

**Representative Policy Board
South Central Connecticut Regional Water District**

Public Hearing Transcription

**Application for Approval of a Project to complete the Branford Hill Service Area Improvements
April 16, 2020**

RPB Members Present: Thomas P. Clifford, III, Peter Betkoski, Brian Eitzer, Mario Ricozzi, Timothy Slocum, Frank Pepe, Michelle Verderame, Charles Havrda, Stephen Mongillo, Jamie Mowat Young, Joseph A. Oslander, Richard Smith, Naomi Campbell, Anthony Rescigno, Jasper J. Jaser, Robert E. Harvey, Jr., Michael H. Horbal, T. Gregory Malloy, Mark Levine, Vincent Marino

Authority Members Present: Anthony DiSalvo, David Borowy, Joseph Cermola, Kevin Curseaden, Suzanne Sack

RWA Management Present: Larry L. Bingaman, Linda Discepolo, Rose Gavrilovic, Rochelle Kowalski Beth Nesteriak, Ted Norris

Office of Consumer Affairs: Jeffrey Donofrio, Esq.

Murtha Cullina: Bruce McDermott, Esq.

RPB Staff: Jennifer Slubowski

[7:00 P.M. - PUBLIC HEARING STARTS]

Jamie Mowat Young:

Okay. I'm Jamie Mowat Young. I'm calling the meeting to order. I want to thank you for participating in this public hearing. This public hearing is being recorded. A transcript will be made available at a later date, but please remember if you are... When it's time to ask questions, to please identify yourself, your name and your town. I'm going to read the notice of hearing first, and it was published on March 25th, 2020 in the Connecticut Post and New Haven Register. Notice of Public Hearing. Can everyone hear me okay? The Representative Policy Board RPB of the South Central Connecticut Regional Water District will hold a public hearing to consider the South Central Connecticut regional water authorities application for the approval of a project to complete the Branford Hill Area Improvements. The public hearing is on Tuesday, April 16th, 2020 beginning at 7:00 PM via remote access only in accordance with the Governor Lamont's executive order number 7(b) for the protection of public health and safety during the COVID-19 pandemic and response.

Jamie Mowat Young:

The public hearing will be held remotely under the requirements of paragraph one of the executive order number 7(b), suspension of in-person open meeting requirements. Members of the public may attend the meeting via conference call, video conference or other technology. For additional information on attending the meeting via remote access, please go to www.rwater.com and select the green tab, Board Meetings and Minutes. The public hearing is being held pursuant to sections 10 and 19

of Special Act 77-98 as amended. The application and accompanying information are available for public inspection at www.rwater.com and again select the green tab board meetings and minutes. All users of the public water supply system, residents of the regional water district owners of property served or to be served and other interested persons shall have an opportunity to be heard concerning the matter under consideration. Presented by Mario Ricoszi, chairperson, Representative Policy Board, South Central Connecticut Regional Water District, 90 Sargent drive, New Haven, Connecticut 06511. The procedure will follow for this public hearing is as follows:

Jamie Mowat Young:

I'm not going to set a time limit for speaking at this point but expect that everybody will be reasonable in the length of their comments. Before anyone... When it comes to your turn, I'll ask that you raise your hand or click and I'll try to call on you as I can. It's a little difficult with zoom; we'll do our best. Again, every time you speak though, please say your name and your town. If members of the public join the call, when it's time to invite them to speak, we'll ask them their names at that time. Again, we're going to advise everybody that your testimony that's going to be given tonight is going to be done under oath, so I'm going to ask those that will be giving factual information at this time, and I know of at least three: Jeff, Donofrio. Ted, where are you? Ted Norris and Rose Gavro, help me, Rose... Gavrilovic... Okay, to raise your right hands. Do you solemnly swear, and sincerely swear, or affirm and declare that the evidence you shall give concerning the case now in question shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, upon the pains and penalties of perjury or false statement?

Jeff Donofrio:

Yes, I do.

Ted Norris:

I do.

Rose Gavrilovic:

I do.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Okay. At this time, I will turn it over to the applicant to provide the presentation.

