Minutes of Meeting

Route 20 Sewer - Citizen's Advisory Committee

Wednesday May 9, 2013

CAC Attendees: Craig Blake (Chairman), John Baranowsky (Clerk), Daniel Kenn, Andrew Sullivan, Ellen Joachim, Steve Eppich and Peter Cramer

Having determined quorum present (CAC only) Craig Blake called the meeting to ORDER at 7:40 PM.

Old Business

Approval of Minutes – March 13, 2013

A version incorporating edits received was discussed. Following this, A MOTION to APPROVE was made, SECONDED and VOTED FOR. Ellen Jochim abstained (was not present).

New Business

Review of Meeting Schedule

Since neither committee (Steering, CAC) achieved quorum last month, the focus of the discussion was concerned with whether changing the meeting schedule (now set for the second Wednesday of the month) to better accommodate member participation should be contemplated.

Chairman Blake provided a handout (Attachment I) listing member names by committee against weekday calendar nights. Known scheduling conflicts (i.e. BOS, Health, SPS and FinCom) were checked off. A column was included for member preference and where member preferences have been expressed these were indicated as such on the chart.

Ellen Joachim described the process by which SPS rotates their schedule according to school vacation week or Town Meeting and how SPS meets less frequently during July and August when school is out. Normally, they meet on the second and forth Wednesday.

Craig Blake mentioned that consideration must also be given to conference room availability and scheduling should these joint committees find prudent the need to move away from the second Wednesday of the month schedule as this room is not available on the first Wednesday.

Upon further discussion, consensus was reached around holding these meetings on the third Wednesday of the month here in the DPW conference room.

Reports from Subcommittees

<u>Sewer Alternatives (Framingham and Marlborough)</u> - Andrew Sullivan advised that his subcommittee is of the belief that their work has progressed sufficiently to the point where they

feel they are good to go forward to the Board of Selectmen with the recommendation to pursue the "East Marlboro Alternative". The appropriate motions have been made and unanimously approved at a prior joint-meeting. Upon hearing this report, Mr. Blake suggested that Jody Kablack be instructed to push forward with this initiative.

A chart summarizing cost alternatives for the various sewer alternatives was distributed and discussed (see Attachment II). The chart shows the Marlboro alternative to be viable in terms of cost compared to the decentralized Sudbury alternative. Similarly, the Framingham alternative is now considered infeasible based upon cost criteria.

Craig Blake displayed the original decentralized plan and topographic maps of the alternative plans. Mr. Blake used these maps and plans to further illustrate the concepts shown in the alternative cost breakdown (the aforementioned Attachment II). All numbers shown are preliminary and may require further breakdown and fine tuning.

One key cost driver for the East Marlboro alternative is the distance to the site from the western portion of the district as approximately 21,000 feet. The site is in the vicinity of the Half-Way Café on the north side of Route 20.

Other preliminary cost assumptions were made and subsequently built in to the Sewer Alternatives Summary Worksheet. The linear cost per foot for the force main along Horse Pond Road to the Curtis Middle School of 80/ft has been bumped up to 100/ft for the force main to East Marlboro (Marlboro Alternative) to account for additional incremental costs for work on the State road.

Another cost driver now estimated to be in the \$3 million range is the Marlboro connection fee. This cost has been included in the Sewer Alternatives Cost Summary sheet.

Cost Allocation/Financing - No report.

<u>Facility Operations/Management</u> – John Baranowsky advised that his three member subcommittee will endeavor to set up a time when all can meet. Ellen Joachim was unable to attend the prior meeting. No other news.

<u>Utilities</u> – Craig Blake reported on a meeting held on April 10, 2013 with JoAnne O'Leary of NSTAR (power utility serving Sudbury) attending. While this utility is a key component to the overhead wire burial portion of the Route 20 Sewer project, it must be noted that there are many other utilities occupying the area utility poles and these must also be moved. Future meeting will be arranged to deal with these other utility companies.

This meeting was somewhat non-productive in that the NSTAR personal needed from the engineering division (working out of the Southboro office) were not in attendance. According to JoAnne O'Leary no real cost estimates can be contemplated until a definitive scope of work together with a deposit for design services is received by the Southboro office. Maps and

narrative descriptions are sufficient to trigger the cost estimate. The cost for the necessary design services is in the \$100 to \$200 thousand dollar range.

