LITCHFIELD WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
258 West Street, Litchfield, CT 06759
September 11, 2025, at 7:00 pm

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** C. Levesque called the regular meeting of the Litchfield WPCA to order at 7:09 pm.
2. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Members present were Chris Levesque (Chairman), Ken Merz, John Bongiorno (BOS Liaison), Bill Buckley, Kate Honan, Keith Shortsleeve, Raz Alexe PW Director, and Ted Donoghue, Plant Superintendent.
Absent: None.
.
3) SEATING ALTERNATES: None seated.

4. MINUTES:
Motion: W. Buckley put forth a motion to accept the 7/10/25 Public Hearing minutes and the 7/10/25 regular WPCA minutes, and K. Honan seconded. There was no further discussion, and all members voted "aye" and the motion was carried.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS RELATIVE TO AGENDA ITEMS. None presented.

- **REPORT FROM CHAIRMAN.** None presented. The group did discuss the recently approved IMA agreement with Torrington. R. Alexe noted no supplement for uses as we go; a supplement to the IMA exists for hazards; it does not obligate them. C. Levesque described it as a mutual aid agreement with fixed rates and considered it a good deal. T. Donoghue was asked if we had received the FY 26 invoice as of yet, he said it is expected within the new two weeks.
- **DISCUSSION RE: LWPCA BOOKKEEP INTERGRATION INTO TOWN HALL.**
- **Online billing and payments (QDS and Invoice Cloud)**
  Town implementing QDS for billing and Invoice Cloud for online transactions. Invoice Cloud processes payments and remits; no need to re-send. Live payment link available. Lookup by unique ID or bill number; [Raz Alexe] said last name and property lookup will be available. Bills must be mailed by state statute; cannot be emailed. Payment options: online (service fee applies for credit cards ~2%–3%, cited 2.5%), ACH/Checking typically no fee; bank bill-pay/auto-pay possible; drop box at town hall; in-person Tuesdays/Thursdays; snail mail. Funds settlement approximately in three days. PCI compliance handled by the payment vendor.
- **Billing cycle timing**
  Missed September 2 (last day in September to get bills out for the 30th). New due date: October 31.
- **Integration with Munis and data reconciliation**
  Discussion on integrating with Munis for property updates to avoid billing former owners. Current process uses an exception report between two files, reconciled a couple of weeks ago. No automatic "shim" yet. Proposal to perform quarterly syncs going forward. Belief that once regular syncing is in place, future fund source changes will be easier.
- **Rate structure: EDU change and impact**
  Past EDU basis was 42,000 gallons; new EDU basis is 35,000 gallons. Residential

EDUs remain by dwelling unit. For metered uses, each 35,000 gallons equals 1 EDU annually. For properties without meters (not residential), historical EDU estimates were used. Concern raised that keeping the same EDU counts while the EDU gallon value decreased effectively undercharges non-metered properties relative to metered ones.

- **Adjustment for ~30–32 non-Aquarion non-residential accounts**
  There are 30–32 non-residential customers are not serviced by Aquarion and lack metered usage; prior total EDU count list ~98.5 (from an older list, possibly 2 years old). Bills have not gone out yet. Proposal discussed to adjust their EDU counts proportionally (e.g., 1.2× or 1.26×) to reflect the shift from 42,000 to 35,000 gallons per EDU, preventing non-metered users from receiving a de facto discount and incentivizing meter installation. Example: 1 EDU becomes 1.2 EDUs; if they had 5 EDUs, apply factor accordingly. Note that more commercial properties are billed on actual metered use this year; only these ~30–32 remain non-metered.
- **Plan to require meters for non-Aquarion commercial properties**
  Based on a passed resolution, any commercial properties not metered through Aquarian will be asked to install water meters to measure usage for next year and establish an annual baseline.
- **Residential fairness, minimums, and lawn watering considerations**
  Discussion on fairness: residential bills ideally tied to water usage; some residential units have low usage under 35,000 gallons. A minimum EDU applies to residential. For irrigation/lawn watering and other non-sewer water usage, approaches discussed: bill only a percentage of metered water (e.g., 90%) or use averages of low-use quarters. Any discount would require rate adjustments (e.g., the cited 424 minimum charge would need adjustment to maintain revenue neutrality).