Ted Norris:

Thank you, Ms. Moderator. My name is Ted Norris. I'm Vice President of Asset Management at the Regional Water Authority. I'll be presenting tonight with Rose Gavrilovic director of Capital Planning and Delivery of the Regional Water Authority representing the Branford Hill Service Area Improvements project to the Representative Policy Board for approval and for action. The Branford Hills Service Area Project is a multi-phase construction project intended to... I'll wait till Jennifer. Jennifer do you have that...

Jennifer Slubowski:

Yes, I had it ready, I'm looking for it. Let me just bring it up.

Jamie Mowat Young:

While Ted is... This is Jamie Young again. I'll ask those that are not presenting factual information at this time to please mute your computers or your technology so that you're not interrupting with the sounds in the background, and when we call for questions, at that time, you can unmute. I'll let you know when it's time to unmute. Thank you.

Ted Norris:

You could Jennifer, Can we go to the next page. The Branford Hill Service Area Project is a multi-phase project intended to improve service pressures and fire flows in the Branford Hill area. The project includes the installation of about a mile of transmission main and associated appurtenances. It's located at... On West Main Street, on Route One and the Montoya Right of Way. The Montoya Right Way is located just to the East... Immediately to the East of the Branford Walmart. We refer to this project as of being on the Branford Hill, which is West of the area where the Branford Walmart is.

Ted Norris:

This was a multi-year project, originally budgeted for FY 20 and 21 the project was accelerated to FY 19 and 20 as a result of a planned Connecticut department of transportation paving project on route one. The estimated cost developed in May, 2019 as part of the FY 20 budget was \$1.75 million dollars. The final cost of the project is now estimated at \$2.4 million dollars and therefore requires RPB approval. Work on this project is substantially complete. I'll do that. I'm going to turn it over to Rose who will lead us through a lot of the details and information regarding the project and application.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Thank you Ted. Good evening again everyone. [inaudible]

Mario Ricozzi:

Rose, Rose, one second. Somebody may have a phone and a computer because we have a really bad feedback.

Mario Ricozzi:

Right, try again. Rose.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Is this better everyone?

Jamie Mowat Young:

Folks need to mute your phones and your computers by dragging your hand to the far with your mouse to the left and there's a mute button. If you can do that, and take your cell phones and move them away from your computers, that would assist us with Ms. Gavrilovic.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Did I get it better that time?

Rose Gavrilovic:

Can you all hear me better now?

Mark Levine:

What is she using? Is she using a phone, or is she using a computer?

Richard Smith:

Yeah. I think that's the problem. Is the source. Nice.

Suzanne Sack:

Do you have a headset you can use?

Rose Gavrilovic:

No, actually I don't have one handy. I can try to get one quickly.

Mario Ricozzi:

Rose, if you lower your volume, perhaps that'll help.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Rose, you sound a little bit like Darth Vader.

Rose Gavrilovic:

That is surely not my intention.

Brian Eitzer:

How about muting your computer totally and dialing in and being on the phone. I've done that at times. Can work.

Rose Gavrilovic:

How this is first?

Mark Levine:

Who do you dial into it Brian.

Jennifer Slubowski:

Meeting invite has a number on it. Do you have that handy Rose?

Rose Gavrilovic:

Yes, I have. Just Hold on.

Brian Eitzer:

Phone number to dial into is +1 646-876-9923. The meeting ID, three nine three.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Hold. on one second, Brian. Okay.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Okay. Go for it.

Brian Eitzer:

Meeting ID, three, nine, three.

Mario Ricoszi:

Rose. You're fine now.

Rose Gavrilovic:

I do? Okay.

Brian Eitzer:

Good go.

Rose Gavrilovic:

All right.

Mario Ricoszi:

Don't touch anything else.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Okay, thank you all. As Ted mentioned, this project had an original budget of \$1.75 million, and is now estimated at \$2.4 million. As you know, we normally come to the RPB prior to construction for approval, but there were a few unanticipated costs that caused this project to exceed that budget and exceed the \$2 million threshold, which is why we're here this evening. I'm going to first go through a little bit of the project itself and run through that, and then we'll get into some of the issues that caused that project to exceed the \$2 million. So just to run through a summary of the proposed improvements that Ted touched on.

