



Town of Bolton

222 BOLTON CENTER ROAD • BOLTON, CT 06043
TELEPHONE (860) 649-8066 FAX (860) 643-0021

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2021
7:00 P.M. – VIRTUAL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
RE: MARK ANTHONY LANE**

The Board of Selectmen held a Special Meeting on Thursday, September 2, 2021 with First Selectman Sandra Pierog presiding. Also in attendance were Selectmen: Robert Morra, Michael Eremita, Kim Miller, Interim Administrative Officer James Rupert, Inland Wetlands Agent Barbara Kelly and Town Civil Engineer Howard Pfrommer.

Members of the public included following Hop River Road Residents:

Michelle Trudeau – 624 Hop River Road
Pat Cinea – 630 Hop River Road
Tom & Jayme Mosier – 634 Hop River Road
Dave & Kristen Cook – 636 Hop River Road
Richard & Evelyn O'Connor – 638 Hop River Road

1. Call to Order.

First Selectman Sandra Pierog called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. Status Update from Residents.

H. Pfrommer, Town Engineer, sitting in for J. Dillon who is out on vacation. Was asked by the Town to try to help the residents help facilitate some options. Heard from a company, Contech out of Massachusetts, who said they were in the process of making large diameter pipe that day (6' rise by 8.5' span). Said if we called back within 2.5 hours they would call the plant and ask them to make some additional pipe. Price given was \$12,000 for 1-30 ft. length of corrugated pipe arch or \$24,000 for two. That's material price only. The next day Contech contacted Howard saying there was some type of financing issue. He explained to Contech he was working for the Town and only asked to help facilitate the process.

H. Pfrommer was then contacted by Hemlock Construction who had some premade materials from a job with the DOT and had drawn up a pre-stressed adjacent box beam superstructure with abutments and rip rap banks. H. Pfrommer reviewed the plans and put down his thoughts for Hemlock to then review and address. He then heard from Hemlock that this was supposed to be a permanent structure not temporary.

Hemlock thanked Pfrommer for the comments and said it was exactly what they were looking for. H. Pfrommer stated he had no preconceived desire or want here; it was just his thoughts and he was just trying to give feedback and facts from the standpoint of the bridge hydraulic permitting world to people he believes are trying to wrestle with what to do and trying to understand how to get it done.

B. Morra asked if they had provided a weight load capacity for this structure.

H. Pfrommer replied that the super structure would carry HS 20 live load. Basically, the bridge would be capable of carrying all state legal loads which includes: fire trucks, garbage trucks, oil trucks, cement trucks and anything that is not a permitted vehicle.

Per K. Cook Hemlock reached back out to the residents with updates that go along with H. Pfrommer's recommendations for the bridge along with costs for these updates. All information was emailed out to the residents last night and yes, the bridge is meant to be a permanent structure that these residents will all own.

S. Pierog stated that we are trying to do what we can to help you. We arranged for Unified Search and Rescue to come out on Sunday evening and assess the situation and provide some guidance on a way to respond if there was a health emergency on the street. We have also reached out to the National Guard whom declined the mission because they are not allowed to work on private property. The Governor's office was asked to intervene with the National Guard but we were again we were told no due to it being private property.

We have also spent time researching loan and grant options. We were hopeful about the USDA Emergency Waterway Funds Grant; but that grant is prohibited for use with anything to do with transportation. There is a FEMA grant as well; but only if more than 100 addresses in Tolland County have incurred more than \$1,000 each in uninsured damages from storm Henri. FEMA is currently 3 storms behind in getting information and reporting so we may not know for another 1-3 months if this is an actual option. This looks like this might be our only hope at this point.

Rep. Robin Green and Steve Cassano have also reached out to the Governor to please consider the CARES ACT for this. There has been no answer yet and there are very few funds left at this time.

J. Rupert then asked H. Pfrommer if once this bridge goes in will there be any type of recertification's that have to take place at some interval to make sure this bridge will continue to be able to support things like fire trucks, oil trucks and heavy equipment that might have to go down there from time to time.