Mr. Blake also mentioned that once distribution lines are buried, it then becomes necessary to run underground services from a pad transformer to each building service, again underground at additional expense.

Mr. Blake hopes to get more definitive information when this subcommittee next meets (other utilities will be invited for these meetings).

<u>Zoning</u> – The Chair of this subcommittee, absent this evening, is Peter Abair. The subcommittee met twice (March 6 and April 4, 2013). Mr. Blake asked Steve Eppich and John Baranowsky, both of whom were present at these meeting to recap.

Many of the salient issues are memorialized in Mr. Abair's report (Attachment III), the Final Minutes of the March 13, 2013 Joint Meeting of the CAC and Steering Committee and various plans and draft overlay districts provided by Mr. Fee and drawn up by Mr. Baranowsky last year. As these were rehashed, Mr. Kenn remarked that there was no need to cover old ground, everyone agreed, and the discussion closed.

<u>Outreach/Public Education</u> – There is nothing new to report. This subcommittee meets next on May 20.

- Other New Business None
- Schedule Next Meeting Wednesday, June 19, 2013

At 9:07 P.M. Craig Blake asked for a MOTION to ADJOURN which was made, SECONDED and VOTED unanimously in FAVOR.

Check off Nights that are not available meeting nights for you (i.e. you have another non-flexible commitment)

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	
Kirsten Roopenian						Tuesday Perferred
Peter Abair						
Craig Blake						
Dan Kenn						
Jono Lapat				×		
Ellen Joachim			2nd & 4th Wed. of Month			School Committee
John Baranowsky	V	>	ند	,		
Andrew Sullivan					2	
Jonathan Danielson		2				
Peter Cramer		70				Open
Mark Minassian	3rd Monday of Month					FinCom Meeting
Steve Eppich	×				×	Thurs best, followed by Wed then Tues
Robert Haarde	,					
Eric Poch				×		
Stephen Grande						
Joan Carlton	3rd Monday of Month	×				FinCom Meeting
Lisa Eggleston		×		×		
Rich Robison			2nd & 4th Wed. of Month			School Committee
Ted Pasquarello						
Mike Coutu						
Brian Mcnamara		٠				Thursdays good
Jody Kablack		×	2nd & 4th Wed. of Month	^	š	Planning Board Wed.
				7	: Ar	INjondays & Thurs, perferred

Attachment I

SUMMARY OF SEWER ALTERNATIVES 5/9/2013

Attachment II

Ave. Daily Flow 205,010 gpd MWRA II Fee \$6.50 per gallon MWRA Sewer Entrance Fee \$3.90 per gallon MWRA Water Entrance Fee \$5.00 per gallon MWRA Annual Sewer Treatment \$3,300.00 per 1,000,000 gallons MWRA Water Rate (assume WW flow= 85% \$3,200.00 per 1,000,000 gallons of Water) Sudbury Construction Cost Estimate Collection & Transmission System \$3,200,000 \$3,670,000 1.15 Collection \$2,187,774 \$2,188,000 Transmission \$1,482,226 \$1,482,000 Curtis Soil Absorption System \$1,500,000 \$1,720,000 Wastewater Treatment Plant \$7,500,000 \$8,610,000 **Engineering & Contingencies** \$1,800,000 Total \$14,000,000 \$14,000,000

