

TOWN OF PUTNAM

BOARD OF FINANCE MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

TOPIC		DISCUSSION		ACTION/ RESOLUTION
PRESENT:		Chairman Nash, Vice Chairman Garceau, Members Marion, Sessums, Alternate Carvalho (7:09)		
ABSENT:		Alternate Duffy – Excused, Member Deary		
1.	CALL TO ORDER	Meeting called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Chairman Nash		
2.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – 3 Minute time limit per person	None		
3.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	A.	<p><u>August 22, 2016 Board of Finance Meeting Minutes:</u></p> <p><i>Vice Chairman Garceau made a motion to accept the minutes. Member Marion seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</i></p>	
4.	CORRESPONDENCE		None	
			<p><i>Vice Chairman Garceau made a motion to appoint Alternate Carvalho as a voting member. Member Sessums seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</i></p>	
5.	FINANCE DIRECTOR REPORT	A.	<p><u>Finance Director Report:</u></p> <p>(See attachment “A”)</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau How are you making out with item # 1? I came in and Shana wasn’t in, but Donna was down there has she spent a lot of time down there</p> <p>Finance Director Fox-Howard If she goes down for more than 15-20 minutes we charge it back to the WPCA</p>	

		<p>Year-end reconciliation is still going on. The auditor is tentatively scheduled to come back the end of October early November. The software conversion is going slow; they are requesting a lot of information from me that I had not anticipated. A technician from Tyler came down and met with myself and Caroline and Eileen to talk about timelines and training, she also met with Shana and she will meet with Lucille when she comes back</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau You are saying we will not be online until January 1st, what time-frame did you expect</p> <p>Finance Director Fox-Howard I was hoping for October 1st for Accounts Payable and general ledger</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau So this is three months behind your estimate, but it could be sooner right</p> <p>Finance Director Fox-Howard No, I would rather it be right this time. Item 5 is speaking to the BANS we are ready to do in November. I have spoken with Member Sessums regarding change orders that have come through the BOE on the high school renovation project, which will necessitate another round of BANS and then the final borrowing next year. Based on the dollar amount of the change orders, I would prefer to wait for the permanent financing</p> <p>I did want to talk about the financial reporting months. At some point prior to my arriving, you had a schedule set up for reporting that is a little odd to me, can we revisit. It should be the month after each quarter end. I understand the change was made to accommodate BOE, but it doesn't make sense to me is there some way to put it back to a normal reporting cycle</p> <p>Chairman Nash What is different today</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Vice Chairman Garceau Denise when did we change the reporting months</p> <p>Secretary to the Board Roireau Some years ago</p> <p>Finance Director Fox-Howard Can we at least change the reporting schedule for the General Government</p> <p>Chairman Nash I do not have a problem with that at all; I just think it should be reflected in the minutes. I would like to see it on a piece of paper and then we will vote next month</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>TOWN ADMINISTRATOR PROJECT UPDATE</p>	<p>A. <u>Town Administrator Project Update:</u> (See attachment "B")</p> <p>Member Sessums Item 6 – Pomfret sewer line connection – it says Pomfret is looking at Spring of 2016 is it really 2017</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler Yes, they originally planned for Spring of 2016 and now they have made changes and extended their projection</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler We held our first Tax Sale, at some point tonight I will give you a report on the tax sale</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Did we do well</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler Yes</p> <p>Chairman Nash The referendum on the additional funding for the Manganese Treatment, about 130 people voted and when I went to vote, nobody in that room even knew what that was about. Some question has been raised</p>	