H. Pfrommer answered: bridges with a span of 20ft or greater are inspected on a bi-annual basis. Bridges on state roads are inspected every two years and we would highly recommend that the homeowner's do something like that even though it's a private bridge. A load rating is done. That's an engineered computer simulation to determine what the capacity of that bridge is so that in the future as it's inspected and deterioration is found somebody can go back into that computation and decrease the section and decide if the bridge is still plenty strong. At the very least the bridge should be looked at by an engineer every couple of years. In regards to precast concrete, he said that's the only thing his firm will recommend to their municipal clients. It's rare for us to do a steel bridge. Precast concrete will last for a long time.

3. Questions from Residents.

P. Cinea asked why did a rush of water enter downstream.

B. Kelly answered that she understood it was strictly the localized amount of rainfall coming into the watershed. B. Morra agreed with that and added on top of that in the past we have not had the saturations in the ground like we have now. Whatever came down was not absorbed in the soil, it all just ran off of any surface. It was the perfect storm with a surge that the vegetation and soil would normally absorb and this didn't happen this time.

S. Pierog reported on a comment in the chat box. The dam in the Upper Bolton Lake has failed and DEEP has contracted to have repairs done this October. Pierog responded she wouldn't call this a dam failure. They do repairs up in Vernon to a culvert that goes under the road; and that is to let more water through not less.

Another comment: why wasn't the dam opened days before a heavy rainstorm? Pierog responded, that's a DEEP issue and she doesn't believe any of us realized we were going to get as much water as we did. Had the dam been opened it probably still would have flowed through as that water had to go somewhere. Normally, when we request a dam drawdown it takes over a month, this doesn't just happen overnight once it's been approved.

M. Eremita asked, do we know when was the first information that this culvert/bridge was showing serious signs of deterioration? This couldn't have been the thing that happened all of a sudden because of the storm this year could it?

D. Cook explained the bottom of the pipe was starting to rot probably a year or two ago but then we had all this rain and it got so high it couldn't take that water. A lot of water came down.

P. Pfrommer said typically the corrugated pipes rot at the bottom. When they do rot, a pipe has a soil interaction structure so it relies on the backfill around it for its strength. A picture that he saw of the culvert a week before the storm he said

was pretty representative of what happens. What eventually happens is you lose sediment and back fill materials as large flows go through it. It tends to draw the backfill loss of section and creates sink holes and pot holes in the road. It's sort of a classic failure for that type of structure. It's a slow thing, it gives you signs, it not catastrophic. Unfortunately, in this case it was so far gone that it did what it did. With regards to the slug of water, it's about a 5 square mile watershed, according to the DOT drainage manual the bridge should be designed for a 100 year storm with about a foot of freeboard. After doing some quick computations it looks like to accommodate a 100 year storm around 1100 CFS that would probably take about a 30 foot span (a rectangular waterway). Your waterway on the Hemlock drawings is a trapezoid not a rectangle. So, it's not as efficient as the water rises. It's close to 40 feet at the top but at the bottom it's close to the same span the arch pipe was. P. Frommer just wanted to explain that the existing bow could not accommodate a 100 year storm. Now the storm you had was probably well in excess of that. A typical 100 year storm is around 7 to 8 inches in a 24 hour period.

D. Cook then asked H. Pfrommer: on the pipe that was put in there 38 years ago how would you compare that to the structure Hemlock is proposing to do?

H. Pfrommer replied in general precast concrete is a great way to go. I don't think there would be anything more durable. My concerns are that the footings are a little bit high, so you want to make sure the embankments are well protected with rip rap. You have a situation where the water is running along the street and then is forced to turn sharply through the barrel. Not only is that particularly inefficient, but it really worries him for the potential for scour and if you have a bridge with footings that are a little higher than the stream bottom that's something to pay attention to. He said he thought Hemlock was going to revise the design to drop the footing a bit which is good; but somebody should take a close look at the rip rap and make sure it's the right size, make sure its towed in properly at the bottom so that there is little scour at the bottom. More of the rip rap will fall so as to selfheal it. These are his main concerns about the design which he emailed to the resident's earlier.