- **Conclusion**

- Minutes of 7-10 moved and approved; all in favor: Aye.
- No public comments. Bill not yet received; expected any day.
- IMA supplement for hazards exists with fixed rates; no obligation. No indication yet on flow calculations.
- Online payment portal live; bills to be mailed; multiple payment methods supported; credit card fee ~2.5%, ACH likely no fee; lookup enhancements planned.
- Current cycle bills due October 31.
- Exception-report reconciliation completed recently; plan to pursue at least quarterly updates; no live automatic integration yet.
- Recognition that non-metered commercial accounts must be adjusted to reflect the new 35,000-gallon EDU basis to maintain proportionality.
- Consensus to adjust the ~30–32 non-metered commercial accounts before bills go out, applying a proportional factor (e.g., 1.2×) consistent with 35,000 gallons per EDU; pursue metering for these accounts.
- Will request meter installation for applicable commercial properties to enable usage-based billing next year.
- No change adopted; acknowledged residential minimum EDU charges and the need for revenue neutrality if applying irrigation discounts.
- **Commercial sewer billing based on metered water use vs. estimates**
  Discussion on aligning commercial EDU charges with Aquarion metered water data, incentivizing unmetered properties (likely on wells) to install meters. Consideration of an

escalating estimated-rate schedule for non-metered commercial users to encourage metering and ensure fairness and cost-of-service alignment.

- **Current EDU totals and revenue impact from water-based calculation**
  Reported totals using Aquarion water data show approximately 891 EDUs, translating to almost 370,000 dollars. Some accounts increased and others decreased compared to prior bathroom-based estimates, reflecting more accurate cost-of-service allocation. Minimum charge remains 1 EDU.
- **Identification and follow-up for properties needing review**
  Approximately 30 places require review due to discrepancies between prior estimates and new metered data. Aim is fairness and to discourage avoidance of metering.
- **Handling unmetered commercial properties (wells) and metering responsibility**
  Unmetered commercial properties are presumed to be on wells. Expectation stated that commercial property owners should provide meters equivalent to Aquarion's (e.g., one-inch, two-inch services). If no meter, apply estimates per an adopted schedule.
- **QDS system customer IDs and data integration**
  QDS is driven by property address; customers previously billed on water need unique IDs for QDS. Marissa is working to add these customers into QDS. Master list includes every water customer in town; green lines indicate property totals in the data.
- **Clarification of Aquarion-metered cohort vs. broader customer base**
  Confirmation that the ~891 EDU and revenue figure pertains to commercial properties with Aquarion meters that are currently not billed accordingly. Recognition of potential perceived deficits and familiar addresses indicating shifts vs. previous assumptions.
- **Adjustments timeline and operationalization**
  Plan to apply adjustments using available data, with mention that changes can be implemented by the end of the month. Coordination implied for implementation and billing updates.

Conclusion

- Group consensus to adjust commercial sewer charges to reflect Aquarion metered usage where available; for unmetered commercial users, develop and apply an estimation rate schedule that may escalate (e.g., 1.2 this year, 1.4–1.5 next year) to incentivize metering.
- Acknowledged revenue impact: ~891 EDUs ≈ ~370,000 dollars from Aquarion-metered commercial customers with minimum of 1 EDU; more accurate and fair distribution expected over prior bathroom-based estimates.
- Agreement that about 30 properties will be reviewed; intent is to follow up and adjust appropriately.
- Expectation set that commercial users should install appropriate meters; if not, an adopted estimate schedule will be applied and may escalate to encourage metering.
- Marissa to continue creating unique IDs and integrating customers into QDS based on property address master list.
- Confirmed focus on Aquarion-metered commercial properties not yet billed under metered usage; expect some accounts to go up and some down.
- Adjustments to be implemented using current data by the end of the month.
- No recent invoices received; not all tasks authorized; need clearer reporting format (percent complete and billing columns). Unclear whether 132,000 dollars will be invoiced until remaining tasks are completed or authorized