Rose Gavrilovic:

This project was constructed in three phases. The first phase is about 1400 feet of 12 inch water main, and that was along West Main Street in the Branford Hill area. Phase Two is 1600 feet of 16 inch water main along the West Main Street corridor moving East, and then Phase Three is 2200 feet of 16 inch water main in the Montoya Right of Way. There were also gate valves and isolation valves added as appurtenances to be able to isolate that Branford Hill area when we were connecting it to the new North Branford service area.

Rose Gavrilovic:

If you turn to the next slide, this just gives a graphical depiction of the project. You could see kind of up in that upper left hand corner is the Branford Hill area, which is the first phase. The second phase goes down Route One, and I'd like to draw your attention to... As you... It's kind of in the middle of the screen there. It's hard because I can't point to it, but there's a section there that's identified as an eight inch main, about 2200 feet, that was abandoned in place. It was a cast iron pipe constructed in 1912, and I'll

explain some more details later, but that was one of the additional costs that we encountered with this project. Phase Three in the upper right hand corner is the Montoya Right of Way, and that was the Phase Three of the project, and that was about the 2200 feet of water main. And you could see there was an easement going up through there, and some of the additional costs were related to surveying and clearing that was required up in that area.

Rose Gavrilovic:

If we move to slide five, the Project Need: As Ted briefly mentioned this project addresses historic low pressures in the Branford Hill area. It is included in the RWA's long term distribution system plan originally identified in 2014. It became hydraulically feasible with the Brushy Plains improvement project complete. If you recall way back, we presented an application to you for the Brushy Plains improvement project that included about 12,000 feet of cross country pipe along Laurel Hill Road, Creech Road to connect the Cherry Hill service area to the North Branford service area. Additionally, there were upgrades to the Cherry Hill pump station to address fire flow issues. So that project with that being completed that allowed us to be able to connect the Branford Hill area to the North Branford service area as well. So this project was always planned and budgeted to follow that Brushy Plans project.

Rose Gavrilovic:

As Ted mentioned, it was accelerated from fiscal year 20 and 21, where it was originally budgeted, to fiscal years 19 into 20. And the reason that happened is we were coordinating with the Connecticut department of transportation. They had a project that they were proposing along Route One, and that we believed at the time that coordinating those schedules would allow us to not only be able to construct our water main before DOT came through and paved the road, but would also give us a significant cost savings associated with that. It's on the DOT project. You know, when we have a road that has recently been paved, we would've had to delay that project significantly in order to get it constructed because we are not allowed to tear up fresh pavement.

Rose Gavrilovic:

So if we turn to slide six, a quick summary of the alternatives analysis associated with the project, we always look at the status quo as you know. Status quo would not address the low pressure and the fire flow issues in the area. Route One is a highly congested area. It would be very difficult to go back in later, as I mentioned, and put a water main in, and not doing this project prevents work towards our long-term distribution system goals. The second alternative looked at was booster pumping station. With that alternative, there would be a property purchase required. It would be a significant upfront capital cost, and that was estimated in the \$2-3 million range, and we'd also have ongoing increased O&M costs of about \$20,000 a year, and as you as you could expect, the majority of that would be due to electrical issues to run the pumps.

Rose Gavrilovic:

The third option is the water transmission main. That's the project that is presented to you tonight. It is a significant upfront capital investment. However, it's very reliable, has a long service life, as you know, ductile iron pipe has a useful life of in that hundred year range. And overall, it was... There's very little O & M costs with pipe and it has the lowest life cycle cost.

Rose Gavrilovic:

We move onto slide seven just to give you a little sense of that timeline and kind of how the project developed. In January of 2019, we were notified that DOT had an upcoming project along Route One in the same area where we were planning to construct the water main. In the March-April timeframe, we requested approval to accelerate this project. April and May, we designed the project and began ordering materials, and in June of 2019, we commenced construction. And the DOT project was originally... When we were notified of their project, they were originally set to start their work in June of 2019. Through discussions with them, they had agreed to postpone their project to September to allow us enough time to be able to get a design done, get the contractor out there and get that section done along Route One so that we would not impact their work.