		<p>with regards did anyone [poll workers] know, and are they supposed to know</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau It was out there. On the radio, in the Norwich Bulletin, we did what were we supposed to do</p> <p>Alternate Carvalho It is a matter of going to people where they are and not where we want them to be. I have a low confidence that people are listening to WINY or reading the Norwich Bulletin, people my age, are on Facebook. Both do great work in getting information out and I mean no disrespect, but we have to meet people where they are</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Nowhere else to put it</p> <p>Alternate Carvalho I do not think that people not knowing is a good democratic way to do things</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler If you did a mailer, you are so restricted by the Secretary of State, it would only be the question on the ballot with no additional information</p> <p>Chairman Nash So don't tell them, there has to be some way to get more than 130 people to show up. What did it cost</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler Approximately \$3,000</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Take the cost, it is not a good number</p> <p>Chairman Nash There has to be a better way for non-election type things, or could we wait and have these things on the ballot during election times</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Should you have a higher cut-off that requires a referendum, that would cut down on cost</p> <p>Chairman Nash I was at the town meeting for that and there were not a lot of people there</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau All CT towns complain about turnout, it is usually a very small percentage if it is not related to an election</p> <p>Chairman Nash I am not trying to criticize, I just think it is something that folks that are running the show should think about and look at what others are doing. Spending over \$3,000 for 2% turnout and then complaining that the cost of putting it in the paper is so much, but we can spend \$3,000 to get 130 people to vote</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler When you put the add in, you are limited to what you can say</p> <p>Alternate Carvalho Is there a way to put the question out there and have a hyperlink to more information? I see more and more engagement on Facebook. Where people are is not necessarily only the Bulletin and WINY. I am not just talking about millennials that access their news in other places. I see big signs when work is being planned, that should be the same with major decisions facing the town</p> <p>Mayor Falzarano This vote did not affect East Putnam and the information that was out there was that the cost would be absorbed in the current rates, so why vote, that may be part of it. You can bring a horse to water, but you can't make him drink</p> <p>Alternate Carvalho We are not bringing the horse to water</p> <p>Mayor Falzarano</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>There was a legal notice in the Putnam Town Crier, it was listed in the Bulletin, WINY</p> <p>Alternate Carvalho We need to change the mode of communication</p> <p>Selectman Pempek I'm on Facebook and I find WINY's Facebook page the best place for news</p> <p>Member Marion I only go to Facebook if I get something on Twitter</p> <p>Alternate Carvalho We have to make an affirmative decision to change the mode of communication and reach people where they are at. I would be interested in seeing how many of the voters like the WINY Facebook page. Things that effect the voter and I think that we could do better in getting the information to the people where they are at</p>	
7.	UNFINISHED BUSINESS		None	
8.	NEW BUSINESS	A.	<p><u>Library Request for Appropriation:</u></p> <p>Chairman Nash So the Library is looking for a fire box and painting</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler They are</p> <p>Fire Marshal Perron The older fire alarm boxes are being discontinued as of January 1, 2017. They are requesting a radio controlled box that feeds directly to the fire department or a radio service that will take the alarm then relay it to the fire department</p> <p>Chairman Nash What is better in your opinion</p>	

		<p>Fire Marshal Perron With a private monitoring company, you have to pay for the installation and monthly monitoring whereas the radio box is a one-time cost with no monthly maintenance and the alar does not go through a relay to the fire department</p> <p>Member Sessums If we have the radio box installed at the current location can it be taken to the new location</p> <p>Fire Marshal Perron Yes, Radio box will have a specific id</p> <p>Chairman Nash If we are going to vote, should we wait for the library</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau One or the other</p> <p>Fire Marshal Perron On a radio controlled box it is a one-time fee, and the monitoring co will do an installation fee and then a monthly fee</p> <p>Member Marion How much is the monthly cost</p> <p>Chairman Nash \$600/annually</p> <p><i>Vice Chairman Garceau made a motion to approve the Library's request for the Radio Monitoring Box that goes direct to the Fire Department with funding to come from General Fund Surplus. Member Marion seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Chairman Nash Now the painting, they have provided several estimates</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau I walked around the library yesterday and the exterior doesn't look good</p> <p>Chairman Nash We have estimates for \$7,400.00, \$8,252.00, & \$9,765.00</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler They are going to have to go out to bid as the cost is in excess of \$5,000.00, these are just estimates</p> <p><i>Vice Chairman Garceau made a motion authorizing the Putnam Public Library to go out for bid for the interior/exterior painting and authorizing payment not to exceed \$8,252.00 from General Fund Surplus. Member Marion seconded the motion.</i></p> <p>Discussion regarding cost</p> <p><i>Vice Chairman Garceau made a motion amending his motion for a cost not to exceed \$8,000.00. Member Marion seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</i></p>	
	<p>B.</p>	<p><u>Cady Copp Cottage Request for Appropriation:</u></p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler Several years ago, Aspinock Historical Society went forward with a major renovation project of Cady Copp Cottage with a grant for \$100,000.00 and very little of that money left out there, but there are opportunities. The project is not completed, but the goal is to have</p>	

