that they've grown memories in. You're going to force these people to have to move out of their homes because they will not be able to afford them. I don't understand how that is fair when you have a family of six people who may be actually utilizing that sewer and they're paying the same as that 90-year-old woman. It's not fair to that 90-year-old woman. You need to rethink how you're organizing that and where you're coming up with these monies. I think you need to figure out how many people are living in each home and do it accordingly based on who is living there. And when the changes come and new people buy in, then the assessments change. There has to be another way to do this. It is not fair to the elderly and the disabled that are at a disadvantage that you guys are taking advantage of.
MR. PIERSON: Thank you. James Pierson, 8
Nichole Lane. Two brief points. I won't belabor
the sentiment that's been raised here. A lot of
good feedback has been given to you already. I was
reading a recent housing study and two numbers
jumped out at me, the first of which is 30 percent
of homeowners are already stressed financially. A
large portion of their income is already going
toward housing, which means it's not going to other
places like food, clothing, and things like that
just to live. It's even higher for renters. It's
above 40 percent. Where do you think these
assessments are going to go? The landlords are
going to put that into the rent. And they're going
to be even more stressed. We have a very stressed
financial situation in our community. In 2016
foreclosures in this town jumped over 100 percent.
A large jump. Things to be aware of.

My second point is an interesting one and
this is what made me jump up because I'm
disappointed in the comments from Mr. McGee and
Mr. Shibley. I won't say anything more about why
I'm disappointed other than you are not the
determiners of what falls under the ethics code,
the Ethics Commission, and you're doing Mr. Skurka
a disservice by telling him he's not in violation. We're going to find out very soon if he is. Thank you.

MS. RUTLEDGE: Hi. My name is Claire Rutledge. I live at 33 Rawlinson Drive in Coventry, Rhode Island. I've been here three years. I've never -- I've lived in Wakefield, Massachusetts. We always voted on everything. I think I'm free. Everybody should be free. I think the people should have sent out letters, not mandate. I just think it's wrong. I just have one question. The septic systems that are in our backyards, who is going to be responsible for taking those out or can we leave them there? So that's more money. What about the water bill, is that going to be increased, too? Okay. So this is just some points. I live here. It's a beautiful city, but I'm sad. I'm retired. I have cancer. My husband's retired. I don't know how I'm going to come up with the money. Thank you.

MR. LOMASTRO: Hi. Jorge Lomastro, 751 Washington Street. And there seems to be financial issues obviously, environmental issues, and I suppose ethical issues as well, and I'm just trying to help out as far as subcommittees go and this,
that, and the other thing. Now, to the engineers, if you can design the septic -- well, pardon me, the sewerage line so that they're environmentally sound, correct -- there's a m Ike right there.

MR. NICHOLS: I would assume the answer is yes.

MR. LOMASTRO: Okay. That was the first question. So the second question would be could you not also engineer a septic system so that it's environmentally sound? And I've been all over this nation, so I already know the answer, but let everybody else know.

MR. NICHOLS: So there are --

MR. LOMASTRO: Can you design a septic system in a given property that's environmentally sound?

MR. NICHOLS: So you can design -- engineering is such that you can design a solution to virtually any problem given the right financial --

MR. LOMASTRO: That's the answer.

MR. NICHOLS: -- investment.

MR. LOMASTRO: Now, I talked to a gentleman that has five family members that lives on the street. I'm not speaking for myself at the
moment, although I'm a member so -- if all five of
those residences have dumped 20 grand at once,
that's a hundred thousand dollars on his entire
family. What are the odds of all five septic
systems failing at the same time?

So that might help make a decision for you
is my point, you know. My grandfather, boy, I miss
him, wise man. He had a saying, don't throw good
money after bad. That's it. That should help you
make your decision. It's simple, but it really is
that simple. And then it comes back to the people
issue. It's really about people anyway. And that
issue would be -- I've got 46 seconds left. I
can't dance anymore, but maybe I can sing a
little -- how do we pay for this? And I've already
brought it up. But listen, folks, we all got to
help one another dig out of this hole. You can't
dump it on just one person here and one person
there. If we all kick it all in a little bit, we
can get out of this hole quick. That's really the
only way to do it. I've already paid for mine. So
I'm here to help you all out. I could just stay at
home and go -- I'm okay. It's their problem. I'm
with you. We all got to help one another out on
this one. It's the only way. Hopefully that helps
you guys out, and it will help us out, too. Okay. Check this out. I could be on the radio.

MR. NUNES: Jason Nunes, 4 View Road. I just purchased the property a year ago. The septic system is five years old. I live in the house alone. Two-bedroom home. Virtually, the septic system should be my lifetime. Now, with this assessment coming up, and this has been in the works for years, there should have probably been a disclosure or do I call my closing attorney? That's unfair. They should not be mandated by no means, no means at all. And I don't think we're going to hear the end of this one.

MS. STENSON: My name is Janice Stenson. I live at 670 Knotty Oak Road. So to follow up on what Representative Patricia Serpa said, how many of you up there make more than $100,000? How many of you make more than $50,000? I see a few people squirming. How many of you make less than $15,000? So for you to say that you want to ask everyone else to disclose their information, their personal information, to some stranger that comes to the door or to send it out via mail, via whatever, for anyone to look at, why is it that it's okay for all of you to be uncomfortable and not disclose but you
want all of them to. That's not acceptable. Secondly, how many of you up here across the whole panel, how many of you is this sewer project actually going to affect? How many of you are getting the sewers? I don't see any hands. You want to mandate something on town's people that make a fraction of what you make every year. You want to put them into debt where they cannot recover. You want many of them to lose their home. When they lose their homes, are you going to buy that home? How are you -- how are they going to sell their homes? No one is going to want anything to do with this.

Now, onto another question. Thank you. I still have time because you haven't answered any of my questions yet. So when you went -- entered into this project, how many of you reached out to your colleagues in other cities and towns and said how did you guys tackle this? Two people that have nothing to do with the town council that's mandating this? Seriously? That's your job, every one of you. You're mandating these people to spend all of this money, all of us, to take part of this, when they can't afford it. You have no clue what they're dealing with day to day, but you're
mandating this on them. You're mandating that they
lose their homes, and you sit up there, and --
excuse me, this is directed to you, sir, the only
one who sat there and said that he majored in
communications. So you sit there, and you tell
everyone who's upset about these sewers that you
majored in communications so you know that every
time that you're shaking everybody off, that you're
not looking at one person that stands up here to
speak their mind, that implore you to please listen
to the citizens, you sit there and you look at the
clock, you look around, you look at everything else
that you possibly can and you know especially full
well what that body language says.

MR. SHIBLEY: Next.

MR. HANNA: Hi. My name is Bob Hanna.
I'm on Arizona Street. So I'm on the -- I'm in the
Tiogue Lake area. I've been paying the assessments
since 2011. And in 2011 after the assessment came
and it was initially -- came in -- we're actually
going to pay an 8 percent interest, not 6, it was 8
at that time, we came to a meeting; and then for
whatever reason, it was put down to 6, which it
currently is now. But my wife and I did some
research as far as we were -- we had some questions
as far as grants go and, you know, why weren't there Federal grants paying for this. And at the
time, we came upon some community development block
grants, specifically for preserving clean water
that the Federal Government has made available.
And so were any of those received ever for this?

MR. THIBEAULT: At the last meeting that
we had about three weeks ago to discuss issues very
similar to tonight, information was given out about
community development block grants for individuals
needing assistance tying into the sewer and also
assistance with a septic system if that's what they
needed. That information was given out. If you
need that information, you can, or anyone else, can
call the town manager's office and they'll send you
to the right department.

MR. HANNA: Okay. So there were Federal
grants given to the town?

MR. THIBEAULT: Well, the individual who
needs the assistance would have to apply for a
community development block grant. And that
information is available in the planning office.
So you can call the planning office directly or
call the town manager's office to get the number
over to planning.
MR. HANNA: I see. Okay. And then my other question is what -- is there a plan yet for any recourse for the people in my area who have been paying for the last six years on the assessment as far as if things are going to be put to a halt, are we -- what are we to do from here?

MR. WATERS: The people who live on Arizona Street, no, there's no plan to put the assessments to a halt.

MR. HANNA: So we keep paying?

MR. WATERS: Yes.

MR. HANNA: Okay.

MR. BENJAMIN: Roger Benjamin, 30 Cecile Avenue, Coventry, right on top of MacArthur Boulevard. I said this several times. I know, you guys don't -- all the hardships -- I don't know -- I like to know what you guys are thinking of up there while we're talking and trying to explain people that have hardship. I mean real hardship. You have to think of those people. Hundred thousand dollars a year, oh, man, I could do wonders with that, but that's beside the point. I voted the Town of Coventry -- I should say we, the people of the Town of Coventry voted for the sewers not to have them. Okay. Many years ago that
happened. How come we got them? Anybody that can
answer that I'd like to know.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: I think we have them,
Mr. Gorham, through state enabling legislation --
that our legislators back in, you know, I don't
know, was it '97 that it was pulled together, 1997,
and, again -- no, no, no, no, no, the enabling
legislation that was brought forth to the State
House, again that was something done long before
all of our time on the council, but I believe it
was something that had to do that if, and I believe
in the legislation, and Mr. Raptakis might be able
to tell us that. He was on the legislation that
moved some of these things forward here. Like I
said, in '97, it's not for all of the taxpayers to
pay. I think what the enabling legislation that if
it was put in, it would be financed by the people
who are on the sewer line which is why it probably
didn't have to go to a vote by the people. Again,
I don't know why or how it was put in at that
point. But I believe, if I'm correct, Mr. Gorham,
could you speak to it. You are a legislator and an
attorney.

MR. GORHAM: That's correct --

MR. BENJAMIN: My time is running and you
guys are answering my question.

MR. GORHAM: I'll try to answer your question a different way. The law in Rhode Island provides that the town can borrow money based on revenues, anticipated from the installation of sewers and that's what allowed the town to go forward with the sewer project without having a voter approval referendum. It's the legislation that's in place and has been in place for several years.