Rose Gavrilovic:

So once we started construction in June, we're two months into construction and then in August the DOT notified us that their project was postponed. So at that point there was no choice. We continued with the work, finished our pipe work substantially in December of 2019.

Rose Gavrilovic:

If we turn to slide eight. So the explanation of unusual circumstances that is included in the application. And I think, as I mentioned, it's highly unusual to come to the RPB with a project being constructed. But the RPB threshold of \$2 million was exceeded due to a couple of reasons. The first one was the pipe corridor relocation. So as I mentioned on the graphic, there was an eight inch main that was relocated and services ... I'm sorry, that was abandoned and the services were transferred. This was due to a conflict with the high voltage electrical lines that were identified in phase two while the construction was ongoing, there were some mismarked utility lines out there and due to the highly congested road on Route One, it was determined that the best option was to abandon that eight inch and construct the new main, generally speaking right in the same area as that eight inch main. So, although it wasn't ideal, that main is very old, constructed in 1912 so we were able to replace that main as well. Unfortunately it added a significant cost of 400,000 to the project.

Rose Gavrilovic:

The second reason is, as I mentioned, the DOT project got delayed on Route One to where we were thinking that we would gain efficiencies and save about 175,000 in paving costs with the DOT postponing their project. We obviously couldn't leave the road unpaved so we were required to do that paving and incur those costs ourselves. And the difference, there's 175,000 we estimated originally. There's an additional 25,000 that we were anticipating just as touch up work in the spring once it settled.

Rose Gavrilovic:

The third reason, the Montoya right of way. As I mentioned briefly, we needed to do some additional survey work, significant trees out there needed to be removed and cleared once we were able to fully define that right of way to construct the main there.

Rose Gavrilovic:

So moving to slide nine. As we mentioned the original budget associated with this project was \$1.75 million. The dollar spent to date is \$1.96 million. Estimated cost to completion was the 404,000, bringing the total to 2.4 million. And then just those unanticipated costs that I just mentioned, the pavement

restoration, abandoning that eight inch main and transferring those services and that additional work in the right of way equated to about \$670,000.

Rose Gavrilovic:

So on slide 10 the project schedule. As I mentioned, the water main installation is completed. The final paving and restoration to the Montoya right of way is scheduled for the spring. And actually I just found out the work just started today on that restoration. And then the final piece of this project is transferring over the Branford Hill Area to the North Branford Service Area. And that's really a matter of opening those gates, as I mentioned, to isolate the Branford Hill Area from the [inaudible 00:52:57] Service Area where it was originally connected to the North Branford Service Area.

Rose Gavrilovic:

So given the situation, we wanted to kind of take a look back at this project and look at what we could've done differently. We conducted a lessons learned on the project and some of the things that were identified are The first thing is the contract execution. So we use our on-call contractor for this. So in the future, we would want to evaluate the applicability of utilizing our Capital Pipe on-call contract for such a large pipe project. When we look back and we think about the schedule and everything that was going on with the DOT, for us to have taken the time to bid this project separately, we would have not been able to complete it in the timeframe that DOT originally needed us to complete it. But generally speaking for projects of this size, we would want to bid those separately and get competitive bids.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Related to the project budgeting and contingency. Normally with each project we budget about a 5% contingency. We would want to look at the adequacy of that 5% related to pipe projects. As we all know, we don't know what we don't know and we can't see in the ground. So we might look at increasing that contingency for a project such as this.

Rose Gavrilovic:

And then notification to the board. So if we identify that there's an issue or something that would require board approvals, we want to notify the boards as quickly as possible to give that heads up on what's going on. But having said that, I'd also like to mention the successes with this project because I think when we look at it as a whole, the project was highly successful. I think we were able to complete a significant amount of work in a short period of time, very safely, on a very busy, congested road in the middle of the summer. Our contractor was very responsive. We had multiple crews at different points going at the same time. So I think that when we look at the project as a whole, I think the project team did really well in getting the project done.