R. O'Connor stated Hemlock had sent a proposal with three new recommendations from the original proposal based on the conversation/recommendations from H. Pfrommer.

The recommendations included:

1. Lowering the footings down to obtain a 4 ft. depth from every angle– H. Pfrommer new about this recommendation.
2. Add filter fabric below rip rap behind the abutments – Per H. Pfrommer – this is a really good idea – it helps to prevent sediment from getting in between the blocks and creating pot holes behind the abutment
3. Add rip rap toe section under the bridge area
4. Add an additional row of block to the abutment

H. Pfrommer agreed this was all good. The one thing they should check is how big is that riprap. You would probably want what DOT calls intermediate riprap. Someone should take a look at that and make sure that the velocities are such that they won't wash the riprap away in the next big storm.

T. Mosier stated that the proposal says the riprap would be size intermediate (12-18 inches). Grout could be added later if required, and limits of riprap beyond structure could be extended after final design and performed during an allowable period.

H. Pfrommer asked, the drawing they gave you; is that really a concept are they actually going to get someone to design it and analyze it? Is that clear to you guys because it's not clear to me? If it's sort of a concept and they're expecting an engineer to be retained to do what we engineers do; or are they proposing something they're looking to move forward with, with you guys?

D. Cook asked Howard if that's something you should talk to Hemlock about I think, wouldn't you?

H. Pfrommer replied only if the Town asks me to. I work for them.

D. Cook stated he thought it was something they were all concerned about so he thought that would be something he would understand better.

H. Pfrommer replied he would be happy to do it but S. Pierog asked H. Pfrommer before you do it, D. Cook I think that's a question the folks who are paying Hemlock need to ask them.

D. Cook replied yes I can but I just wanted to make sure that H. Pfrommer was on board with what they were doing to make sure everything was right.

H. Pfrommer then replied he's on board to the extent that it's a concept. From an engineering perspective there's a lot that goes in behind a drawing like that, (i.e. Hydraulic modeling, looking at the riprap size, making sure the waterway is adequate, obviously the structure and making sure that's strong). In concept I'm certainly okay with it. I think my concerns are in the email and I hope you guys would follow up on that. If we were asked to follow up on that we can. Again, I'd hate to see something go in and we have these big storms that seem to be coming more frequently. If the riprap should wash away, the abutments are 4 ft. from everything like they say but there not 4 ft. below the bottom of the channel, nobody's done a scour analysis. The water is approaching that at a very sharp angle. I know all too well, I've had my own projects with problems like this. I've seen other projects with it and I think you guys have your upstream embankment rip rap from what I understand because it's occurred. It's happened to you guys. I think just looking at some mapping I'll bet you that stream was rerouted to put the road in years and years ago. I imagine Mother Nature had it going sort of back and way through. It's being forced to go through this waterway opening. I hate to see something be installed that you know could be better if an engineer sized the riprap properly and somebody looked at the scour and made sure that you weren't going to have a problem with exposed footings. Be tough to get back in there put riprap in underneath a bridge like that.

D. Cook then asked how could somebody (how would DEEP get away with turning that river) reroute a river.

H. Pfrommer replied, I have no idea. Who knows when it was done? I have clients now even sometimes that say permits be damned. We've all experienced that. Most clients do things right. You find people all over that do different kinds of things. Maybe the DEEP didn't even know about it.