		<p>Cady Copp Cottage open as an exhibition. They requested \$4,000.00 as there is a grant that they can apply for but it requires matching funds. They are working on a major fund-raising campaign with a goal of \$11,000</p> <p>Member Marion made a motion authorizing the expenditure of \$4,000.00 to be taken from the General Fund Surplus for Aspinock Historical Society for Cady Copp Cottage updates. Member Sessums seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</p>	
		<p>C. <u>Fire Marshal Replacement Vehicle Appropriation:</u></p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal The current Fire Marshal vehicle is one that was offered to us used six years ago, by the Putnam Police Chief. Since we were using our personal vehicles, we jumped at that. The fire department had a dinner to pay for the lettering and paint. Now this vehicle has lasted us 5 years and has 150,000 on 3rd set of controls for the windows. There is an electrical short somewhere and in order to track that it is \$800 which does not include the repair</p> <p>Chairman Nash What vehicle you want</p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal Tahoe</p> <p>Chairman Nash Why that one</p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal These are photos of what we have now. The original thought was a pick up with a cap, which is the same</p>	

		<p>cost, but the Tahoe is more secure; we have evidence and we are responsible for sensitive items. I originally went looking for a truck, but in talking to the state bid guy and told me that he has three Tahoes that were ordered, but never picked up</p> <p>Member Marion How much bigger is the Tahoe than what you have now</p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal It has a lot more space. There is nothing out there for grants for fire marshal vehicles and I looked long and hard. We exercised due diligence and went to local auto dealers to see if they could help us out, but they were not very responsive. Putnam Ford was willing to sell us a used vehicle, but we need something reliable. The Board of Selectmen is currently considering a proposal for Fire Marshal Fees, if that goes forward, those funds would be earmarked to pay for the next vehicle</p> <p>Chairman Nash Which one</p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal The last page is the meat and potatoes</p> <p>Fire Marshal Perron We each went to local dealers and tried to get comparable pricing, but the Tahoe is on the state contract thus requiring no bid process</p> <p>Chairman Nash Does it have a locked rear-end</p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal Yes. Why I want to go with a Tahoe is also because I</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>am going to look for a trailer someday, when you are out there for 14 hours in subzero weather, it would be nice to have a place to work that was inside</p> <p>Fire Marshal Perron This would be the first time the Fire Marshal has had one common place to store the gear, evidence, etc. I also want to throw out the fire department and the Fire Marshal are two separate entities yet they are willing to allow us space to park the Tahoe inside during the winter</p> <p>Scott Belleville – Deputy Fire Marshal I know it says \$40,285 that is the vehicle, not the cost of installing the lights, moving the radio, and the lettering. We are looking for a total of \$46,285.00. Greenwich ordered three of these off of the state bid list and just never picked them up</p> <p>Town Administrator Cutler At the Annual Town Meeting in 2015, there was \$50,000 Capital Appropriation for Equipment Replacement which we can borrow from</p> <p><i>Alternate Carvalho made a motion approving the purchase of a 2016 Chevy Tahoe from the state bid list as a Fire Marshal Vehicle to be paid for from the 5-Year Capital Plan approved in 2015 for a cost not to exceed \$46,285.00 including the vehicle and equipment. Member Sessums seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</i></p>	
		<p>D. <u>Delpha Very, Economic & Community Development Director – Budget Breakdown on Cargill Falls Mill Project:</u></p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very presented the Board with an updated budget</p>	