6. FOLLOW UP: RE: TECHNICAL MEMORANDA 3 & 4 - WOODARD & CURRAN

- Follow-up on Tech Memos 3 and 4: percent complete, change order 7, remaining budget visibility. Query on amounts owed and invoicing status: no recent invoices; question whether 132,000 dollars is to be billed. Clarification that not all tasks (e.g., task 5) are authorized. Suggestion to show percent of task completed vs. billed, and show original budget, change orders, billed, remaining.
- **Scope separation: Litchfield upgrades vs. potential Woodridge Lake (WLSD) flow**
  Reiterated contract structure: Phase 6 regarding WLSD feasibility to proceed only after all other items determine Litchfield's independent upgrade needs and costs. Confusion clarified that current studies are primarily for Litchfield compliance, with WLSD evaluation separate and contingent.
- **Data needs for WLSD analysis and who pays**
  Woodard & Curran would need WLSD flow data for any WLSD impact analysis. Debate on funding: some assert Litchfield taxpayers/sewer users should not pay for WLSD impact analysis; suggestion that the state should fund a neutral-party analysis; distrust of relying solely on state-led analysis vs. having independent, state-funded consultant analysis.
- **Regulatory and historical context of WLSD discharge and watershed classifications**
  Discussion of prior positions, 1995 references, and statements from 2020 regarding WLSD effluent quality claims, pipeline under Bantam River, and DEEP perspectives. Clarification on Connecticut's prohibition of point-source sewage discharge into drinking water-classified waters (classification vs. quality), and mention of a past move to downgrade Bantam River from AA to B in 2020 minutes. Disagreement and bias cautions raised.
- **Plant upgrade costs and capacity implications with external flows**
  Reference to statement from prior meeting that 34 million dollars of work is needed to upgrade Litchfield's plant. Concern that taking external (WLSD) flow could exacerbate issues; counterpoint that external connections could be charged. New member sought clarification on study scope and sequence.
- **Reuse/repurposing existing plant infrastructure vs. full replacement**
  Concern that Woodard & Curran may be proposing wholesale replacement instead of evaluating repurposing of existing assets. Direct question previously asked about reusing existing components; perception that reuse was not adequately explored in presentations.

  Conclusion

- It was agreed that we would pull out Task 6 from the Engineering Study. The preference is have this be a separate study that would only begin after everything about our existing plant is completed. We could also apply for a grant reimbursement of the costs, which would be up to 55%. The price of this part of the study would be $59,300. No agreement; strong position expressed that Litchfield should not pay for WLSD analysis; suggestion that the state should fund any WLSD impact analysis by a neutral party.
- No definitive conclusion; recognition of complex regulatory context (classification vs. quality) and differing recollections; suggestion to approach objectively.
- Maintained sequence: determine Litchfield's independent upgrade plan and cost first; only then assess additional costs/impacts for any external flow.

- No resolution; request implied to have Woodard & Curran more fully assess repurposing options for existing plant assets.
- **Secondary clarifier's depth and plant constraints**
  Discussion of secondary clarifier depths vs TR-16 standards. One tank at 10 feet, two original at 8 feet; high flow events create a pinch point. Landscape/hydraulic grade line limits adding basins; rectangular secondary tanks possible but circular preferred by energy standards.
- **Potential repurposing of tanks for equalization**
  Idea to repurpose one of three tanks as an equalization tank to manage high flows and pump out if hydraulic grade line is an issue, to avoid large spend before key decisions.
- **Scope and deliverables status with Woodard & Curran (tasks and invoicing)**
  Concern that engineering evaluation/discussion for Item/Task 6 was not included. Desire to know plant costs independent of regionalization until the answer to 125 is known. Status cited as "100%" complete on Task 4 but with missing deliverables for energy evaluation and final recommendations. Reference to invoice status vs deliverables and prior $11,000 change to Task 1.
- **DEEP leadership changes and implications**
  Acknowledgement of different leadership at DEEP wastewater division now (names referenced include Jim Perry as prior, current mentions include Nisha Mattel and Graham Stevens as Director). Suggest renewed discussion with DEEP; Task 6 could be a separate DEEP-supported study at 55% grant funding.
- **Approach to Task 6 (regionalization/partnership evaluation)**
  Proposal to let Woodard & Curran finish the last two tasks and consider removing/tabling Task 6 from their scope, revisiting later as a DEEP 55% grant study. Board to make data-driven decisions for Litchfield ratepayers on partnership/regionalization based on factual numbers.
- **DEEP authority and funding leverage**
  Warning that DEEP can confiscate capacity and withhold grants if regional capacity needs aren't addressed (example from Danbury: threat to confiscate $1,000,000, and Bethel denied grant funding for not regionalizing). Emphasis on knowing all facts before "hardball."
- **Immediate next steps with Woodard & Curran deliverables**
  Plan to request final report and Q&A session; possibly put cancellation of Task 6 on agenda next month for a vote, giving a month to consider. Verify which tasks (noted: 2 and 5 outstanding; need to confirm vs invoices) have deliverables vs invoicing; only invoice for delivered items.