MR. BENJAMIN: So we're wasting our time voting; is that what you're telling me?

MR. GORHAM: No. I'm saying that the law has changed since the referenda was placed before the voters. It is not always necessary for the town to obtain voter approval in order to expand the size of its sewer system.

MR. BENJAMIN: Okay. So the -- let me get this straight now. We're going to have a vote, correct? You guys are going to vote on whether we're going to go ahead with this project or not?

MR. GORHAM: I can answer the question a little further for you, sir. The town council, if it wants to, can ask for voter approval on -- on the expansion of the sewer system. And I think
it's fair to say, based on the reaction, that that is something that they'll probably consider and examine very carefully.

MR. BENJAMIN: The only other thing I want to say is I hope you guys do the right thing. We don't want them. Just don't want them. It's as simple as that. I can't get any clearer than that. We don't want it. You can hear -- you can hear the complaints. You can do whatever you want. The bottom line, we don't want them because they're going to create more hardship than we already have. And we don't have the money, number one. I'm retired. I got people that live on my street that are retired that walk around with canes and walkers. You don't really care, do you? No, you don't care. I know youse don't. You can tell by looking at -- because you voted it in. Okay. I want them stopped. That's it.

MS. LAW: Hello. My name is Mary Law, 10 Knight Street. First question is do any of you know where Knight Street is?

MR. MC GEE: Yes, I do.


MR. MC GEE: I do.

MS. LAW: Well, let's go back to 2011
because nobody on Knight Street got one of your, whatever it was you sent. And another thing back in 2011 a lot of those houses were foreclosed, abandoned. Many, many in that neighborhood are apartments. They're not going to respond to your survey, and that is a problem. The other thing I wanted to say, too, was -- I forgot. I'm embarrassing my daughter now. The cost was supposed to be, like, 13,000. We were promised that at the meeting in 2011. Mr. Cote told us at that meeting that why our area was being targeted was because it has a majority of housing in it. So that would bring in more tax revenue to continue with the sewers and basically that's what it's about. But just to let everybody here know when we came in 2011 and there's a lot more of you here now, it got voted down and it got postponed. So I'm hoping that's what happens tonight. Thank you.

MR. MOZZI: Good evening. My name is Gregg Mozzi. I live at 56 Benoit Street. And I don't really know what to say, but I've seen your language and I've seen the way that you all looked at us tonight. I think it's repulsive what you have done. You are not considering any of these people's voices. When was the last time you had a
town hall meeting with 1600 people in it. They're all saying no. Why would you mandate something that nobody in the town wants? Remember, all these people behind you voted for you, and they've all said no. For the people, by the people. That's what we grew up on, right? Remember that 1776.

Yeah.

One other thing I want to say to you. How can you guys really look us in the eye and say we're going to charge you 6 percent, but we're only paying 3? Where's that 3 percent going to go? And, also, the man who's on from D'Ambra Construction, really? That is definitely a conflict of interest because he stands to get a paycheck from this. His company stays in business because he's going to get the contract for the Coventry sewer system. That's wrong. Any lawyer knows that you have to recuse yourself out of that. It's Rhode Island politics. It's almost, I hate to say that word, I'm going to say it right now, 38 Studios. You guys are making some money on this, and none of you guys even have the sewers in your district. Why would you even vote for that? What are you guys thinking? Why don't I charge you $25,000 and get my stuff taken care of? Would you
like that? I don't think you would. So I hope you
guys do the right thing, forget the sewers, because
no one in Coventry ever wants them. I lived in
Warwick my whole life. I just moved here a year
ago. They don't want sewers here. Everything is
fine. It's a great little town. Let's keep it
that way. Let's get the tax rate down. Save some
money for the people. Thank you.

MR. BUCACCI: Ray Bucacci, 11 Centre
Street. Forty years ago when this whole project
started, everything was different. We had a lot of
manufacturing. We had big farms. We didn't have
Federal regulations, state regulations. Bodies of
water today are a lot cleaner than they were 40
years ago. So what I'm saying to you is this.
Everybody's on a roll for the sewers because we've
been on a roll for the sewers for 40 years. The
reason we put the sewers in because we were harming
the waterways and the local drinking water. That's
gone. The big manufacturers and the farms that
were polluting the rivers and the lakes aren't here
anymore. The water is cleaner. Unless you can
show harm to these bodies of water from not having
sewers, what are we doing? That's why we have
sewers to stop the harm from our water supplies.
We don't have harm to our water supplies anymore. Why do we have sewers? Good septic systems don't last 20 years. They last forever. The problem why a septic systems fails because the majority of people that have them don't realize you can't put bleach in your septic system. You can't put fats in your septic system. When you have a large group of people at your house and you make food, and all that oils from your dishes you throw in the dishwasher goes into your septic system, it will block your leach field. You have to wipe down all those oils and put them in the trash. How many people want to do that? You can't use a dishwasher if you've got a septic system. That material that feeds a dishwasher that cleans the dishes is too caustic and too acidy and it hurts your pH balance of your tank. All the people that put the septic systems in make a lot of money, $15,000, they're making almost half profit. No one's looking into any of that. People need to be more aware. If you have a septic system, you have to maintain it. You have not shown that we've harmed the waterways and we have to continue doing sewers. Unless you can show harm to the waterways, what are we doing? We just keeping going on and on, and we got someone
that we're paying and D'Ambra's paying and they're saying it's not a conflict of -- of course it's a conflict of interest. It's insane. You can't do that. That -- if that man's being paid on that job, if he works for D'Ambra, he has to give up his job or he has to give up his job at D'Ambra. That's conflict of interest. That's just simple -- that's the way it is.

We don't need sewers because the problem isn't there anymore. Most of the people that were dumping everything into these rivers were manufacturers and commercial interests and they started the sewer projects because they wanted the taxpayers to pay for their damages. Now you're asking all the taxpayers to keep building this sewer system when you haven't even shown a need. Where is the damage to the water system? The state and DEM make sure you can't have cesspools anymore. You've got to put in operating septic systems. They're not cheap: $15,000 is not cheap, and they'll last forever if properly maintained. Why do you need sewers? You've got to show the harm. That's it.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you.

MR. BOOD: Ron Bood, 15 Florida Avenue.
MR. SHIBLEY: Could you say that again. We didn't get that.

MR. BOOD: I said Ron Bood, 15 Florida Avenue. I just wanted to ask before we leave, I just want to understand what's going on here. Now, nothing is actually being voted on tonight? You put in two proposals, and then you put in a proposal to wait until you got more information. So what you're saying is things are just going to keep on going the way they're going, and there's not going to be any stop and how long is it --

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: No. Mrs. Carlson moved to -- Mrs. Carlson moved to put those resolutions after all of the forum. They will be voted on this evening.

MR. BOOD: Okay. I just want to say it's not a question, but I mean, I have two properties in Coventry. One of them, my septic system is three months old and the other one is three years old, you know, at a cost of like 15,000 a piece, you know, and you're going to mandate me, tie it into a sewer. It's crazy.

MR. LE BLANC: James LeBlanc, 43 Hazard Street. I think I have a minute 43 left if you want to clock me. Just so everybody here knows and
the town council knows, Chapter 191-16 which is our
sewer ordinance, it states, "Changes in
regulations. These regulations may be rescinded or
modified or added to by the town council at any
time when, in its opinion, such action is for the
best interest of the Town of Coventry." Five
people do not make up the Town of Coventry. We do.

MR. RAPTAKIS: Leo Raptakis once again.
If I may, Mr. President, Members of the Council. I
just want to clarify a point that it's been said
tonight that us in the General Assembly, my
colleagues that are here, are responsible for this.
Ladies and gentlemen, any bill, legislation
pertaining to this town, whether it's sewers,
whether it's the school bonds that we repaired all
the schools, are requested from the town council.
And there's a resolution asking us to facilitate to
put a bill in. We have no authority, and we're not
to blame because I think the blame game has already
started, and it's the General Assembly's fault why
there's a sewer authority. And back in 2006,
Mr. Laboisssonniere, yes, I was in the General
Assembly. A bill was sponsored by Senator Blais
and myself and Representative Sullivan, Murphy,
Moffitt, Landroche, and Williamson by the request
of the town council, drafted by the solicitor, and a resolution asking us to introduce this and that's the proper protocol in the State of Rhode Island because the towns do not have authority to do anything.

MR. LABOISSONIERE: Mr. Raptakis, what I was trying to get at before was that you would be able to know more about something on the Senate floor enabling legislation than I would. You've been there. That's what I was asking tonight.

MR. RAPTAKIS: But you blamed -- you blamed me Monday night and I have the video. I think a lot of people saw the video --

MR. LABOISSONIERE: No. I said --

Mr. Raptakis --

MR. RAPTAKIS: Blaming Representative Noones and myself. Blaming us. It wasn't us. It was your body.

MR. LABOISSONIERE: There's no need for getting -- no, no, no, no. There was a whole different conversation, I think, but I'm not willing to get back into that tonight. I asked you tonight, again, maybe if you could lend some light to the enabling legislation that stated what we needed to do.
MR. RAPTAKIS: I can. The town council and the solicitor drafted it. Why are you asking us the question? You should be -- not you, but the past councils should be answering that question, how the legislation was enacted. Don't blame us. It's all in black and white, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you.

MR. DAVIGNON: My name is Gordon Davignon. I actually have two houses in Coventry, one at 8 Hickory Road and one on Harrington Road, right on Tiogue Lake. And I'm looking at my own situation right now because my wife and I would like to retire on the lake and rebuild a home, and I'm getting prices right now between 25 and $35,000 for a septic system. So for me, personally, whatever way we go, I just would like to know which way we're going because in a couple more years I'm going to be retiring. And at this point, I'm getting the feeling that I don't know where to go at this point. It seems like everything is in limbo at this point.