E. O'Connor then asked to speak. I want to be careful what I say but I'm so upset about this. I gotta say and I just want this to be on the record, what D. Cook just asked, it was a big boys club and it's really sad that the Town is not going to try to help us pay for this in some way, because I was naïve. We were the first house built on this road that was actually a Larry Fiano house. The others were all subcontracted and we just said we'll just take care of the road. We did forever. Nobody in 38 years saw this kind of water. I would just like to say for the record; I think as a Town, we have never been rebated in any way for taxes or anything. We live on suicide six. We take care of the road. It's such a tragedy that everybody just says you take care of it it's yours. How did this ever happen; that nobody knew he put this culvert in that was not going to last more than 25 years. Which I'm hearing from people, they've heard. I never heard it. I'm going to leave it at that but I am just devastated. None of you were here. We built this house in 1983. In all fairness none of you on the Town were here. Nobody knows anything but I'm just saying; shame on all of us for not helping people like us. I'm sorry, I think the Town should try to do something and we really need your help. Thank you.

S. Pierog thanked Evelyn for her comments and stated she thinks we have tried to do our best to help.

E. O'Connor replied to S. Pierog and thanked her and thank you to everybody because you really have. I mean there was some nasty letters that were sent but I understand now why it had to happen and that's okay. I just want to say thank you and I'm sorry but when you're down like a dead dog you don't need to be kicked. Thank you.

B. Morra then stated, I think one of the things the Town can do and has done through the Building Department, is try to assist in evaluating this situation and even having our engineer look it over and come up with suggestions. Obviously, if the bridge proposal moves forward, it's going to require a review on the Town's side and inspections and so on. I think in a situation like this, perhaps the Town can be of assistance because we normally charge for stuff like that.

M. Trudeau replied, let's just reference back to Evelyn's conversation. You guys have done nothing to help us and you're just spewing some type of rhetoric that sounds wonderful. Some specious argument that really doesn't make any sense and you're still not helping us. You've done nothing! This is wonderful were having this meeting. I very much do appreciate it But you're really not doing anything to help us.

E. O'Connor then joined in saying our houses are worthless now and if I have a fire tonight my house will burn to the ground.

S. Pierog replied she understood that frustration. You know Mark Anthony is not the only private non-public road in the Town of Bolton. We actually have about 10 and 15 miles of private roads.

E. O'Connor exclaimed, it never should have happened!

S. Pierog replied, unfortunately, they did happen and it started in the early 50's and continued probably up until shortly after your road was put in and when they put a requirement in that it could only be 3 houses. One of our Selectman, Kim Miller lives on one of those three house.

M. Trudeau then spoke saying so, the Town should take over our road now. Its three houses. What does this have to do with our particular situation? I don't care about houses in 19 whatever and 3 homes. Were now talking seven houses, 4 of which are unobtainable to be able to get to; and all I hear is a lot of rhetoric and not a lot of answers to our situation. D. Cook has proposed the most reasonable situation and been our champion of being able to get this done and all I see is the Town throwing up a road block every single time something comes up.

S. Pierog replied, first of all, I don't believe were putting up road blocks. We're trying to work with you to get the best solution possible in the quickest manner. Our Inland Wetlands Commission took some steps last week to allow you to proceed without what would be the normal permit process which would have put you into November to get anything done.

M. Trudeau retorted, oh my gosh, that's a great joy! They did us a great favor for this? They don't understand that four houses are unobtainable to get fire or rescue. They did us a favor? Is that what you're trying to tell me right now? That the Lajoie's, Evelyn, the Cook's, the Mosier's, they have to get down on their knees and say thank you because you proceeded in such a timely manner. Are you kidding me?

B. Kelly then asked to speak on behalf of the commission. The Inland Wetlands Commission is not looking for things. The Inland Wetland Commission has a responsibility and the oversight of the whole permitting process of the work that would be done to replace or repair that bridge.

M. Trudeau replied, I understand that. So, you're doing us a favor?

B. Kelly stated, it's not doing a favor; but they certainly went out of their way to find a way to address this situation.

M. Trudeau responded, a bridge washed out. You have 4 people, 4 homes, two of which have children, and they proceeded in such a timely manner.