7. **STATUS: RE: FST TANK COVER**
   1. **UPDATE ON APPROACH TO LIFT FST COVER.**

- **FS tank cover removal status and insurance**
  Quick Pick attempted lift failed; adjuster at CIRMA approved approach. New company with experience on two similar tanks (one exact diameter, one larger) quoted $99,000 to jack from below with hydraulic jacks, potentially remove in one piece; can cut if needed. W-9 received; awaiting start date. CIRMA adjuster blessed coverage.
- **Operational constraints and winter plan (frac tank)**
  Frac tank holds 7,000 gallons (one truck) and may freeze in winter. Plant has minimized sludge levels and improved thickening; need to restore tank use before winter to buy

time until bigger decisions. Plan prioritizes dislodging cover, inspecting haunches/corbels, and shoring if needed.

- **Safety and method for dislodging cover**
  Crane-only lift considered risky due to stuck top and potential sudden release. Plan to use synchronized hydraulic jacking (house-lifting style) applying millimeter-level increments to safely pop and then crane if freed. Estimated one week of work.
- **Costs to date and fiscal status**
  Tank rental is $1,300 per month. New fiscal year started; sludge pumping up two trucks vs last year. Spreadsheet of charges shared with CIRMA; no negative feedback. Quote for removal is $99,000. Concern about damage risk acknowledged; insurance engaged.
- **Governance on proceeding with tank removal**
  Update only; within spending limits and vetted with insurance; no board motion needed. PO is generated; awaiting scheduling within the next couple of weeks after W-9 processing.

2. INSURANCE/ENFORCEMENT UPDATE. R. Alexe share that the adjuster, Darren Toth, is working with CIRMA and has submitted the extra expenses we have incurred since last October.

8. DISCUSSION: ESTABLISHMENT OF SEWER CONSTRUCTION FUND (Ref Sec 5.15B)

- **Establishing a Sewer Construction Fund**
  Proposal to formalize a Sewer Construction Fund aligned with rules/regs to support upcoming plant and collection system improvements. Document also clarifies debt service fund management, which is not explicit in current regs. Materials circulated for review; feedback next month.
- **Policy on who pays for extensions vs maintenance**
  Clarification sought: new user/developer pays for extensions (quarter mile/half mile), while the Sewer Construction Fund would cover maintenance/replacement of existing infrastructure and plant upgrades. Past practice included assessing existing users $30,000–$40,000 for replacement on streets already served—questioned as unfair.
- **Assessment methodology reform**
  Statute allows assessing a “benefit,” but replacing an existing sewer may not increase property value. Intention stated to change rules so lining/replacement costs on existing segments are not charged only to directly fronting current customers but spread across rate base via the Fund. Prior attempt to propose change deferred for time/stomach reasons.

9. DISCUSSION: ASSESSMENT AND CONNECTION CHARGE FEES & SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR PREVIOUSLY ASSESSED PROPERTY

Sewer assessments, developer responsibilities, connection fee reforms, and financial structuring for infrastructure

- **St. Michael's sewer damage and reimbursement possibility**
  [Speaker 7] raised an incident where a WPCA contractor installing a sewer line through

St. Michael's violated storm/drain lines, causing significant damage. St. Michael's spent about $20,000 to resolve it. The contractor is out of business; discussion focused on insurance and timing.