I do want to personally thank Councilman Laboissonniere. I have spoken to him quite a few times about these issues, him being on the subcommittee, sewer subcommittee, and he's been
extremely informative to me. I can only give him kudos for him getting back to me on a daily basis sometimes. And I understand the impact on everyone financially here. I really do. I mean, I can just hear it. And I also feel for everyone up on that stage of what it must be like being yelled at by your father, but my question is this. Say the sewers go in and there is a lien on my property. Seeing that I don't have a mortgage on the house on the lake, would they become the first lienholder on my property; and say I want to get a construction loan, if they are the first lienholder, would that have to be paid off prior to me getting that loan.

MR. GORHAM: Typically, the banks treat sewer assessments in the same fashion as taxes. In fact, the enabling legislation that was put in place for the town when it began the sewer system specifically provides that the tax -- the assessments and the use charges are to be collected in the same fashion as taxes. So you don't have to pay the lien off if you refinance your mortgage or if you sell your house. It's something that would be assumed by the next buyer. They'll have to know about it. It will be on the lien certificate that's issued whenever anybody buys a house in
Coventry, all the taxes that you owe are shown. But it doesn't require you to pay it off if you're going to do construction on your house or anything like that.

MR. DAVIGNON: Okay. The next thing, I was just doing some math and I took $35,000 divided by 220, which is 12 months times 20 years, divided that out and it came out to $145 per month, divided by thirty days, and it came out to like $4.88. Personally, I bought a Subway sandwich that cost me $10 today. I'm not saying -- listen, everyone is in a different position here. Okay. And I'm not here to have people clap for me. I'm not here for that. What I'm just saying is I think we have to keep cool minds here, and I think through this type of debate, things are going to be better for the Town of Coventry. And whatever way it works out, they're hearing what the people are saying, and I'm sure and the people are expressing their emotions and they're also expressing their opinions about the situation. Okay. But I think what has happened here if people are saying that it's just not fair, well, you know, folks, we live in Rhode Island. What is fair in Rhode Island? Personally, I don't find anything fair in Rhode Island. Thank
you.

MR. ROBIDOUX: Kenneth Robidoux, 21 York Drive. I have a question for Mr. Shibley. I'd like to know if the taxpayers can get the same deal that they got when we sold Anthony, $930,000, we sold it for $60,000. Can we get the same deal on our sewers or on our taxes. Can we?

MR. SHIBLEY: I guess the answer is no.

MR. ROBIDOUX: Why not?

MR. SHIBLEY: I mean, that's an answer. That was an economic --

MR. ROBIDOUX: 900,000 to $60,000.

MR. GORHAM: Sir, thank you for asking that question. It's come up a couple of times, the issue with Anthony Mill, which was an approximately 120-unit mill that was renovated, and a question arose at one of the prior meetings about why they didn't have to pay a sewer assessment. And the simple answer as for this council is this council never waived any assessment for Anthony Mill, ever. It was prior councils who put together a deal and charged nothing. And so this council was faced with the very difficult decision of how do you -- it was -- we were actually approached by the staff. We said we have this huge looming obligation that
was never paid, and there's nothing on paper to substantiate why it wasn't paid. This is the $900,000 sewer assessment you're talking about. So let me answer your question.

So the town made a demand upon Brady Sullivan who was the owner of the Anthony Mill and had paid no assessment, and we went back and forth from many months. To bring litigation to collect a sewer assessment that a prior council had waived and had no paper to prove anything would have been a very difficult and challenging lawsuit for the town to bring and one thing was for absolute certain, it would be an expensive lawsuit. After many months of going back and forth, the town put together the best deal they could get in the circumstances. And you have to remember, the circumstances were not good, but they got something. They got something. They got $60,000. You're absolutely right, but it's not fair in my estimation to blame this council for trying to fix something that they got that was very badly broken.

MR. ROBIDOUX: I don't blame this council for this here. I blame this council for this. You are telling me to get a sewer, mandating me to hook up to go down my street to pay for this -- wait a
minute -- when they paid nothing. I don't care what the council is or who the council is. You have no right to make it everybody in here to have a sewer if they don't want one when they got away with this. I don't care who the council was or what they was. Now, we have to pay for them. Not right. You pay for them. Not me.

MS. STENSON: Thank you. Thank you. My name is Janice Stenson. I'm at 670 Knotty Oak Road. So regarding Brady Sullivan, in case you're not aware, because, unfortunately, it does seem that way, Brady Sullivan, anyone can look up really easily on Google, that's a multi-billion dollar company, multi-state company. That company comes into little cities and towns. They buy up tons of little -- old mills. They refurbish them. They get all kinds of tax credits. Some deserved, some not. Did you research this company, any of you, because honestly at least somebody was here during that time. Yes?

MR. GORHAM: Were there members of the -- what do you mean?

MS. STENSON: Were you the solicitor at the time?

MR. GORHAM: No, I was not.
MS. STENSON: Did any of you research that company at all?

MR. GORHAM: What I researched was the value of our case, the -- how likely we were to have success if we went all the way to trial with the case. That's what -- the company clearly had the resource -- you're right. The company had the resources. If we could establish an obligation to pay, they had the resources to pay it. I don't think they're a multi-billion-dollar company as you stated. I don't think that that's factually correct; but, nonetheless, your point is taken well. They probably have the resources to pay an assessment, but that wasn't the only criteria that we had to use to decide --

MS. STENSON: They make it a habit of taking advantage of cities and towns. Do your research before you enter into a contract. That contract, before they came here, that contract similar to what Providence just did, that contract should have had a clause in there saying that, yes, you can have maybe some of these tax rebates, but in exchange you have to make sure that you hire from local, from here. You have to get your materials from here. You have to spur the economy
in this town, never mind out of state where most of
their contractors are from Massachusetts,
Connecticut, New York, Florida. Why should we have
ever paid for their economies to boost a little?
It shouldn't happen. But the point is it required
research. So on this particular sewer project, now
that you charge them $60,000 but you're going to
charge a lot of town's people here close to 50,000
because that's so acceptable, so comparable.
Right? So now that you have all of these -- you've
singled out who has to have these sewers, how many,
off the top of your head, how many homes are in
this town? I heard one person could answer, could
formulate an approximate answer. How many homes
are going to be affected by this project? If this
is a question-and-answer session specifically for
this, you should have these facts and figures. You
should know the answers. You can't come here and
say we're going to have all the answers for you and
then just sit there and look around and not have
any answers. Is that because, as you said the
other day, your mind is already made up? Check the
tape. You did say that.

MR. SHIBLEY: We have decided that Brady
Sullivan, the previous owners had paid for the
sewer line. They came in and renovated the empty, desolate building and then with another council and then -- but I'm just saying, we didn't make an agreement with them.

MS. STENSON: You're not listening.

MR. SHIBLEY: You aren't. I said that we were going to lose --

MS. STENSON: The train of thought is the pattern of behavior of not checking out the facts. Not doing -- not vetting everything. Not doing your due diligence of finding out all the facts beforehand.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. We weren't on the council. I mean --

MS. STENSON: Regardless. The two situations in this town that still set up the taxpayers for pick up for you.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you for your comments and you've made your point a couple of times around. So I'd like some other people who haven't talked yet and then we're going to get on, I think, with the evening. Thank you for your comments.

MS. STENSON: So how many of these local companies that you're hiring here, how many people do you think you are actually employing from the
town?

MR. GORHAM: Ma'am, with all due respect, you've been given significantly more than the three minutes that other people have abided by --

MS. STENSON: You were speaking for most of that time. But this is just a continued pattern --

MR. GORHAM: You asked a question. I answered it.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: My name is Bill Kennedy. I've lived in Coventry 30 years. I have a septic tank that works perfectly, quite frankly, like most people here today. Now they tell me I have to come up with another $20,000; and I'll tell you, I'm 84 years old. I'm a senior citizen. There's no way that I can come up with that kind of money. Me and my wife love living in Coventry, but we've already decided that if we're going to be faced with this kind of a problem, that we're going to have to move out of Coventry. I don't want to do that. Like I said, I love Coventry, but you're putting us in a position where we have no other way. Our budget is stretched as far as it can stretch with the fire taxes, the water taxes, the state taxes. And when
you're on a fixed income, there's no place to go. And I just say I'm against this thing and, you know, I just think it's wrong because I know most people in here think it's wrong, and they probably have the same type of system that I have and it works. So why change. Thank you.

MS. FERRI: Linda Ferri, 6109 Flat River Road in Greene. I don't really have a question, but I'd like to make a statement. I live in District 1, and I would like to tell you that we fully support everybody in District 3 because we know very well what it is like to have a majority town council jam something down your throat that you do not want and did not ask for. So we fully support you in your fight. Thank you.

MS. DELIBERIS: Karen Deliberis, 49 Read Avenue. First thing, no questions. This should not be Republican against Democrat. This should be everybody helping the people of this town. I don't care. I don't -- I'm not a Republican. I'm not a Democrat. I am for who is perfect for the job. When is the next town council election?

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: November 2018.

MS. DELIBERIS: Thank you. Town of Coventry, please remember this come November of
2018. My next question is how do we go about getting a referendum for the town people who pay the taxes and vote you in. How do we get a referendum going?

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Referendum for what?

MS. DELIBERIS: To get -- to give us a chance to say no once again.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: I think that's probably we're looking --

MR. SHIBLEY: To get the resolution voted on.

MS. DELIBERIS: All right. My next question. Mrs. Carlson, you asked about some invoice that wasn't submitted yet at the last meeting. Has that been submitted yet? Do the people of Arnold Road, do know that there's still an open invoice and they could still add money to what they may have told you already? And Mr. Waters, my house was built in 1965. It is still the same septic system. Knock on wood. Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. Eric Wilson, 48 Hazard Street. If over 40 years have gone by and we got 7 percent connected, how is the town $29 million -- over $29 million in debt with the sewer
fund? We pay assessment fees. Those assessment fees assumingly cover the cost of construction, the contracts, material costs, what have you. On top of that, if we are overcharged in our assessment fees, the town keeps that money and on top of that as people mentioned before, a 2.75 percent loan you get, you charge us at 6 percent, and I assume the people that are connected are paying sewer tax. So how are we $29 million in debt right now?