		<p>breakdown of the Cargill Falls Mill Brownfield Municipal PILOT Grant (see attachment "C")</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau I wanted to know if any money was spent for admin purposes and I requested any loans or salaries given to the property owners</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very There are no salaries or loans; this is for brownfield clean up and to be put on national historic register of historic places. The sky bridge is considered historically relevant, so we need to preserve it. In order to save the sky bridge, we had to build a steel structure to support it as building #10 is being demolished. When digging the footings, they found oil and it has to be contained and taken away. Since we found additional undetected hazardous waste, we were able to apply for an additional 50% bringing the total Brownfield Municipal PILOT Grant up to \$750,000</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau What I would like to do is stop by your office and look at Invoices 21258, 22042 and 22323. On the second page, is that all legal expenses</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very Except for Day Publishing which was a legal notice that had to run for two days, yes</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Lockton Insurance</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very That is for Insurance on the property while we are</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>doing the work</p> <p>Since I did this report, there was an another expenditure dated august 31, 2016 which brings us to a total expended of \$405,809.88</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Separately from this grant, they also borrowing money</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very I am not working on anything for them. I know they have a loan from CHAMP for the housing portion of the project</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Are there any other loans that you know about</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very They have loans for the hydro project</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau On the loans, we have no way of knowing what they are taking in administrative costs</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very We have no way of knowing</p> <p>Vice Chairman Garceau Where is it going</p> <p>Economic & Community Development Director Very From my end, because we had to take out the additional contamination, we are not sure how far we have to dig to hit solid enough ground to support the</p>	
--	--	---	--

			steel structure for the sky bridge. We have hired someone to ensure that when building #10 comes down it is safe for workers to work in that area. Site Con is remobilizing their work team. The hydro plant, I believe, is ready to put the second turbine in	
		E.	<u>All Other Business to Lawfully Come Before this Meeting:</u> None	
9.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – 3 Minute time limit per person		None	
10.	ADJOURNMENT		<i>Member Sessums made a motion to adjourn the Board of Finance meeting at 8:09PM. Member Marion seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</i>	

Respectfully submitted,

Denise S. Roireau, Secretary
 Board of Finance

September 26, 2016

Finance Board Members:

1. We have our “new” Accounts Payable/Grants Analyst and she is doing a wonderful job thus far. She is jumping right into the role with both feet. The only caveat is that she is still being sequestered downstairs to the WPCA until they hire her replacement. I had to send an email out to Jerry Beausoleil stating that if her hours exceeded occasional help (i.e. hour here and there) we will have to charge back to WPCA for her services. This comes after she came to me requesting permission to work the entire day on Friday to help fill her prior position void.
2. The year-end reconciliation process is moving along but no word back yet from the Auditor regarding when she plans her next visit. I have placed an inquiry email. Until then, we continue reconciliations.
3. The new software conversion is moving slowly and steadily along. Our Old General Ledger was 74 Pages long, the new Ledger prior to a few additions will be approximately 10-15 pages in length but Tyler has now given me additional requirements to add to the spreadsheet upload document along with pages of “homework”. This has required a great deal more time than expected and has placed me in an uncomfortable position with timelines. I did meet with the actual software conversion technician last week to go over the highlights. After sitting with us, it is apparent that we will not be online with the software until January 1st. We will have some items online by year end but not officially switched over until after the first of the year. It will be imperative to have Payroll online by that date and I will do everything in my power to see that through.
4. The property Tax Sale made for a very busy time here in Town Hall, several property owners stepped forward to pay off their debts once these auctions were posted. We are seeing the revenue proceeds coming through the finance office.
5. We have begun to perform our analysis in order to obtain our next round of BANS for the various older projects and the Manganese. The latest update from the BOE School Project is a newly submitted “change order” totaling \$656,000 and arriving into the BOE Finance Office in a 6” thick volume. We had to have the document scanned onto a jump drive in order to review for processing due to the sheer mass of the document. They are now anticipating completion of the project by the end of March 2017. This also means that we are planning to move out the Permanent financing BAND to mid July 2017 in order to include any remaining costs which may appear between now and fiscal year end.