- **Open assessments status**
  there were probably five or six assessments; for $40,000, three of them are still open. Discussion sought clarity on whether there are open assessments and any non-payers.
- **Developer cost responsibility for upgrades and extensions**
  Debate on who pays when existing infrastructure must be replaced or upsized to accommodate new development, including cases where a line was sized for three single-family houses and a developer now seeks more units.
- **Assessment methodology reform**
  Current regs may over-rely on a single parameter. Proposal to base assessments on multiple parameters: number of residential units, acreage, zoning, and assessed value, with a 25% weight to each, allocating costs proportionally (e.g., a property with 17% of total acreage pays 17% of that 25%).
- **Service area capacity and extensions outside service area**
  Facility plan defines a service area sized by zoning-based saturation flows. Extending sewer outside the service area risks exceeding plant capacity and displacing existing service area demand.
- **Reimbursement mechanism for developers when crossing unserved homes**
  if a developer extends sewer past existing unserved properties to connect to the system, the developer might be reimbursed when those properties later connect, up to the developer's cost.
- **Illustrative examples for public explanation**
  Request for visual examples to explain scenarios where existing homeowners with good septics may not want sewer while a developer extends past them, or where multiple homes have failing septics and face choices between a $40,000 assessments vs. $30,000 septic repairs.
- **Construction fund and financial structure**
  Question raised about setting a determined amount or percentage per year from assessments to start/build a construction fund and how to structure buckets of money (operating capital outlay vs. construction). Clarified that "general fund" means the sewer general fund, not the town's general fund.
- **Connection fee modernization and examples**
  new connection fee structure increases fees based on size/usage. Example: a 9,000 square foot building's fee changes from $4,000 (old) to $8,100 (new). Tractor Supply paid $4,000 three years ago; under new regs they would have paid more.
- **Supplemental connection charges for expansions of existing properties**
  When an existing property increases rooms/units, charge the delta based on approved changes: e.g., if previously 3 rooms and now 35 rooms, collect 32 times $4,200. Align charges to P&Z approvals and allow time payments coordination with assessments.

Conclusion

- C. Levesque and T. Donoghue, Superintendent] stated the contractor's insurance should cover it. Incident occurred 25 years ago and was discovered a year ago; no definitive path to reimbursement was finalized.
- T. Donoghue, Superintendent will email details; financial report update to be provided at the next meeting in July.

- C. Levesque confirmed via the developer permit agreement process that developers pay all costs (design, replacement, and necessary upsizing), analogous to installing a 16-inch water transmission main if required. If upsizing is solely to correct undersized legacy pipe (e.g., 6-inch to 8-inch) for existing customers, the utility bears the cost via sewer funds, not assessments.
- General agreement to draft changes: adopt multi-parameter assessment methodology; maintain connection charges as a component; potentially waive area/frontage components for developers installing public infrastructure but charge per-unit connection fees (e.g., 40 units = 40 times the connection charge).
- Policy stance reiterated: No sewer outside service area without deciding whose capacity is cut; protect existing sewer customers and ensure capacity for all within the defined service area.
- Concept supported, but current regs lack a frontage assessment mechanism to implement reimbursements. Plan to draft ordinance/regs changes and outline a flow chart to clarify processes.
- Team agreed examples and pictures would help; no final materials yet.
- [Chris Levesque] to assemble a table of funding buckets and proposed uses; maintain some capital outlay in the operating fund annually; avoid transfers to the town's general fund; further discussion needed.
- Consensus that modernization is appropriate; connection fees represent newcomers' capital buy-in (e.g., [Speaker 1] emphasized $4,000 formerly every ten years times four).
- Reg language added to enable collecting the difference (32 × 4200 in the example). Need to clarify interactions with time payments and assessments; approach will be explained before broader rollout. Not retroactive; West Street (Union Bank/firehouse) may be the first through the process.

10. REPORT: RE: PUBLIC WORKS / TREATMENT PLANT SUMMARY.

- Ted Donoghue, Superintendent] reported typical August flows, no issues. Implemented guidance from Wood and Kern to lower biomass in aeration tanks; reduced to ~1,000 mg, then maintained ~1,200–1,300 mg (about 1,000 mg lower than when accepting septage). Filaments reappeared. Increased wasting to lower biomass; SPI dropped below ~150, then crept up. Coordinating RAS and normal mitigation. Plans to send mixed liquor for filament ID.
- **Solar array metering and credits**
  [Ted Donoghue, Superintendent] flagged net metering issue: receiving Verogy and Eversource bills without reverse metering. In August generated almost 50,000 kilowatts. Eversource failed to list site as co-generator; retroactively paid $54,000 for first nine months since the meter tracked data. Eversource reimbursed two ZRECs (~$14,000). Average use ~40,000 kilowatts/month; UV off reduces by ~10,000 kilowatts/month. Expect credits between now and November. New panels are fewer but more efficient; vendor maintains site.