MR. THIBEAULT: The $29 million in debt is over the life of the remaining debt, which I think brings it out to approximately 2035. So that's the number over the years that the debt is still active. It's not a current number that we have to pay this year.

MR. WILSON: So what is the current number we have to pay this year?

MR. THIBEAULT: About $2.5 million, a combination of our West Warwick loans and the loans that we've take out ourselves.

MR. WILSON: That's what the town owes?

MR. THIBEAULT: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: What's coming in for assessment fee charges, sewer tax, whatnot?

MR. THIBEAULT: Sewer use and assessment
is approximately 2.1, 2.2 million dollars and
there's other small sources of revenue. So for the
last few years, maybe four years, fund balance has
been used to offset the differential.

MR. WILSON: Fund balances?

MR. THIBEAULT: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: So how are we — so if we're
overcharged for this assessment fee, you keep that
money. Yet how are you in debt, especially with
the whole loan program where you're doubling your
money or doubling the interest?

MR. THIBEAULT: The last couple of
years -- the last two loans the town has taken out
through Rhode Island Clean Water, which is 2012 and
2013, the debt service that we're occurring on an
annual basis is not as high as the assessments that
we're taking in because we're not assessing --

MR. WILSON: So is that the engineer's
fault for not estimating the cost of all the
drilling, hammering, whatnot?

MR. THIBEAULT: No, sir. In 2012, the
funds that were actually earmarked for 2012 was
Quidnick -- those funds were earmarked for Quidnick
Village; and when the decision came not to sewer
Quidnick Village, those funds were diverted as a
matching grant for the 117 project. At the same
time, funds were issued in 2013. Those funds were
to be used for the 117 -- Route 117 project. But
since the 2012 funds were used, the 2013 funds sat
without being used for several years, but the town
was paying debt service on that. So we have the
2012 loans which, because we received Federal money
in 2012, the Federal Government said that you have
to assess commercial. You don't have to assess
residential for a period of time. So the
assessments that we're taking in and use fees
taking in on Route 117, which is the 2012 money,
it's less than the amount of the debt service. And
on the 2013 loan, we're taking in no assessments
against that debt we're paying.

MR. WILSON: Did everyone get that? How
much money is in the sewer fund right now, just out
of curiosity?

MR. THIBEAULT: Approximately $2.1
million. That's the fund balance.

MR. WILSON: So why was a loan taken out
using the city -- excuse me, town hall annex as
collateral?

MR. THIBEAULT: We're required to maintain
125 percent of one year's payment of fund balances.
Because we were under 125 percent, a decision was made to go to a third-party lender because Rhode Island Clean Water would not fund the loan because there was a dry line. They have a policy where they don't fund that. So a decision was made to seek a third-party loan to put a sewer line in Arnold Road South, which is Veterans Market towards the landfill and ultimately tie that line into Briar Point -- Briar Point neighborhood once that was built, and then it drives the entire line.

MR. WILSON: Okay, but, I mean, I'm not an expert, I'm not right up on my laws or whatnot, but can town property be used as collateral in a loan?

MR. THIBEAULT: The entire loan process was thoroughly reviewed by our town solicitor who agreed that it was appropriate to do so.

MR. WILSON: So it's appropriate, but not legal. Well, let me move on. I got one last point.

MR. SHIBLEY: All right because the gentleman behind you --

MR. WILSON: -- was not answered, my question earlier. I guess this refers to the engineers. The amount of ledge on Hazard Street, as I mentioned, you're making next to no progress
from 7 to 4. It's just constant hammering and
drilling by those massive machines for this ledge.
Were there any boring reports done saying this is
undrillable, this is unsmashable? Also, if the
structural integrity of my home, and I assume
everyone else here, their home, the foundation of
their home or, you know, the lead paint issue I
brought up, I hold the town solely responsible and
if you want to go after the engineer company, feel
free to do so. But I hold you solely responsible
for those damages. Along with the vibrations, I
was wondering if there's any vibration reports
taken to ensure that the structural integrity of
all these homes are safe as well as the water main
that is feet, if not inches, away from where you
are hammering away.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. BACON: Hi. Richard Bacon, 16 --

MS. BACON: Hang on a second. I'm sorry,
Rich, sorry. I'll interrupt you. He's my husband.
That's why. No, the gentleman before asked a
couple of questions regarding boring reports and
vibration reports, correct? Okay. Could those
please be answered.

MR. NICHOLS: Yeah. Some good questions
in there. I'll try to answer the pieces that are
answerable. Yes, we do soil borings in every area
before we try to proceed with sewers. In
particular, one of the things we look at is we look
at whether there is rock; and if there's rock, is
it significant? We try to characterize that to
some degree. Indeed, we understood that Hazard
Street had rock on it. It's impossible to drill
every two or three feet down the road so we don't
get a perfect profile. And rock tends to move up
and down in New England pretty steeply. So at the
very beginning of Hazard, we did actually hit more
rock than we expected to hit. In addition, the
rock on Hazard is -- a lot of you know if you live
there -- is extremely hard. And that's one of the
reasons they've been having such a hard time
actually hammering that rock. That methodology
that they use with vibratory hammering is actually
required when we work in the vicinity of sensitive
areas, in particular sensitive utilities. Most
places when we deal with rock of that nature we do
blasting. We'll actually use dynamite and drill
holes in the blast rock. We do not do that in
Rhode Island in close vicinity to utilities. The
rock excavation is pretty significant, that being
said. The installation we try to move as quickly as we can. We do have to hammer that rock to get it out. The contractor, I believe, is pretty much, Tim, out of that first big nub of rock. He's hopefully only got a couple more days before we hopefully come back out of that piece and I do expect, I hope, for all the folks in the neighborhood's sake, that we can come out of that and reduce that amount of hammering. We agree that it's very annoying and very difficult to listen to if you're in the neighborhood the whole time. The challenge is there's not a lot of other ways to get the rock out. There's only blasting and hammering.

To the question that you asked about damage to your property, we do require that the contractor maintain insurance if something happens, and that's something that you've got to monitor on an individual basis. If we were doing blasting, we would be out there doing more monitoring. If you note something in particular of concern, we do ask that you bring it to our attention with your house; but for the most part, the rock that's being taken out up there, that's the only method that we have to actually address it.

MR. WILSON: So if there's a crack in my
foundation, and it affects the structural integrity of my house, how do I prove to you that it's your fault?

MR. NICHOLAS: Well, you don't do that with us. If you want to file a claim, what would happen is you would present that claim to the town and the contractor's insurance company and that contractor's insurance company and the town would then assess that claim. Generally, the insurance company will go out and take a look at the crack. I can promise you that in older homes, cracks are pretty common, and it's oftentimes you don't notice them until you actually start to go looking for them. So the insurance company can make whatever they will of it, but I would not discourage you if you feel like your property's been damage from taking whatever actions you think are appropriate.

MR. SHIBLEY: The stenographer can't hear your questions if you don't come to the mike. Again, ask the question again.

MR. WILSON: The question about the structural integrity and the foundation to the house? The lead paint? So a lot of people in those houses, excuse me, all the houses in that neighborhood are fairly old. My house was built in
1925, and is one of the newer ones. A lot of these houses are dealing with lead paint. Some people have the finances to take care of it; some people don't. I, myself, am slowly taking care, especially with the windows because the windows, there's lead paint in those. Friction, opening and closing them, creates lead dust. Lead dust comes in the house. That's how children get lead poisoning. But these vibrations, that's unstoppable. If I open a window, I can wipe it with a damp cloth. That takes care of the lead dust. That's what I do for the windows I haven't taken care of myself. Constant vibrations from your company constantly drilling away for eight hours, nine hours a day, nonstop -- by the way, they're at the bottom of the hill and I can feel it in the ground at the top of the hill just for safety sake.

What about the lead dust issue? Those constant vibrations are going to create lead dust, been coming in my house and go out into the ground, in the soil and the groundwater. If we're doing sewers because of, you know, the pollutants from septic tanks and cesspools that, from my understanding, pretty much are working, what about the pollution
from all this lead dust?

MR. NICHOLS: So your question is you believe that you have loose lead paint or --

MR. WILSON: It doesn't matter, chips, lead paint, or not. If there's friction caused, that creates lead dust.

MR. NICHOLS: So, in general, if you have a condition in your home where there is freedom for the lead paint to be moved about, you need to be very cautious with that. If vibrations from the work can cause that to dislodge, other things that would happen in your home, including movement about your home could do that, too. We do not specifically survey any of the individual homes for lead paint. That's something that is up to the landlord if it's a rental property or the individual homeowner. I would suggest to you that you would want to be pretty cautious if you have paint that you can actually see dust moving around. I would suggest to you you want to be pretty cautious with that. If you have children in that house and you see that dust floating all around the place, I would --

MR. WILSON: What if I don't see the dust?

MR. NICHOLS: I -- again, you need to know
if you have lead paint in your home --

MR. WILSON: I do know I have lead paint --

MR. NICHOLS: We don't do that survey. On our end, we don't take that survey. So --

MR. WILSON: What about the boring reports, what were the readings on that in regards to Hazard Street?

MR. NICHOLS: So as I said before, we did take soil borings on Hazard Street. We found rock in various places as we expected --

MR. WILSON: How far apart were these?

MR. NICHOLS: Borings are generally done for sewer work approximately every 300 feet down the road, standard. We sometimes will intersperse those closer or put an extra one at an intersection. I'd say that I think about half the borings on there showed rock, Tim, maybe more than half. We pretty much got refusal on every single hole.

MR. WILSON: So if there was a refusal, how do you expect to drill for it for a sewer?

MR. NICHOLS: So what we were hoping in a number of those places that we got refusal, the refusal was fairly deep and what we're shooting for
is to get through some of these minor nubs of rock and get through the spot where we could get over the top of the ledge which is still what we expect to happen once we get up around the Knight Street -- just before we get up to the Knight Street area, but, as I said, you know, we did hit a little extra on the beginning of the road, a little more than we expected to hit.