B. Kelly responded that they did respond in a timely manner. Nobody is asking for anyone to be grateful. They are addressing the situation at hand. They recognized how crucial it was. They looked through the regulations and the regulations are lengthy. They are 50 pages long; and they found a way to cover what needed to be done. They did that because S. Pierog brought it to the attention of the commission and they acted. They found a way to address it. In advance, they took the steps, they went out on a limb in some instances.

M. Trudeau exclaimed out on a limb!?

K. Miller then spoke up saying, I 100% understand how frustrating this is for you. I think it's a whole other issue...

M. Trudeau again exclaimed out on a limb!? We've got four people stranded and a house with children. You don't go out on a limb to me again!

K. Miller replied, I understand there's a whole conversation around should the Town own it and it's a road blah, blah. At this exact moment in time...

M. Trudeau replied don't say blah, blah to me again.

K. Miller then I apologized. I get it. But I think every single person on this call, everyone, really wants to try to figure out how we can help get this resolved. So, can I just make a suggestion that we focus on what are our solutions, options and next steps. I know that the Town's been trying really hard to figure out what they can do. I get his whole situation sucks! I myself live on a very long shared driveway and we have a whole thing right now because it needs some repairs. So, I do get it. I'm not saying we shouldn't revisit it at some point, the roads that are named roads but are private; but right now for this moment it is private property and I think we should focus on getting the solution. Like, how can we get this fixed? Then if we revisit it at some future time the Town ownership and we can have a debate about that. I just don't want to spend a lot of time back and forth when I really know everyone wants to get it resolved.

B. Kelly then explained, what I'm trying to speak to, we've talked a bit about there's the technical and construction aspects of getting the bridge in. The reality of the situation is that there's a bureaucratic process. There's permitting required through Town Inland Wetlands which is delegated through the state and through other regulations that were referred to in Mr. Pfrommer's letter. All the Inland Wetland Commission and Bolton can do is try to make that piece of it go as smoothly as possible. To that end, the mechanism was issuing an order to correct because that was not subject to any of this time line delays that are built into the statutes. It was a way to avoid that and they did that. The letter went out. There's the hearing on Tuesday, where people can answer and say what they think about it. That is a way to address it. At the time that order was written no one from the street had become involved to look for that kind of permitting and there was no idea of what the solution was going to be. Now that there is; the work can be covered through a modification to that order. So, on Tuesday, if the group knows what the solution is going to be or they know they're working with Hemlock; if a representative wants to contact Inland Wetlands, attend the zoom meeting, they can request that either that order be revoked, that it be extended or modified to accommodate things. This was a way to allow work to be done to stop the damage that's going on from continuing rain fall. Those are the two immediate things. You don't want the situation to get worse and you want a temporary or permanent solution. Something has to be done as soon as possible. So, the one small piece of correcting it, is permitting through the Inland Wetland Commission. This taken care of with that mechanism if people follow through with that from the Town's standpoint. That's the only controllable part the commission had and how they addressed it and as of Tuesday night that piece can be done.

R. O'Connor then asked, based on everything we talked about tonight, if we and H. Pfrommer and Hemlock all agree can we just go forward with it? Is there some other permission we need from someone? Can we move ahead? Hemlock is ready to go as soon as we say go. What's the delay?

B. Kelly replied, in terms of local Inland Wetlands the order would let them start stabilization work in the channel and move towards installing the temporary piece. Prior to the bridge, that order would have allowed somebody to go in and pull the old culvert out so that it wasn't blocking.

R. O'Connor then stated they are going to do that all at the same time.

B. Kelly replied, okay. I'm just saying that order from the local perspective let you get started. There are other considerations that are the technical and other construction considerations. J. Rupert and H. Pfrommer can address that piece; but permitting wise you've got the order. You can start. There is other permitting at other levels that Hemlock could be taking care of for you.

H. Pfrommer then stated, I would look to Hemlock to take care of the Army Core and DEEP permits. There's a simple 2-page Army Core permit and once you put in the mail you have the permit. As far as DEEP, you copy that application to DEEP and you'll have your permit. There are certain requirements in that permit you have to meet. So Hemlock could handle that form for you. The Army Core does allow situations for emergencies and to me this is clearly an emergency.