Thank you

Brenda Fox-Howard

Town Administrator Report
September 19, 2016

1. Projects Update:

Quinebaug Regional Technology Park Bridge, Road and Utilities Construction

- Project complete.
- Broadband Connection – Various contractors have approached Town to extend broadband connection off the state network to the Tech Park. Will go out to bid/RFP on this service. Meeting with CEN, the state internet organization, to tie into the state's fiber trunkline. Town committee, appointed by Selectmen at last meeting, will convene on this issue by end of September. Bringing broadband just to the Tech Park will cost a little over \$90,000.
- Appraisals completed and a forester has been contracted to determine how to make lots shovel ready. J&D Engineers are working on a gravel removal plan. Will soon conduct sampling to determine quality and quantity of gravel on proposed sites. No change.
- Pomfret has finally signed Interlocal Agreement establishing Technology Park and will be invoiced for their share.

Water Line Replacement/Relining Project

- Contract 1 work is complete.
- Contract 2: B&W Paving and Work is finishing up in Grove and Mechanics Street areas. Work will soon be finishing up on Milton and Vandale Streets area. Work will be starting up next in Walnut Street area. Work is about a month behind schedule. B&W is bringing in more crews to get the schedule up to date. The remainder of proposed Contract 2 project areas:
 - Arthur Street, Brown Street, Canal Street, Centennial Street, Church Street (Pomfret to Woodstock), Eden Street, Edmond Street, Fenner Street, Florence Street, Frank Street, Furnace Street, George Street, Interval Street, Letters Street, May Street, Memorial Terrace, Olney Street, Pomfret Street, Sewer Plant Road, Tatem Street, Vine Street, Walnut Street, Wood Avenue (Church to Marshall)
- No change.

Sewer Lift Stations

- Project complete and paid for.

Manganese/Iron Treatment Building

- At September 13th referendum, the question of adding an additional appropriation of almost \$3 million to the original \$2 million appropriation was approved. WPCA has selected the project team of Tighe&Bond/R.H. White Construction to proceed with project and are working on an agreement with team to proceed with project. Suez, the water and sewer operations management firm is working on a supplemental funding application to the USDA for a loan and grant to cover the additional appropriation. Usually

USDA provides a 75% loan to 25% grant ratio. This additional appropriation will not warrant an increase in the water rates.

Putnam High School Project

- Work is progressing in accordance with construction schedule. You recently were provided with the most current monthly project update.

2. Conversion of Owen Tarr Park and Sabin Street/Woodstock Avenue properties. The town's original appraisal firm, Fishman Associates, is no longer doing appraisals and this information has put us behind in conducting the necessary appraisals for the land substitution for the Tarr Park and Sabin Street projects. A new appraisal firm, Platt Associates, has been selected and they have begun work on the property appraisals of the town's existing parcels and potential parcels needed to substitute for Sabin Street/Woodstock Avenue/Tarr Park. Messier Associates has completed work to determine the field needs on Sabin Street and construction of a bridge to site. Plans are available for review. Working with Committee to evaluate potential sites to provide the substitute land for passive and active recreation. Site evaluation is ongoing.
3. Armory. A proposal is being circulated to consider using the Armory for the following purposes: site of the Senior Center, offices for Recreation staff, offices for registrars of voters/polling station, and multi-use recreation facility. This proposal is being circulated because taking care of the senior center at the armory may be a more cost effective way of having the center developed as opposed to adding it to the proposed Town Hall/Library/Aspinock Offices complex.
4. Sidewalk Reconstruction. To date, we have spent all of the \$750,000 previously appropriated from the Ash Landfill account. There may have to be further discussion about increasing this appropriation. In addition, the Town is working with NECCOG to discuss using various regional transportation funds for our sidewalks. Priorities to consider are using the funds for new projects --- extension of the sidewalks to Day Kimball and Walmart --- and/or repairing/replacing existing sidewalks.
5. High Speed Broadband Fiber Installation. **No change.** Firms' under state contract are investigating cost of bringing fiber to Tech Park from the backbone line. Began discussion with Town's IT consultant on bringing high speed fiber installation to certain locations in town for economic development reasons, particularly to our Tech Park. Discussion will be framed as a town policy decision and not just for the sake of installing technology. Possible ways to manage installation could be as a public utility much like our water and sewer utilities. Some key questions to move this question forward are:
 - a. What's Putnam's policy?
 - b. Who are the champions to move this forward?
 - c. Who are community partners?
 - d. Who are the telecommunication carriers serving Putnam?
 - e. Identify key players and their roles?