MR. WILSON: So you agree there's a lot of ledge; there's to be a lot of drilling on Hazard Street? So is that the reason the town decided to target Hazard Street, so there could be an enormous assessment fee for each resident to make money?

Thank you.


MS. BACON: I'll say it after everyone else does. Thank you. Just remind me.

MR. BACON: Richard Bacon, 16 Catalpa Way. I hear everybody tonight, you know, everybody's got hardships and it's costing -- I hear 25,000; 50,000, and we come back to this Brady Sullivan and it really bugs me. It really bugs me. It's almost a million dollars. We act like, we say, oh, it was
a previous council. It was a previous solicitor. There was nobody here that was part of that? Nobody can explain what happened? So we put sewers in for almost a million dollars. There was no contract. How does this happen?

MR. MC GEE: I can explain that. I was on the council at the time and let me tell -- that's absolutely false. When we had the negotiations with Brady Sullivan, which is a very reputable company and we did do our homework, they did hire local contractors, especially when they did the Harris Mill. Besides that, when we were making a tax incentive plan, we were told by the solicitor that we could not use sewer for any tax incentive plan. There was not a betterment clause in the sewer -- the assessment is done to pay for the cost of the sewer line. There was already a sewer line at the property. We could not charge them for assessment because there was no betterment clause. There is a betterment clause in the new way we assess, but there wasn't at the time that program was made. So it's absolutely false. We did not use sewer fund as a negotiating tool to bring --

MR. BACON: I didn't say that. I'm just asking like how this happened.
MR. MC GEE: But that's the reason there was no betterment clause and we could not charge them. A betterment clause is if you're going to change the use of what you're using it for, then you get to charge them for use. That's a betterment clause, and they did change the use. They went from an industrial/manufacturing to residential. There was not a betterment clause when we were negotiating the tax incentive plan. So we could not use the sewer fund, and we did not. Thank you.

MR. BACON: So there was -- why did it come back around to the town that they decided they were going to charge for a sewer assessment if it was not possible to do so. So suddenly the town goes oh, we got a huge bill here. We've got to go, you know, charge this company and then we suddenly go, oh, we have no recourse. So there was no -- why is there never any communication around here. The other day we talked about adding four houses on the street off of -- Sand Street. And then this gentleman here is saying well, you have to make a call in the middle of a construction job and, well, it was always supposed to be in there anyway. Well, if we were engineering that, why didn't we
put it in in the first place. Why do we have to
have this revelation from a resident says, oh, I'd
love to have a sewer. So now we put them in and we
just kind of swing it through without voting on it
as a resolution or anything like that. This town
is getting way too big and our budgets are getting
way too big. There's too much money, too many
taxes to not have checks and balances and then you
wonder why people are aggravated and, everybody,
you cannot forget tonight why you're here because
these gentlemen put this resolution out tonight to
quiet you down. They didn't care until last
meeting when somebody called for their recall.
Then suddenly they're like, oh, let's do an
economic study so we can find somebody else to pay
for it. Just like, you know, somebody said
earlier, it's like a Ponzi scheme. We spent all
this money and now we need to find new suckers to
pull into this. We cannot keep doing this. Thank
you.

MR. SHIBLEY: All right. This will be the
last two people talking, then we're going to get on
with our council business. The last two I said,
ma'am.

MS. STENSON: This is a town meeting,
right, not just yours.

MR. SHIBLEY: And I'm town council
president, and you're the last two. Go ahead,
ma'am.

MS. STENSON: Yes, you said that, but not
for long.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you.

MS. STENSON: Janice Stenson,
S-T-E-N-S-O-N, 670 Knotty Oak Road. So I asked
previously if you knew how many homes were
affected, but none of you were able to give that
answer, correct? So if you're not able to answer
that question, then it's pretty obvious, I would
think, that you're not able to know how many of
those homes have failing septic systems, correct?
You've assumed that septic systems are going to
fail and that they're failing and, therefore, we
need these sewers. That's an assumption, rather
than arbitrarily choose a couple of streets that
you say must have it. As part of your research,
should you not have looked at the records first if
it's needed? If someone just put in a septic
system, how long does that work? If I can ask the
engineers, do you have any idea? Can you please
tell us. Generally a brand new septic system, how
long should that be able to continue without any
issues?

MR. NICHOLS: So do want me to just answer
that one or go back to your other questions because
I can answer some of your other questions, too.
So for instance --

MS. STENSON: You have the numbers but
these --

MR. NICHOLS: Hazard Street has 30 homes
served. That's one of several numbers that we
have. Depends on how much -- so it's hard to
answer a question like that when it's not specific.
So, for instance, Hazard Street has 30 properties
served. Each of the areas that we serve have a
different number of properties served. The entire
sewer program for what we see for eastern Coventry
going forward has something on the order of 4,300.
4,365 was the penciled-in number from the facility
planner. Total number of residential properties
that will be served.

MS. STENSON: Penciled-in --

MR. NICHOLS: Total residential properties
that would be served. That's a mix of commercial
residential, but remember that we don't always
have -- because it takes so long to build
everything, we don't always have accurate
information on what gets built and changed and how
many units they have. So those numbers tend to be
a little bit round until we get into each area.
But we do actually have a -- we know the numbers as
we go into each area.

MS. STENSON: So you know that on Hazard
Street there was approximately 30 and overall
they'll be approximately 4,300. How many of those
have septic?

MR. NICHOLS: So all the homes that we're
putting in have septic systems, obviously. And
so --

MS. STENSON: Don't say obviously because
if we're still in the year period where everybody
has to change over from septic to -- cesspool to
septic, so possibly some of them may not.

MR. NICHOLS: You're right. Some
homes have -- every home has an on-site system of
some type. Some of them are cesspools, some are
true septic systems, some are alternative systems.
At one point in time when the facility plan was
done, there were still some homes that had a pipe
that went out somewhere into the back --

MS. STENSON: God only knows where, and
it's scary, and I get that. So those definitely need to have something done to them. But for someone who's just put in a septic, as you've heard many have, within the last year, the last two years, three years, generally, especially with brand new septic systems, we've come a long way from those pipes way back years ago. How long do they last?

MR. NICHOLS: So determining how long a new septic system will last is a very difficult thing. It depends on a lot of factors and a couple of folks that have spoken here tonight have actually mentioned some of those factors. One of those that's very significant, one gentleman talked about how you treat your septic system. Folks that do a really good job of maintaining a septic system, if it was built to modern standards, can probably expect to get a very long service period out of their septic system, certainly in excess of twenty, possibly thirty years and upwards of fifty is not unusual. Septic systems generally over time, though, will eventually fail because they generally get plugged. A small amount of solids escape the septic tank when you actually dose a septic system. It's not something you can prevent.
It's in the nature of the design of the septic system. So over time, the field tends to plug. It's possible for folks who use a very small amount of water, that that could take a very long period of time, but it is very unpredictable. There are a lot of folks I know who their septic systems fail pretty quickly because they discharge things and, again, the gentleman that made the comments was pretty good there. You discharge either some type of chemical to your septic system or one of the worse ones is grease or you put in a garbage grinder and you grind garbage and you put it out to your septic system when you really shouldn't be doing that on a septic system.

So there's a lot of things that factor in to how long your septic system will give you service. There are septic systems, though, that can be in place and can be -- appear functional that aren't really performing up to the standard. This is one of the things we talked about.

Septic systems generally are thought to be working by the homeowner as long as they don't back up, and we can actually say that there are a number of things, if you poison your septic system, it doesn't always back up, but it can stop treating
and it can discharge different things into the environment. We also have an issue if the soils are very well drained where the water, if it goes away, you generally assume it's working and it isn't always working. In point of fact, a septic system whose leaching field is in contact with the groundwater table has categorically failed. That's something that's universal across the country. It's not a Rhode Island standard. It's not anybody's individual standard. Those are just the things we know because of the way a septic system is designed to treat wastewater.

The challenge with the type of problems that we have here is we can't build sewer systems to serve people that currently have failing septic systems and it's actually one of the things we'd really like to do. In a perfect world, we would very much like to wait for a street to all have problems with their septic systems and then go in and say don't worry in six months we'll have a sewer in that street for you and address it.

In general terms what tends to happen is if we can catch one or two people on a street at the time that their septic system is actually experiencing failure problems, that's usually a
pretty good hit rate and I know that doesn't sound
great, but legitimately that's the way it works
because the systems all fail at different times by
their very nature.

MS. STENSON: They do all fail at
different times. So there are ways that you can
figure out if they're failing, though, right? Not
necessarily you personally, but there are ways of
learning whether it's failing or not.

MR. NICHOLS: And I forgot to answer that
one -- I apologize for jumping in. I did forget to
answer that part of your question, too, and that
was a good question, too. Every time we redo the
facility plan, we actually pull the most recent
data, I think I mentioned that at the last town
council meeting, we actually go through the
previous five years of data from DEM's files and we
look at everything that's happened with anybody's
septic system in the entire planning area and we do
that pretty exhaustively to try to see if
something's changing drastically in that area.
Some areas will exhibit that there's a lot of new
systems and no one had a problem building those
systems and they look good and that will give us an
indication that gee, maybe this area shouldn't have
sewers because folks are clearly successfully
building septic systems. In other areas we'll see
that people have excessive pump-outs and that's
usually a symptom that their system has failed and
that's really all they can do when your system
starts backing up is pump out but it's an
indication of failure, but we do actually pull
those records. I just want to make sure I answered
that.

MS. STENSON: The DEM records, having to
do with those that are failed or those that they
know, is based on who's putting new ones in.
That's how they collect their data. So would it
not necessarily be a good idea to have someone
actually inspect them, have an idea of what's going
on in our town? Are there certain areas that --
you may be missing an entire area that they're all
failing and it's still going to end up backing up
somewhere, right?