Rose Gavrilovic:

On slide 12, the summary. In summary, this project does advance our long-term goal of operational flexibility in the distribution system. Our timeline was accelerated and condensed. We constructed this project in probably about half the time it would normally take to meet DOT's project schedule prior to them postponing the project and the resulting paving costs to us were unavoidable. The abandonment of the 1912 eight inch cast iron pipe, under the circumstances, we feel that it was a wise use of RWA's customer dollars. And what I can say for sure is once those services were transferred over, the customers ... we got some really good feedback. They were very happy to see the pressure increase in

their lines. Although we didn't see it inside the pipe, we're anticipating that there's a significant amount of tuberculation inside that cast iron pipe. And actually we think about what could have happened if DOT was paving over that eight inch pipe too and the dirty water that could have settled out from the pipe. So I think under the circumstances I think we made the best use of our customers' dollars.

Rose Gavrilovic:

And with that we'll take any questions you might have.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Let's first start with attorney Jeff Donofrio from The Office of Consumer Affairs and we'll follow him by the RPB members.

Jeff Donofrio:

Thank you. Jeff Donofrio, OCA. The project was clearly necessary to address low pressure and fire flow issues in the Branford Hill Service Area. If you take a look at the 2014 New Haven Service Area Improvement study by Tata & Howard for the Authority, the project was discussed and it's a project that's been mentioned from time to time by the Authority in budget discussions over the last few years. As we know, the project was accelerated in an effort to coordinate with and take advantage of a DOT project, which we know from the application and from the applicant's testimony tonight was postponed and that in and of itself caused a 10% budget hit.

Jeff Donofrio:

In Appendix D of the application, we have Tighe & Bond's, hydraulic modeling, inclusive of the Branford Hill Service Area through the Cherry Hill Service Area and if you look at the general pressure analysis, the available fire flow analysis, the water age and source contribution analysis, it's clear that this project was necessary and appropriate, so when I reviewed it, I reviewed it twofold. First as if it were an application filed for the project not yet performed and then secondly with respect to the overruns, whether or not the Authority could have avoided the overruns or whether or not the Authority's budget estimate, which was as we know a quarter million dollars below the \$2 million threshold, was prudent. But from a necessity perspective, as you know, you have my memo in the record from April 2nd, recommending approval of the application. The OCA certainly found the project to be appropriate, necessary and in the best interest of consumers.

Jeff Donofrio:

With respect to the overruns, I think the primary lesson learned I think really should be the danger of using a percentage across the board for contingency. Because when you have what is a relatively small project, a under \$2 million project, and you use a 5% contingency, you're giving yourself less than \$100,000 contingency for subsurface construction. And aside from time impact, cost overruns, differing or changed conditions are the big dollar changes that you see on these types of projects. So we took a 10% hit just by losing the \$175,000 efficiency that would've come from coordinating with DOT. But really over 60% of the overrun was attributable to that differing condition, that \$400,000 hit. And when you're talking about a project where you're dealing with 108 year old main, I think it really underscores the need to establish contingency on a project by project basis. Especially when you're talking about pipe projects and you're going to have better information in terms of what's in the ground for some projects than you will for others.

Jeff Donofrio:

So I did appreciate seeing that lesson learned with regard to the contingency. It's something that we've talked about year after year and the Authority certainly has improved its process in cost estimating and establishing contingency and more often than not, the Authority's contingency has been adequate.

Jeff Donofrio:

And then the other \$70,000 was just unforeseen site work, surveying, clearing, grubbing and tree removal associated with the right of way on Montoya Drive. So I really didn't have any problem with the project management. I think it's somewhat speculative, the 5% I understand where that comes from. I understand when that was established and what the engineering principles are to establish an across the board contingency. But that would be the big comment from the OCA's perspective, is that this really does underscore the problem with a 5% contingency on a small job. You're talking about a project that was estimated to be under \$2 million and 5% doesn't really get you much in the event that you have any kind of different condition or time impact. But the OCA recommends approval of the project. I think that the project was necessary and appropriate and glad to see it was performed successfully and on time.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Thank you, counselor. If there's no comments by Rose and Ted to what Jeff has said, then we'll move on to the RPB, excuse me RPB members. If any of you have questions, if you could kind of raise your hand or get my attention. And then following that we'll go to the public if there's any public comments.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Is there anyone who has any questions? Mike Horbal. Please identify yourself and the town you're from.