E. O'Connor exclaimed, you think?!

H. Pfrommer responded, please let's follow what Kim said. It was two weeks ago today we got a price for the two pipes. I would have thought somebody would have thrown those in there, back fill them and get to your homes and ask questions later. But I understand, it's a money thing too; and you don't want to spend a good chunk of money now not knowing what you're going to have to do later. I keep coming back to put the two pipes in now get yourself across and you get yourself a little extra capacity.

K. Cook replied, Hemlock is ready to go. There's no reason to spend the extra money and that would be a temporary solution when we have a more permanent solution ready to go.

D. Cook then stated, you being an Engineer H. Pfrommer, you would think you know what Hemlock is proposing.

H. Pfrommer responded, me being an engineer I have a bunch of things I'm trying not to say to upset people here. I don't want to be the one you think is trying to stall the project. That's why I'm saying, go to Hemlock and ask them for the Army Core permit. Let them file a permit right, wrong or indifferent that says whatever it says, right, wrong or indifferent, and try and get your permit. I know what it should say. To get the simple permit your bridge has to be designed for a 100 year storm. That's the fact and I wouldn't put my name on it if it's not designed like that. Hemlock might or Hemlock might find an engineer that would. That's an avenue you should honestly look too; because I think the Town is going to require whatever permits are necessary. You could also go the emergency route. You call the Army Core of Engineers,

and good luck with that as we have towns with 4 or 5 emergencies right now and we cannot get ahold of these people. You call them, convince them it's an emergency over the phone, they agree with you. They say go ahead and do your work and file your permits later. I see you're frustrated because whatever you do is going to become permanent and are you really going to go back afterwards and get the permits or change the bridge design? Why spend extra money. Put something in there now. Again, I say go back to Hemlock and ask them to get you the required permits or maybe they have to get an engineer that can do it for you. Ask them to get you the simple self-verification permit. Once you put that in the mail you got it. What I'm not telling you is that there are certain requirements to the self-verification permit application that I do not believe this bridge meets. However, you might find an engineer that disagrees.

D. Cook then asked H. Pfrommer, you didn't want to talk to Hemlock about certain things you thought the bridge needed why weren't you guys discussing that?

H. Pfrommer replied, I told you I talked to Hemlock about that and they said they understood and they said my email is what they wanted to see. I did not tell them they should get someone to file the core permit and I didn't tell them they should hire an engineer to do that. That was beyond our discussion at that point. I was asked to facilitate. Two Monday's ago we made a bunch of calls and got a solution I thought was good. But I get it. I get where you're coming from with not wanting to spend some money now and a bunch later. I would look to Hemlock to ask them about the Army Core thing. You're their client. You're hiring them to do something for you. So ask them to get the permits you need.

D. Cook then responded, years ago you guys dropped a pipe in here and now we're looking for something so much more advanced. How come it was allowed to drop that pipe in here?

H. Pfrommer replied, once again, same thing with re-routing of the stream; I have no idea. I can't speak to that. I have no knowledge of that whatsoever.

D. Cook stated, you do have an opinion and you should know that the bridge that Hemlock is trying to propose is way more advanced than the pipe drop.

H. Pfrommer responded, no question about it and much larger hydraulic capacity.

D. Cook then stated, what I'm saying is we feel as neighbors you guys are trying to get us to build this 100 year bridge and spend all this money on our own; when you guys just dropped a pipe and backfilled it with gravel and no rip at all. I helped fix that bridge I know how it was put together. It's all gravel. It's not even done right.

H. Pfrommer responded, again, I'm sorry I have no knowledge of it. The other question I have was what gauge was the steel? Was that pipe salvaged from another job? You said it lasted 38 years. That's pretty good but we've seen some of those reach a service life of 50 to 60 years and others less than yours depending on the soil or water makeup. I don't know how to answer your question. I don't know. Hemlock's bridge, certainly the waterway is superior; but I don't want you to end up in this same spot. You build a bridge, we have another one of these huge events and something happens to the riprap and exposes the footing because Hemlock's is a superior design better than the pipes, because nobody wanted to go the extra mile and have somebody look at that. I don't want to see you in the same situation as right now.