MR. NICHOLS: Again, another very good
question. So there are communities that employ
management approaches that include physical
inspections. We actually have done a tri-town
program in a couple of towns as a trial basis going
back maybe 15 or 20 years ago, and we set up a
program that the town implemented to just go around
and inspect literally everybody's septic system.
The challenge is --

MS. STENSON: How often, like every five
years or --

MR. NICHOLS: You do it once every five
years generally. You try to do it once more
frequently, once every two or three if you can, and
if we're asking people about pumping, we always
recommend you pump every two to three years anyways
even if you don't have to. That sounds a lot but
it can actually protect your field. The challenge
with the inspection program is it's costly to
administer and it's fairly invasive and we actually
found through practice, I think almost all the
communities who have done this on a large scale,
they still do it on small scales, found that
homeowners generally don't like to get a call to
say, hey, I'm coming to your house to inspect your
septic system tomorrow. It comes across as a
little invasive. So it was --

MS. STENSON: There are better ways of
planning it out. Yes. They could have
notification beforehand about things that happen
which, unfortunately, appears to not happen very
often here; but, thank you. I appreciate all that information.

So there is a way of having an inspector inspect certain streets, certain areas, so you would have information ahead of time and know what it is that you're dealing with rather than making assumptions. That's my point. Don't make assumptions. So if you -- so, Mr. McGee, you had mentioned before that you had no idea how many people on Hazard Street, I believe it was in particular to Hazard Street, or another woman that was speaking earlier, on a particular street, you had no idea how many people you sent out fliers, you don't know who came, who left, who may have moved, who whatever, correct; you didn't have any of that information? You got returns.

MR. MC GEE: I got returns from people with answers and questions --

MS. STENSON: From 2011?

MR. MC GEE: From 2011, correct.

MS. STENSON: And you said as a follow-up to that that you have no idea since then how many people still live there, how many left?

MR. MC GEE: That's correct.

MS. STENSON: So on the town tax assessor
data base, the information available online through Northeast Revaluation Group, it's a public site. Any one of us can look it up and get that information for you probably in about ten minutes. If we, as taxpayers, whenever we want something, information from the town, we have to take time out of work to go to the office and request it in person. You're the town council. You have access to information like that. There is no excuse for you to say you don't have information that is right there at town hall. Not at all.

So out of everything that I've seen in the past few meetings, in all of these sessions, it just -- it's amazing. Of all these sessions, these town council meetings, these issues, from what I can see, they all come down to a few simple issues. The majority of this town council does not do the due diligence that is required of your positions, does not do the due diligence in asking questions beforehand. You wouldn't have a lot of these issues if you do. You don't ask questions beforehand. You're not making sure that you have all of the completed documentation before suggesting that you vote on something's complete. You're not necessarily, you're not, following
protocol. Honestly, these are all skills that our teachers teach in elementary school.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. You're next.

MS. CASTELLI: Lisa Castelli, 15 Chopin Street. Why weren't the studies that you're all saying you're willing to do now, why weren't they done before the $29.2 million debt that we're in for now? No answers?

MR. SHIBLEY: Weren't sure of your question.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: What was your question?

MS. CASTELLI: Why weren't the studies that you all are saying will be done now, why weren't they done before the $29.2 million we are now in debt for?

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Obviously, we make decisions on what's brought before us for our council. I can't -- we can't say what other councils, why, as a group, they've made a decision on stuff. But decisions in the past were made to move ahead to borrow money for particular projects, and so they've become cumulative over time, and I'm sure with all the information that was presented by the engineers, by the sewer subcommittee, et
cetera, that's how -- that's the criteria that
councils have used for -- to make decisions. And
obviously the one question that we erred on and
I'll admit to making an error is to not asking the
question, was it financially really feasible
socioeconomically for a particular area. We didn't
ask that. We followed the, you know, the reports,
et cetera. Obviously, we're seeing the outcry, the
community outcry, seeing what's been done. That's
why we now decided to make a decision to say how
are we going to move forward with this program.
We've heard what you've said, and that's the idea
for the resolutions to try to come up with a
solution for everybody that we can.

MS. CASTELLI: So we're still going to be
in the 20 --

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: That's correct, and
there's some of the solutions that we have to come
up with because if we're going on a negative
trajectory like it was presented, this council --
we're trying to catch a flood downstream and try to
make the best decisions that we can.

MS. CASTELLI: Okay. So if you said
there's 4,600 houses in the Anthony District --

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Is that the entire
facilities plan?

MS. CASTELLI: The facility plan? Yes. Okay. So you're going to be making $96 million it's going to cost to do this? Well, if you -- I want to thank youse all for your answers tonight. Youse did a great job answering everybody's questions. And these two ladies right here, God bless you two because you were the only two that are willing to help and speak up for everybody here and they're not filling you in. So anybody in District 3, be at Club Jacques Thursday night at six o'clock. We're recalling McGee's spot.

MR. SHIBLEY: Thank you. All right. We entertained a motion to put the public forum up ahead of the two votes on the resolutions. Now we're back to the resolutions. We have the first one before us is the -- regarding the Hazard Street sewer line. It's Resolution B1, which has already been read. All right. Do I have a motion to -- we get a motion. We get a second, and then there's discussion. We get a motion. We get a second, and then I'll ask for discussion of the council before a vote. Do I have a motion to approve the B1, the resolution that's already been read to stop the construction on Hazard Street sewer line? Do I
have a motion?

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: So moved.

MR. SHIBLEY: Do I have a second?

MR. MC GEE: Second.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Discussion?

Mrs. Bacon.

MS. BACON: Okay, great. I would like to -- the progress schedule that's in the contract -- by the way, the contract for Hazard Street, if anyone wants to find it, it was not provided to council by the way. I went on Google search. I found it. You can go to Accentblueprints.com. You can find the Hazard Street contract. You can find those boring reports that we're going to be talking about. You can also find the two contracts for Arnold Road if you want to review them. This one is about 300 and I think 32 pages long. So I just have snippets of it. I do have a question regarding this project.

The progress schedule that was scheduled, I don't see a copy of it. So are they on target? Are they meeting their benchmarks. Have there been any reports from the engineer? Have there been any concerns because I'm kind of baffled also regarding these boring reports. We have a drill report from
May 13, 2003, and it states large cobbles and boulders are likely. There are six boring reports. One, in particular, hang on, bear with me, Boring Number B87, it says bedrock. It also says the auger refusal at 8 feet. Attempted to auger through obstruction without success. I'm just -- I'm questioning why this -- and by the way, these are all dated 11-19-2009. So it looks like in 2003 and in 2009, there were issues with Hazard Street. So I'm just confused why we even went forward, and I want to know -- I really want to understand, did the engineers have any difficulties, did the contractor contact them, is that why we're stopping this project all of a sudden?

MR. NICHOLS: So a couple of your questions. First of all, yes, we did the borings earlier than the project was done. A number of the borings were done at various phases of the planning for the -- for various projects going back to 2003. The majority of the borings for Hazard Street were done when we originally did the Quidnick design which was, I want to say, 2008, 2009, just prior to when the town decided to stop that project. We actually had most of this previously designed and had shelved it at that time. Generally, the
borings are fine to be reused. We did, as I think
I said before, we did fully anticipate hitting rock
on Hazard Street. The contract, if you'll see, has
a significant quantity of rock in it, but, you
know, we do borings every 300 feet. So I think as
I mentioned in answer to one of the questions, it's
kind of hard to know exactly what you're going to
hit between the borings.

In point of fact, in answer to your later
question, we did hit more rock and we've been
talking about that as we've gone. We did hit more
rock right away than we were hoping to hit. That
first nub, a lot of the folks in the room have
actually mentioned that we've been hammering at, is
much harder than we were kind of hoping to get
through because it came up faster but, again, that
was within the confines of what we expected to see
on this particular street. In point of fact, the
rock on the street is one of the reasons why we
anticipate needing to have a sewer system in there
because not really a conducive area to septic
systems long term.

The status report that we have right now I
think Tim had told me that we've reached -- we've
reached a point where we've expended, you know,
enough of the rock where we feel comfortable that we likely will have more cost if we finish the 
street and that is absolutely a concern and we have begun to raise that with the town, but that kind of has happened in parallel with this concern about stopping the sewers. So I think the goal at this 
point is to find out the will of the town council. Our anticipation from the engineering side is to help you make a solid, sound decision as to if you want to stop the project, where to stop it. Our goal would be to mitigate the town's costs in that case because when you terminate a contract, there are likely to be contract termination expenses.

MS. BACON: Is it possible to get a copy of that progress schedule because I'm just -- I'm curious because in the contract it states that this project is to be fully completed by October 27, 2017.

MR. NICHOLS: So, yes, I apologize, Councilwoman. I forgot to answer that part of your question. They are, obviously, because there's so much rock, they are behind schedule, yes.

MS. BACON: So the contractor is having the issue. Is that why -- is this being -- we have this in front of us tonight? Did they have
concerns that they would not be able to get this done by October 27th?

MR. NICHOLS: The contractor is not making great progress, and they're obviously, I can only assume, not thrilled that they're not making great progress. The contractor has not once suggested to anybody that I know of that they do not want to fulfill their contractual obligation to finish the work on the road.

MS. BACON: But have they had concerns that they would not be able to get this contract done by the 27th?

MR. NICHOLS: It is pretty clear that finishing it by the 27th, unless we complete -- the rock completely disappears is pretty much off the table.

MS. BACON: And if they didn't, then there would be liquidated damages in the sum of one thousand for each consecutive calendar day, correct?

MR. NICHOLS: That's --

MS. BACON: I just have one other thing. It would have been very helpful to -- prior to voting on this Hazard Street project, it would have been very helpful to have this document in front of
us because we would have seen these boring reports. We would have questioned why we would ever go forward with this project. So please don't -- so please, going forward, we need to see these. We need to see these boring reports. I mean -- and people may say they're boring, but 383 pages long. I mean, it's unbelievable. It tells you all about your change orders, unauthorized changes at work. I mean, we'll have to look at that for the Arnold Road project. You know, it's very interesting to read this, and I think the council should have seen this before we even voted on this because I think there would probably be -- I know I would not have voted for it.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Thank you. All right. Motion made and seconded. All in favor --

MS. CARLSON: Whoa. Wait a minute. I still have a couple of issues. I think Greg had some questions. On both of these resolutions, and I know we haven't made the motion for the second one yet; but they both say, well, this one in particular says an appropriate place to stop the project prior to completion. There's no criteria for stopping. Who's going to say that we shouldn't just stop it now because they're not getting
anywhere. It's just -- they can't get through the
ledge or the granite whatever you want to call it.
And then, also, there is -- I thought we had
something in here about a 60-day -- the manager
will report back to the town council on the final
outcome of the Hazard Street sewer project. It's
kind of open-ended. The other one? Well, but this
one's also open-ended.