Mike Horbal:

All right, Mike Horbal. Seymour, Connecticut. And I had sent in a request to Ted Norris, which he answered and I wanted to say some of his comments was that there was a conflict on this project due to the error of the layout of existing mains, which caused the water company to change the location of the main from one side of the street to another. And I asked, "Was this error in the location of the plans made by our consultants?" And his answer was "No, that it was another utility."

Mike Horbal:

Now, I don't know which utility it was, but my main goal is to make sure that the water company does not make these kind of mistakes or that the utility that they rely on does not make this mistake, which costs all of us money in the future. Then the second question I had was you ended up awarding this contract under the Capitol Pipe bid and I wonder if that's a smart thing to do when the project was estimated at \$1.75 million and you're trying to keep under the \$2 million cap. Okay, so I believe that the construction that was undertaken after the find of this error to replace the eight inch 105 year old water main with a 12 inch main was a very good decision and I believe that the project was necessary. My main goal is to try to make sure that in the future projects that come close to the \$2 million cap don't run into the same type of problems. And that's all the comments I have. I appreciate the comments that I received from Ted Norris and the comments just recently from Rose. Thank you.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Thank you, Mike. Ted or Rose, do you want to respond to his comments or?

Ted Norris:

This is Ted Norris, I just want to make it clear, Mike, and I think you have it right, but I want to make sure everyone else does, that the relocation of our main was required as a result of mismarking by another utility. So they mismarked, we started to dig, all of a sudden we found a large transmission main 10 feet off of where it was supposed to be. That was what caused the main relocation and the largest cost increase of the project. So it happens from time to time. We're not perfect with all of our markings either. So you've got to be careful with that. But you're right, going forward in the future we need to look at and how we actually did the project, the timing was a little bit short in order to be able to bid this but in retrospect, and another lessons learned, this kind of project in the future will be bid.

Ted Norris:

It's hard when you have a project that is close to the 2 million, this was 1.75, would I go forward with this project again? Probably not at that kind of numbers. We have several projects that we're looking at now that are close to the \$2 million numbers. One of them is actually the one that was talked about tonight, North Sleeping Giant, that was close and actually was slightly over the \$2 million. So we have to be more careful with the projects that are close to \$2 million. So thank you for your comment.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Go ahead Rose.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Thank you. I'd just like to add to that, Mike, just to make sure that we're all on the same understanding. The main was not moved to the other side of the road. It stayed on the same side of the road. I think part of the issue here was because it was on Route One. If we have mismarked utilities and we identify them, there's the potential that we can shift over a little bit and we could be fine.

Rose Gavrilovic:

I think because what added to this project was the fact that we were in Route One and it was so congested and there was that conversation on, "Well, should we look at the other side of the road and moving to that side?" But it was just as congested over there, as you can imagine on Route One there's a lot of utilities. So given that it was under construction and all of the conditions that we encountered, it was on the same side of Route One but it did have to be shifted and that caused all of these other ... Due to the congestion and the fact that the eight inch was there, that's kind of what brought it together.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Thank you, Rose. Jeff did you have something you wanted to add?

Jeff Donofrio:

Just on the issue that Mike Horbal raised, the Authority really doesn't have any choice when it comes to determining location of high voltage electrical transmission lines, underground lines, but to rely on the utility who I assume is relying upon as-built drawings. It's not like you can drill borings to find out where the transmission lines are. So I'm sure that's the crux of the matter, is that it doesn't happen that often,

but it does happen from time to time that there's not an as-built or somebody looks at an as-built and just doesn't give accurate information.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Thank you, Jeff. Is there anyone else? I don't see raised hands, but is there anyone else who has a question? I'm looking.

Frank Pepe:

Hello, Frank Pepe. And I have a question for Rose. Rose, number one, is the DOT going to give you any kind of a sense of a reimbursement for this pipe project to be moved on Route One?

Rose Gavrilovic:

Believe me, Frank, we gave them a really hard time for that. Unfortunately they don't do that. We've actually said to them, "We should really have paving agreements with you guys." And they said, "No, we don't do that." So we have really pushed them but unfortunately to no avail.