D. Cook responded he understand that. That's why we're looking for someone like yourself and the Town can steer us the right way and make sure this is done right.

H. Pfrommer stated, I'm trying to do that but I'm trying to be ginger about it because I don't want some of you to think I'm trying to stall this thing. Certainly not, because I thought that pipe on the Monday morning was the way to go and I made sure to get that information to you 15 minutes after I got it. But that apparently wasn't something you wanted.

D. Cook responded I'm just afraid of pipes after what we've seen. Especially if you tried to do two. The debris that comes down that river when that volume comes; and that's what happened this time. That pipe filled to the top, swirled like a whirlpool, all the logs and branches and choked up that pipe.

H. Pfrommer replied that's an excellent point. A clear span hands down is better than two pipes. I was just thinking of your need to get to your homes.

D. Cook stated, us living this and going through it there's no way you can know exactly until you do it. We'd rather spend the money, get that bridge done and done right and we'll sacrifice the walking back and forth. We're more worried about

if someone has to get in here. We don't want to go through this twice. We think \$70,000 to get the bridge is enough money to spend. When a pipe was thrown in years ago. We feel like we're building a bridge for the town. I'm 61 years old, I won't be here forever. You guys will be collecting the taxes all down here after we put this nice bridge in and its way better than what you guys did.

S. Pierog responded, it wasn't the Town who did that. It was your developer.

D. Cook replied he understand that but somebody okay' d that. There's no way you would allow that pipe to be put in without being inspected and approved.

E. O'Connor then asked to speak again. I have to say I love Larry Fiano but I've got to say it was the big old boys club and none of you were here then; but I think the Town owes us because they never ever should have allowed that to happen. I was naïve, we built in 1983. I was like 20 something years old. It breaks my heart that I thought I would ever get screwed over like this. It is so wrong. That was not an acceptable culvert. There's no map. There's no record of it and I think the Town owes us something; especially since we've maintained this road for all these years. Thank you.

J. Mosier then asked, just to clarify, if we go through with this Hemlock bridge which is what we're leaning towards. If we go to this meeting on Tuesday night, present to them what our plan is and we get the waiver for the wetlands to sort of start our process. Is that correct?

B. Kelly responded, certainly yes. They could start their site preparation. Now I think indirectly I heard the one comment that no one wants the bridge to be done twice and another that expressed the dissatisfaction that it wasn't a good job done years ago. I think what I'm hearing from H. Pfrommer is one of the things that the Army Core permit requires is a hydraulic analysis. I'm not sure how much work that is or what it takes; but there's a real strong suggestion that the second they file that two pager with the Army Core that will ensure that the right kind of check is done by an engineer. Now I know Hemlock has and Engineer a P.E. on staff who can stamp things and I know they've talked about doing that analysis after and going back in and fixing things

J. Mosier replied, okay, so we talk to Hemlock, square away the Army Core permit assuming they sign off on that, we get that self-verification permit. We cut trees and marked things for Hemlock. We're ready to go. Hemlock said they could do this in two or three days for us. But our thoughts are, we know we are hitting this September 30th mark where it would be labeled as temporary for now and then it would be after July we could possibly label it as permanent through the Town. Is that how that works?

B. Kelly replied she was not sure how that works. But you could present your plan at Tuesday's meeting and you could potential wrap up with Inland Wetlands at that point.

J. Mosier then asked what do we face with the Town after that?

J. Rupert the discussed, from the Town's perspective what we intend to do is engage Nathan L. Jacobsen and Associates, either H. Pfrommer, J. Dillon or a combination of both to look at this bridge as its going in so that we can help you ensure that it is being built according to the plan. We want you to be sure you're getting what you're paying for and that is one of the pieces the Town can do to help you ensure that that does happen. We can't go backwards. We know there was issues with what was done, when it was done, but we can try to help you avoid those pitfalls now and for the future.