MR. SHIBLEY: This is to allow authorizing
the town manager to act as the agent of the town
locating an appropriate place to stop --

MS. CARLSON: I understand that.

MR. SHIBLEY: It will be his decision to
locate with the engineers on the appropriate place
to stop. It's very clear.

MS. CARLSON: I understand that, Glen, but
I'm saying that I want to know when he's going to
report back to the town council. We don't need to
have a special meeting. We have a meeting Monday
night but he can, as usual, either e-mail us or
call each of us to let us know when the project
stopped, and I think it needs to be immediate.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Can I ask a question
before you do?

MS. CARLSON: Yes.
MR. LABOISSONIERE: Thank you. Actually, I'd like to bounce off of Mrs. Carlson's question there on a question to Kent. We're looking for a stopping point. Are we close to one, to a spot? As the engineering firm, are we close to a spot that we can actually stop it, you know, and what would an estimated time frame be?

MR. NICHOLS: So it's a difficult question because we don't know what is in the near future. I can tell you that they are -- they have hammered their way up the road quite a bit from where they laid their last pipe and so one of our concerns was stopping immediately would be -- we don't want to pay for rock that was not removed in order to put any pipe in the ground. In addition, we also -- we like to terminate sewer projects at a manhole so that we can get future use out of the pipe that we've put in to date. What we would like to do is to get to the manhole. As the rock drops off, we're approaching Knight Street. As a bare minimum, we would like to get to the manhole at Knight Street, which is a pretty short distance up the road from where we are. What we would prefer to do then, though, it looks like the rock drops off between Knight and Sharp, and that we could
probably get that last run in and that will get a little more than -- right around halfway up the road. That looks like a really good place to stop before we get further into the rock.

So the answer is a little hard to make until we get a better assessment of where that is. We could stop at any time. The challenge with stopping immediately is we don't have a way to utilize that sewer line that has been put in to date. If somebody needed to connect to it, you've got a pretty high sunk cost into what's in the ground now, and our preference would be that we get the ability to button it up, have services extended to the property line from what we have put in, and in the distant future if somebody wants to connect to it, you will have the ability to utilize the line that's in the ground rather than just abandoning the work that's been done to date, and I think that's in the best interest of the town.

MR. SHIBLEY: So, Mr. Nichols, you know, again, some flexibility, an appropriate place to stop and that's to be determined. All right.

MS. CARLSON: All right, but I think I'd like some sort of idea of --

MR. SHIBLEY: Not necessarily known
because we don't know --

    MS. CARLSON: -- timeline. Thank you,
Greg. Thank you.

    MR. SHIBLEY: How many days? We don't
know.

    MS. CARLSON: Well, but that's a question
for Kent.

    MR. SHIBLEY: I think he just said he
didn't know. Go ahead.

    MR. NICHOLS: I don't know for sure, but I
can say that my hope, if we jump out of that rock,
it's a very short distance. I think, Tim, you can
correct me if I'm wrong, I think the distance to
get from where we are now to Knight Street from a
pipe -- and most of the rock is already pulled in
that, there's a little more hammering to do there,
is only like 60 feet. In theory, once the rock's
out, that pipe could be laid in a day. The
distance then up to Sharp Street is only like
another 170, 180 feet.

    MS. CARLSON: But if you're only
progressing 5 to 7 feet, it doesn't seem to me that
this will stop anytime soon.

    MR. NICHOLS: So the deceptive thing is
the reason that they're progressing 5 to 7 feet is
just because they've been hammering rock more than laying pipe. Once the rock is out of the way, we actually think that can all be done -- our hope would be be done by next week. And we would actually go back and then finish off a few service connections to the property line and then come in and pave and you would have a project that's buttoned up pretty quickly. About -- I think a reasonable two-week time frame is always kind of a good planning horizon for what needs to happen there. There would be probably some follow on things. We would still make the contractor test the lines and other things. Again, subject to what we hit in the ground. I think if we set back into a situation and we've done some test pits out ahead just to check it, if we got back into a situation where we saw a lot of rock coming up again and it looks like we were going to have to do excessive hammering, I probably would suggest to you that we should stop earlier rather than later.

MR. SHIBLEY: All right. We're moving the questions. Motion made and seconded. All in favor --

MS. CARLSON: So should we put a two-week deadline on this to get another report back because
what I don't want to do is spend a lot of extra
money trying to chip away at a granite -- a piece
of granite we can't get through. So can we ask for
some type of timeline?

MR. SHIBLEY: We certainly can ask for a
two-week report back; but whether it gets done or
not, at least we'll have a report in two weeks.
How will that be added to the resolution? Please.
Please. We're trying to discuss up here. We're
not answering the audience. We're answering up
here.

MR. WATERS: So, Councilman Carlson, what
would you like the resolution to say?

MR. SHIBLEY: The question is two weeks
sufficient?

MR. WATERS: This is to report back to the
town council in two weeks?

MS. CARLSON: Or less.

MR. WATERS: What am I -- what am I and
what is the staff reporting back?

MS. CARLSON: For the stopping.

MR. WATERS: For, like, a location to
stop?

MS. CARLSON: Right, because it says in
here --
MR. WATERS: We can do that.

MR. SHIBLEY: So the addition, I guess, Mr. Gorham, do you want to add it, but it's within, what, a two-week period? Would you add that in the front line, the first paragraph?

MR. GORHAM: Sure.

MR. SHIBLEY: All right.

MS. CARLSON: Okay. Wait a minute. One more question.

MR. SHIBLEY: Within the first paragraph, we'll just put made the motion, again with the amendment to put within a two-week period to report back through the council. All right? Thank you. We had the motion and -- with the amendment. Are there any other --

MS. CARLSON: Yes. In the one, two, three, four, fifth whereas, depending on outstanding expenditures, excess materials, and other factors, once a stopping location has been determined by the town manager, the town manager again, I think that's a typo, and in consultation with the town's consulting engineers and the town finance director, my question is what does this mean, outstanding expenditures, excess materials and other factors, which other factors sounds kind
of general.

MR. GORHAM: I can explain what that's in there. I think we went over this earlier --

MS. CARLSON: But they weren't there. I was.

MR. GORHAM: The reason that that is in there is because the contract that we have with Rocchio requires that we give them seven days' notice of termination of the contract. There is a portion in the contract that actually gives the town the authority to cancel the contract even without cause. And in order to exercise that, we have to have someone who can exercise it, and I think the town manager is the person to do it. Once he's made the determination, because otherwise you're just going to be extending the period of performance for Rocchio -- well, hold on -- until there's another town council meeting, and the town -- if you authorize the town manager to terminate the contract at the appropriate time, at the appropriate point, I really think it's going to pay dividends for the town in trying to end the contractual obligations that it has to Rocchio and that's why that's in there.

MS. CARLSON: I agree. I don't want this
to keep dragging on and as Glen likes to say
we're -- okay. Well, all right, then let's have
this report on Monday --

MR. SHIBLEY: Two weeks --

MS. CARLSON: No, no, stop. I'm amending
it. We have a meeting on Monday. Let's stop
wasting money is my point. Two weeks is too many.
All right. Two weeks is too many. Greg and I have
gone back and decided two weeks is too many. So we
should have some sort of --

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: We'll have a report
-- we'll have a report Monday at the next meaning.

MR. SHIBLEY: October 23d.

MS. CARLSON: October 23d needs to go in
the resolution. Mr. Gorham, could you please do
that. October 23d. Thank you.

MR. GORHAM: The resolution will be
amended to provide that the town manager will
report back by the town council meeting on October
23d.

MR. SHIBLEY: All right. We all have that
donw. All in favor, say aye.

(VOICE VOTE: PASSED)

Now we're on the next one B2. Why don't we read
MR. GORHAM: All right. I'm not going to read the title. Do you want me to read the title? I can read it. Okay. Sure. Okay, I'll read the title. A Resolution of the town council, the Town of Coventry, Rhode Island, directing the town manager to temporarily suspend sewer -- temporarily suspend the town's sewer facilities program, to direct the town's sewer engineering consultant to examine the 2016 sewer facilities plan as amended and its sewer project priorities, to take into consideration socioeconomic demographic data, to survey the different neighborhoods affected by the 2016 sewer facilities plan on various factors to include but not limited to desire to have their neighborhood sewered and to order the town sewer subcommittee in cooperation with the sewer engineering consultant to bring forward a revised sewer facilities plan to the town council for consideration. Here's the language of the -- that was the title. This is the language of the resolution. Whereas, in June of 2016 the town council of the Town of Coventry passed resolutions 74-16-4788 and 59-16-4773 to reinitiate the Town of Coventry's sewer facilities plan as amended; and,
whereas, after considering recent public input over
the cost of assessments, the town council wishes to
temporarily suspend the town's sewer facilities
program; and, whereas, the town council directs the
town manager to carry out the temporary suspension
of the town's sewer facilities program; and,
whereas, the town council directs the town manager
to have the town sewer consulting engineers, Weston
& Sampson, re-examine the 2016 sewer facilities
plan and project priorities and to revise the plan
to take into account socioeconomic demographic
data; and, whereas, the town council directs the
town manager to survey all of the different
neighborhoods in the town's 2016 facilities plan
on, among other things, their desire to have sewers
constructed in their neighborhood; and, whereas,
the town council orders the town's sewer
subcommittee in cooperation with the town's sewer
engineering consultant to bring forward a revised
sewer facilities plan to the town council for
consideration in not more than 60 days from
adoption of this resolution that takes into account
the pronounced residents' concerns, socioeconomic
data, and financial considerations and impacts on
the residents of Coventry.
Now, therefore, be it resolved that the
town council of the Town of Coventry directs the
town manager, one, to carry out the temporary
suspension of the town's sewer facilities program.
Two, to re-examine, through the town consulting
engineers, Weston & Sampson, and the sewer
subcommittee, the 2016 sewer facilities plan and
project priorities and revise the plan to take into
account socioeconomic demographic data. Three, to
survey all of the different neighborhoods in the
town's 2016 sewer facilities plan on, among other
things, the desire of citizens living in such
neighborhoods to have sewers constructed in their
neighborhood. Four, to bring forward in
cooperation with the town sewer engineering
consultant and the town's -- and the sewer
subcommittee, a revised sewer facilities plan to
the town council for consideration that takes into
account the pronounced residents' concerns,
socioeconomic data, and financial considerations
and impacts on the residents of Coventry in not
more than 60 days from adoption of this resolution.
Passed and adopted presumably today.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. Thank you for the
reading. A lot of information. I think it's been
well composed, and I think it's what we want at
this stage of where we are right now. My only
suggestion is to -- on the period of time in not
more than 60 days, I think that might be wishful
thinking. I think we should amend that to maybe
120 days to make sure that it's done right. I
think that's reasonable and that is what I would
recommend as an amendment. Okay? 120.