11. REPORT: RE: FINANCIAL REPORT SUMMARY, INCLUDING UPDATED FY 25 NUMBER.

- T. Donoghue, Superintendent, explained no current revenue collection; prior auditor required minimum fund balance of 150,000 each fiscal year. Spent about 216,000 in first two months (~16%). Stacey closed books; a fund balance report will be generated. Fiscal 25–26 slides show first two months' expenses below last year; no revenue posted yet; FY last year revenue reconciled with no major changes. Historically collect about 60 of revenue in two months post billing; expect close to 700,000 by end of September and October.
- **Capital projects and maintenance (UV, motors, valves, and tanks)**
  T. Donoghue, Superintendent is aligning and performing PM on electric motors (Troy Industrial doing work). Preparing to install purchased plug valves for primary tank. UV project ready; delivery of UV system in October; Kovacs and electricians have scoped work. Concern about schedule: aim to install in November; cannot afford to lose 250,000 of ARPA money; pushing subs and verifying equipment.
- **ARPA funding deadlines**
  R. Alexe said ARPA spend must be this calendar year; J. Bongiorno mentioned June 2026 spend deadline but acknowledged new auditors may have changed requirements. [Speaker 1] clarified it is a calendar year. [Ted Donoghue, Superintendent] said November 30th is really hard. Pressure also tied to 70 grand for Wi-Fi and Eversource coordination per Stacey.
- **Collection system and roadway coordination (manholes, paving)**
  T. Donoghue, Superintendent, finished upgrading last secondary tank with wear strips/shoes; one sprocket needed (225 bucks). Plan to shift to collection system QSR, replace manholes on Old South Road and Hard Drive. DOT will pave Route 63 from Litchfield to Moore next year; about eight manholes in southbound lane near double yellow need circle cut and replacement. Will require contractor and traffic control. Past 2017 claim when a cover popped and damaged a truck. Potential for DOT reimbursement noted; amounts discussed varied (125 a piece vs up to 1600).
- **Audits, fiscal close, and Munis handling of construction fund**
  R. Alexe noted town closed FY 24–25 as of June 30th; new auditor engaged and meeting with new staff; auditors requesting samples and process walkthroughs. Discussion on whether to track construction fund via Excel and fund balance or create a Munis line item, and potential to move extra money into fund 66.

12. **OPPORTUNITY FOR GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS.** None presented.

13. **COMMISSIONER REQUESTS FOR CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.**C. Levesque put forth these items.

- **Woodard and Curran deliverables and scope adjustments**
  K. Honan asked when is Woodard and Curran final report is due; thought due August 25th. R Alexe will ask for an extra column showing percentage of completion and will provide updates before the next meeting. C. Levesque and J.
- Bongiorno] discussed removing task 6 from their scope to close out work, then planning next steps including partner options and involving DEEP. Task 5 to identify immediate vs plan items.
- **Rate schedule and state statute compliance (lien and return check fees)**
  T. Donoghue, Superintendent noted rate schedule changes implemented: lien fee to 90 and return check to 75; state statute limits lien fee to $24 and return check up to $20.

Unclear how to implement given regs. Recommendation: align to state statute and revise regs to reference statute so future increases auto-apply.

- **Assessment application for VFW project**
  T. Donoghue, Superintendent described project with front entrance changes, additional bathrooms, and another connection to YMCA (abandon and cap existing). C. Levesque advised using square footage and equivalent dwelling unit to prorate dollars: current square footage determines current dollar value; apply fraction for new square footage to compute additional assessment.

Conclusion

- To place assessment status/process and removal of task 6 on the next agenda; C. Levesque to circulate updates before the next meeting if available.
- Continue standard mitigation; send mixed liquor sample for analysis; coordinate with Woodard and Curran on findings.
- Issue fixed; expect September bill to reflect correct co-generation and credits; [Ted Donoghue, Superintendent] will bring September bill next month.
- Await fund balance report post close; expect significant revenue collection in the next two months.
- Proceeding to meet November installation to protect ARPA funding; monitor delivery and contractor scheduling.
- Follow calendar year spend requirement per current guidance; target November installation to avoid losing 250,000; continue coordination on 70,000 Wi-Fi spend.
- Plan manhole replacements ahead of Route 63 paving; arrange contractor and traffic control; pursue DOT reimbursement.
- Await auditor coordination outcomes; decide whether to manage construction fund via Munis line item or spreadsheet tracking.
- Place removal of task 6 on next agenda; seek updated deliverables with completion percentages; plan discussion on next steps, potential partners, and DEEP engagement after receiving study.
- Charge only what state statute allows: $24 lien fee and up to $20 return check; update regulations to reference state statute; include in next public rate revision process.

14. ADJOURNMENT.

Motion: W. Buckley moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 pm. J. Borgiorno seconded and there was no further discussion. All members voted “aye,’ and the motion was carried.

Terrence Donoghue, Interim Recording Secretary