D. Cook expressed, that's exactly what we need. Thank you. We need someone to oversee it. Just like when you go into a building and inspect what those builders are doing.

J. Rupert then responded, we've got an excellent group of people in Nathan L. Jacobsen and Associates. Sandy and I have talked and that's an expense that the Town is going to incur and we're not intending to bill anybody for that. That's just part of the service we are able to provide to you. Anything else we can do were going to try to do that to help facilitate. One of the questions that was asked was can we help with Eversource getting the power shut off when that happens? I will make the introductions personally with the engineer and we can plan that ahead of time. We can make sure the power is shut off so that it's safe to get in there with the equipment. Sandy and I are committed to continuing to try to find ways, as is the rest of the Board of Selectmen, to find ways we can help with funding down the road. We're intending to look at this and add it to our Hazard Mitigation Plan and continue to look for FEMA funds. Any funding source we can possibly leverage were going to try. We've tried a lot so far but unfortunately have struck out. That's how we see ourselves here as facilitators using the services we have available to us. We are going to lean heavily on H. Pfrommer and J. Dillon to look

at this project as it goes in.

D. Cook replied Thank you! That's exactly what we need. We need someone that knows what's going on. That way the work will be overseen. I think Hemlock's proposal is an excellent proposal. The bridge is solid, H. Pfrommer said so himself. If you guys do a little wrapping up on details that you want them to do. Tim is an excellent guy, he'll work with you and everything will be done that you need to get done. He's told me he's worked with one of the engineer's and he knows him. I know one of your engineers know of him and he does good work.

J. Rupert explained that H. Pfrommer has worked with Hemlock before. He has a pretty good opinion of them. I've talked with a gentleman named Jeff Scala who is the V.P. of CT Techtonic Engineers and also a town resident. We spoke today about the plan and Hemlock, and he also has a high opinion. I also received a call from the gentleman who is the chief bridge engineer for CT DOT. He was following up on a request that we had put in to them to borrow a bridge section and he has also worked with Hemlock and has a very good opinion of them. I think you've found a contractor that comes pretty well recommended from a number of sources. That has given me a much better feeling because I had no knowledge of Hemlock myself. I think it was good to get these other references from other individuals.

D. Cook supplied that Hemlock has been in business for like 60 years. They've been around for a long time and they're friends of ours. They are not even charging us for the bridge. They are charging us to move it and put it in place. We're in good hands. All we need is a little guidance from your engineers. These guys have been around the block and I trust them.

J. Rupert replied, I think H. Pfrommer's given Hemlock the roadmap to success. I think if they follow it and do what he said it will be good.

M. Eremita then asked, Is Hemlock going to be your general contractor?

D. Cook responded, yes.

M. Eremita stated, as a general contractor they should have all the information at their disposal to facilitate all of this. They must have made all these permits in the past. If there as good as we hear, they should be able to help and get all the permits from the Town and represent you at meetings. That's part of the job. They should be your representative. They should know about the Army Core permits and know how to do all this. You're paying them and they should be handling all of this for you and walking you through this whole process.

B. Kelly responded, she has also spoken to Hemlock letting them know how we were handling the local permitting piece. The one thing the Inland Wetlands Commission would ask to address is the erosion sediment control and how they would handle water diversions during construction and they indicated they had that all drawn up and will send it over; but I have not seen it yet. I think they may need to hear from the resident's that you want them to provide us all that final information.

D. Cook responded, I will talk to Tim and have him get all the information over to you.

E. O'Connor asked, what's happening with FEMA?

S. Pierog answered, FEMA is still a couple storms behind and will get the paperwork us and we will proceed from there.

4. Updates from Board of Selectmen.

5. Adjournment.

S. Pierog adjourned that meeting at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy McCavanagh

See minutes of subsequent meetings for approval of these minutes and any corrections hereto.