MS. CARLSON: Can I ask a question? I've
never seen -- Kent, are you done there? Okay.
I've never seen the 20 -- well, I don't think I've
ever seen a facilities plan and certainly did not
see the 2016 one. Now, you're working off of the
2016 plan. Would there be that much to revise
our -- I mean I don't have any idea how this -- how
long the process takes, but if that's a year old,
can you do it in 60 to 90 days? I think 120 days
is a long time.

MR. NICHOLS: So I think the challenge
with the schedule at 60 days is my understanding of
the intent of the council is to do a questionnaire
that we would actually get out to residents. If we
did a questionnaire that was like a web based only,
that would actually be able to be done relatively
quickly. If you do a questionnaire that we
actually intend to mail out and I think that's
traditionally how we would do these if we really
want to try to maximize feedback, we do -- we allow
it to be filled out on the web, but also mail it to
folks, and let them mail it back if they prefer
that. The time to get the questions formatted,
agree on the question formats, get the printing
done, get the things out to people, give folks
preferably like two weeks to fill them out and get
them back in and then be able to compile that data
alone would take the full 60 days that you have in
front of you. I agree you're absolutely right that
we should be able -- and the 2016 facilities plan
is pretty thick, but a lot of it is basically
relevant things from prior things. There's
probably four or five steps that we would do to
update that plan that should be done just to be
careful. One of those is to recheck the costs
because the costs do tend to change pretty
dramatically. Another one would be very clearly to
look at financial options for this kind of sunk
cost discussion which is what do you owe to West
Warwick, what are you already into for the
interceptor systems, and what some of the options
financially are, so an improved financial plan.
Those things can take a little bit more time but probably could be done in a relatively short period of time, a 30- to 60-day period. But probably the hard one is, and the question was asked tonight, the challenge of trying to collect the socioeconomic data is going to take a little bit of doing.

There's basically two resources available to the town. One is, and somebody actually mentioned it here, which was pretty good, but we do have census track data. We can put in some information in the questionnaires but it's voluntary when people get socioeconomic data back. So it's not usually reliable. So we actually have three things. One is whatever people put in the questionnaire. Two would be census track data, but limited by census tracks. And then the third one is whatever is in the town financial records on home values, but home values can be a pretty good -- quite a few of the folks who have spoken have pointed out that these homes have fairly demur home values, and they're not -- that's certainly something we can take into account. Just collecting and crunching that data and making sure we understand it well and then trying to formulate
the plan, I feel like 60 days is a -- there's a
recipe for failure.

MS. CARLSON: Well, let me ask you another
thing because I know if I got something from the
town and they wanted a lot of the gender and
finance based personal questions, I wouldn't answer
them. So now what are you going to do if you don't
get those answers and you can't really base it on
socioeconomic data and also you may not get a good
response, I suggest, if you're going to do that, it
has to go out mail-mail, regular mail, because not
everybody's going to whip out that computer and do
it. The only thing is, and I did write down that
we have a lot -- it appears we pay West Warwick a
lot of money. In your facilities plan, that's
going to be a huge issue I would think from what
Mr. Thibeault gave us this evening. And my last,
well, actually a question is I understand that
Rhodes Technology has a sewer treatment facility
for sale. Has anybody ever looked at what it would
maybe offset the cost if we in the town had a sewer
treatment facility that probably isn't as big as
West Warwick, obviously, because it was theirs; but
perhaps it could help offset some of the finances.
And then we'd have to also -- I think we need to
lower the interest rate.

MR. SHIBLEY: That's my whole point is I think to do it right, 120 days is not asking a lot. What you get back is how much time they can do it well.

MS. CARLSON: You're probably right, Glen, that maybe that isn't -- 60 is not going to be reasonable, but I said we didn't have to stay at 60.

MR. SHIBLEY: But 120 is, I think, within four months and where you're supposed to revise our sewer program.

MS. CARLSON: If we're going to stop this, we need to have a plan. They have to have a sewer facilities plan, and I don't want them to rush to judgment and then we're still sitting here doing something that nobody wants.

MR. SHIBLEY: I think 120 days is reasonable. To do it right, 120 is reasonable.

MS. CARLSON: We know that happens. No, I understand and that's what I'm saying, that's not -- and to actually depend on Northeast Re-val and their information for all of our homes, I take that with a lot of salt because there are a lot of homes I don't agree with.
MR. SHIBLEY: Again, on the one paragraph, changing it to not more than 120 days and then on the last paragraph also the same thing, not more than 120 days. That is my amendment to the resolution before us. Do I have a motion to accept?

MR. GORHAM: This is on the amendment?

MR. SHIBLEY: Yes. A motion to accept. I need a second on 120 days -- a second on that one.

MR. MC GEE: I'll second that.

MR. SHIBLEY: Second. All right.

Discussion?

MS. BACON: Okay. I have a question.

It's in the title. Survey the different neighborhoods affected by the 2016 sewer facility plan on various factors. Well, I did a request to get the sewer facility plan. I was provided the 2010. I didn't even know there was a 2016. And on the town website, it says 2010. So could we please get the 2016 sewer facilities plan up there so I know what it is. Also, different neighborhoods, what are you talking about? Are you talking about two, three, four, and five, or, you know, I want to know. Are we excluding District 1 out of this or are we doing --
MR. LABOISSONIERE: There are different neighborhoods that are included in the facilities --

MS. BACON: But I don't know what the plan is?

MR. LABOISSONIERE: Neighborhoods haven't changed from that facilities plan. Am I correct -- does the number -- the number of the areas in the facilities plan have not changed from 2010 to 2016; am I correct? Kent?

MS. BACON: Don't you think it would be prudent to basically -- I mean, we're looking at the entire town here.

MR. LABOISSONIERE: Well, it's the facilities plan that we're talking about.

MS. BACON: Well, you know what, I think this is the entire town because now we're talking about possibly putting the entire cost of this on the entire town. So I think we should really hear from everyone on that. I mean if we're going to do this, let's ask the entire town. Let's survey them. And I want to know what kind of questions, are we going to have any input on any of these questions that are going to be surveyed. I want to make sure --
MR. LABOISSONNIERE: I would insist on that as well, too. I think that's part of what we've been trying to gather here from the folks. A lot of their questions, et cetera, to bring forward.

MS. BACON: Now we're looking at socioeconomic demographics. So we're basically looking for folks that can afford it. That's basically --

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Or looking for folks that can't afford it and wanted to tell us that.

MS. BACON: But the problem is suppose you only get one person on that street that wants it and that can afford it. Now what happens to all those other folks.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: Then it becomes a choice. There's a choice obviously and difficult choices, too.

MS. BACON: This should have been looked at years ago to see if we could even afford it.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: We can't change that. We're trying to move forward. And my question, again, was the neighborhoods in the facilities plan of 2010, have they changed from the 2016 plan. You had all the numbered areas and the lettered areas.
MR. NICHOLS: So, Tim, I'm going to ask you to help me out here. The main change that we did in the 2016 plan that was different from the 2010 plan was the addition of the Route 3 Nooseneck Hill Road section running out to the West Greenwich line, and that was probably the only significant major change that we did, Tim, in that facility plan? Yeah. So really other than that, not a lot of change. They are principally the same, but just to answer the prior question, though, we have plenty of copies of that facility plan available. If you prefer it hard copy or PDF, just let us know and we can get that to you.

MS. BACON: I just want to make sure I'm understanding this and I want to know. Do you have the list of streets or the neighborhoods that you're talking about that are listed on here, the different neighborhoods affected?

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: They're all in the facilities plan, all the areas with all the streets.

MS. BACON: How many are we talking?

MR. NICHOLS: As I said, if we did just the properties recommended for sewer in the most recent facility plan, it's like 4,300 homes, 4,365
I think was the number, which is a lot; but previously when we sent the surveys out and I think you might have mentioned this already in your comments just recently here, but we generally try to send the questionnaires out to areas outlying from that, too, to kind of get a sense of what the outlying areas are doing. So it would be more -- probably, you know, at least 5,000 questionnaires and then if you are talking about surveying the entire town, what are we talking, 15,000 properties, something like that? Something on the order of 15,000 properties.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. We've heard the questions. We got a motion to approve and a second with the change, 120 days at the two locations on the front page and the last paragraph on the second page.

(VOICE VOTE: PASSED)

MR. SHIBLEY: I guess that's unanimous.

MR. GORHAM: That was the amendment as I understand it.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: With the amendment.

MR. SHIBLEY: Okay. I guess that's it.

Motion to adjourn.

MR. LABOISSONNIERE: So moved.
MS. CARLSON: Second.

(VOICE VOTE: PASSED)

(ADJOURNED AT 9:17 P.M.)
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