Frank Pepe:

Okay. And the second was, I know you [inaudible 00:22:28], but did they do any test holes or anything or it's just the project was too small and you went off the existing plan?

Rose Gavrilovic:

Due to the timing and yes, we did not do test holes. In the future if we have another lesson learn in an area like this, we would take that extra time preliminarily to do test pits to make sure that the location that we were going was adequate.

Frank Pepe:

Okay. Thank you, Rose.

Rose Gavrilovic:

Thank you, Frank.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Okay. So I just had an issue with my screen so I'm going to step away for a moment. Is there anybody else who has question?

Mike Horbal:

Mike Horbal, back again. I have one more comment.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Go ahead.

Mike Horbal:

Okay. I think it would be very prudent in the future on projects in these congested areas and with a project approaching the \$2 million cost that the water company have test pits done so that we can avoid any circumstances or cost overruns like we have with this project. That's all I have to say.

Rose Gavrilovic:

And I agree, Mike. Thank you very much.

Mike Horbal:

You're welcome.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Mike. Thank you very much.

Mike Horbal:

Your welcome.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Is there anybody else who has questions? I'm having difficulty with my screen view for a moment.

Mario Ricozzi:

This is Mario.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Oh there you are. You're back. Go ahead Mario.

Mario Ricozzi:

I will say trying to get in before the DOT does their work. I appreciate the effort on the RWA's part because I know I've had projects where you try to get in before them because you know you won't be able to get in for a long time afterwards and then you'll have to mill half the road or the entire road in order to do the permanent patch.

Mario Ricozzi:

And it looks like they aren't, I'm guessing they're not requiring you to mill all of Route One in order to do the repair, that you're just doing trenched repair?

Rose Gavrilovic:

That's correct Mario.

Mario Ricozzi:

So with that being the case, there's a cost that we would have had to pay that we're not actually paying because we're only repairing where we dug, as opposed to norm that DOT requires is you do an entire lane or an entire road at times, especially when there's a number of services that cross. I'm hopeful DOT gets out there and paves the permanent, so that I don't have to go bump, bump, bump but I will say the

project came off pretty quietly in Branford. I didn't hear any comments or complaints by anyone, so thank you for that.

Ted Norris:

Thank you.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Are there any other questions? From the members of the RPB, looking for hands. Seeing none, are there any members of the public that have any questions or comments you'd like to make?

Jamie Mowat Young:

Jennifer, are you seeing or hearing any from folks on the phone?

Jennifer:

No, there are no members of the public present.

Jamie Mowat Young:

That being the case, I'd like to ask Mark Levine to please provide the mission of the communications record into the record as a public hearing.

Jennifer:

Hang on Mark, I'll get it for you. There you go.

Mark Levine:

First of all, Jamie, great job.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Thank you Mr. Levine.

Mark Levine:

Okay. Exhibit A, Application submitted to RPB on February 24 for approval of a project to complete the Branford Hill Service Area.

Mark Levine:

Exhibit B, a notice of public hearing published March 25th, 2020 in the Connecticut Post and The New Haven Register.

Mark Levine:

Exhibit C, Office of the Consumer Affairs Memorandum dated April 2nd, 2020 recommending approval of the application.

Mark Levine:

Exhibit number D, interrogatories submitted by Michael Horbal on April 8th, 2020.

Mark Levine:

Exhibit E, management's response dated April 14th did interrogatories submitted by Michael Horbal dated April 8th, 2020.

Mark Levine:

And exhibit F, Branford Hill Service Area Improvements application presentation.

Mark Levine:

Thank you very much.

Jamie Mowat Young:

Thank you Mark. Before I close the meeting, I'd like to ask Ted Arose if they have any other comments or any other members to the board before we close the meeting?

Ted Norris:

Nothing for me.

Rose Gavrilovic:

No I don't.

Jamie Mowat Young:

That being said, all the information has been entered on the record. It remains available on the www.rwater.com website for the public's observation, I guess. And the public is hearing is now closed and we'll return to I guess the voice over to Mario Ricoszi for his meeting.

[7:48 P.M. - PUBLIC HEARING ENDS]