	DECENTRALIZED SEWER	MARLBORO CONNECTION	MWRA CONNECTION
CAPITAL COSTS			_
SUDBURY SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM	\$2,188,000	\$1,273,000	\$1,273,000
SUDBURY TREATMENT PLANT	\$8,610,000	\$0	\$0
CURTIS SOIL ABSORPTION FIELD	\$1,720,000	; \$o	\$0
WWTP EFFLUENT PUMP STATION 6" Force Main - 9,000 LF	\$656,000 \$826,000	,	
PUMPING TO MARLBORO	\$0		\$0
6" FORCE MAIN - 21,700 LF		\$2,495,500	
0.3 MGD PUMP STATION		\$721,600	
MARLBORO CONNECTION FEE	\$0	\$2,920,000	\$0
PUMPING TO FRAMINGHAM	\$0	\$0	
ORCE MAIN - 10,800 LF (Treeland&Edgell)			\$864,000
PUMP STATION			\$700,000
WATER MAIN CONSTRUCTION	\$0	\$0	<i>\$100,000</i>
MWRA CONNECTION FEE	\$0	\$0	
INFILTRATION FEE			\$5,330,260
WATER	A		\$1,025,050
WASTEWATER			\$799,539
FRAMINGHAM CONNECTION FEE	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS	\$14,000,000	\$7,410,100	\$9,991,849
ANNUAL O&M COSTS			
SUDBURY COLLECTION SYSTEM	\$430,700	\$100,000	\$100,000
MARLBORO TREATMENT	\$0		
PUMPING to MARLBORO	\$0		
MWRA ANNUAL FEE	\$0	\$0	
WATER		a a	\$281,708
WASTEWATER			\$246,935
SUDBURY WATER CREDIT	\$0	\$0	
PUMPING to FRAMINGHAM	\$0	\$0	
FRAMINGHAM ANNUAL FEE	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL ANNUAL O&M	\$430,700	\$100,000	\$628,642

6" Force Main (Horsepond) = \$80/If 6" Force Main (Rt. 20) = \$100/If 8" Sewer = \$150/If

6" Force Main (Rt. 20) = \$100/If x 1.15 (E&C) Surficial Bedrock, Building, Emergency Generator (Curtis PS *1.1)

7.3% x \$40,000,000

U:\My Documents 2\misc\Sudbury Sewer\Summary of Alternatives - Cost Estimate



ROUTE 20 SEWER CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Zoning Sub-Committee Report (3.20.13)

The Zoning Sub-committee met on: Wednesday, March 6, 2013 6:30 PM at Flynn Building

Sub-committee members attending:

Pete Abair, Jon Danielson, Steven Eppich, Jonathan Lapat

Additional attendees:

Jody Koblack, John Baranowsky

REPORT

The meeting was called to order shortly after 6:30 PM. Peter Abair was assigned meeting clerk.

The group discussed the charge of the sub-committee, i.e. consider full committee discussions held thus far related to zoning issues (potential zoning changes, 40B impact, build-out potential in context of current/future zoning) and develop a rationale for supporting the sewer project that is able to answer community questions on how current/future zoning will be complement the provision of sewer service to the sewer district. The sub-committee will develop talking points aimed at supporting a sewer proposal in public forums.

Past full committee discussions on current zoning was summarized as follows: current zoning does not necessarily limit growth but the lack of a sewer does, as lack of sewer does not compel high investment and best uses as return on investment is limited.

Jody Kablack provided the survey that was presented to Route 20 businesses to assess growth plans and issues affecting them. The group reviewed potential zoning changes to the Route 20 corridor which are in early stages of discussions by the Planning Board. The group emphasized that the sewer project and potential zoning changes would be best characterized as supporting "redevelopment" rather than "new development". Overlay zoning could be aimed at supporting more pedestrian friendly center commercial district (identified on a map as areas A & B), while larger institutional redevelopment could be incentivized in Area C (Raytheon/Chiswick Park area).

The group discussed that the concerns of some residents might be that zoning changes and a sewer might make the Route 20 corridor more like Route 9, though it was noted that Route 20 is already often congested, that limited access routes to Route 20 and between properties is problematic, and that commercial market demand would naturally limit the type and amount of development in the future.

The group also discussed potential implications of 40B housing development that could be drawn to the corridor by the provision of sewer and new zoning. There was some debate on the ability of the Town to use various planning tools to avoid unfriendly 40Bs and instead incentivize higher density housing at locations in the corridor which could support such density. More discussion is planned on this, including case studies on what other communities have been able to do. In addition, concerns were expressed about the extent of the Route 20 corridor impact, notably will this contribute unplanned "new development" and sprawl in the western area of the corridor

The group will focus its next meeting on the developing the following talking points: what does current underlay zoning allow, what would sewer enable, what would overlay zoning allow AND what would NOT be enabled with zoning and sewer, e.g. excessive building heights, floor area ratios, etc.

The next zoning sub-committee will be at 6:30 PM on April 4th.

The meeting was concluded at 7:45 PM.