Working with CEN, the state's internet organization, to devise a plan to bring fiber connection to the Tech Park by tying into the state's fiber trunkline. CEN has provided a

proposal. Committee will meet now that it has been appointed by Board of Selectmen to provide recommendations to the Board of Selectmen on the broadband installation approach. Tech Park appropriation contemplated bringing fiber connection to the park.

6. Pomfret Sewer Line Connection. Putnam is reviewing a draft agreement with Pomfret allowing them to tie in to our system. Pomfret is looking to a possible spring 2016 construction start. Pomfret is looking to go out to bid possibly as early as next month.
7. Solar Project on Municipal Solid Waste Landfill. A review is continuing of Town's possible options since SolarCity has significantly reduced the scope and savings of their original proposal. Town is discussing possibilities with other solar firms.
8. Innovation Places. A new program has been initiated by the state called Innovation Places. Its intent is to support entrepreneurs and leaders developing places that will attract the talent high-growth enterprises need. The vision behind the program is: "Think of an area you walk to, bike to or take a train to where your mind comes alive with possibilities; where you can run into brilliant people solving big problems and inventing new technology; where the sidewalks and cafes are full of conversation; where are events and music venues brim with people making new friends – a place full of ideas." It was decided to file an application under the program as a region. The submitted application's title is: Northeast Connecticut Innovation Hub. See attached Vision Statement.

Vision Statement

Northeast Connecticut offers unique regional assets that support innovation and entrepreneurship as well as quality of place. Home to many small and medium sized companies and a strong higher-education infrastructure, NECT provides ample opportunities for high-quality employment and a dedication to growing innovation, investment, and connectivity. The region also offers a wide variety of lifestyle options, from small-scale urban to rural, that appeal to young professionals who are not interested in the larger-city, urban experience, a group that includes approximately one-third of millennials according to a Rockefeller Foundation and Smart Growth America study.

What we have to offer

A regional quadrangle anchored by Mansfield, Putnam, Killingly, and Windham at its vertices, the Northeast Connecticut Innovation Hub affords numerous opportunities for creators and innovators to mix, mingle and collaborate in a low-key, amenity rich environment. Key assets include:

- Full spectrum of higher education institutions including UConn, Eastern Connecticut State University (ECSU), and Quinebaug Valley Community College (QVCC).
- Vibrant and culturally rich downtowns including the historic urban centers of Putnam, Danielson, and Willimantic as well as the new Storrs Center development in Mansfield.
- A dense cluster of small- and medium-size advanced manufacturing businesses supported in their efforts by workforce development organizations such as the Eastern Advanced Manufacturing Association (EAMA), the QVCC Advanced Manufacturing Technology Center and the Eastern Workforce Investment Board (EWIB).
- The research and technology transfer assets of the University of Connecticut, including the UConn Entrepreneurship & Innovation Consortium and the UConn Tech Park.
- An entrepreneurial environment that includes the CEOs of Nerac and The Stemie Coalition, financial and technical support from a network of attorneys, venture and traditional funders, and micro-lending through the Northeast CT Economic Alliance, and business support services from area Chambers of Commerce and Connecticut's Small Business Development Center.

- Strong **municipal and regional commitment** from the towns of Mansfield, Putnam, Killingly, Windham and Tolland to providing the types of places that will foster and support the growth of an innovation economy.
- A **strong connection to nature** with endless opportunities for recreation and enjoying fresh, local food from our abundant farms.

Creating a Hub

As Northeast Connecticut comprises a similarly-sized area to both Silicon Valley and the Research Triangle, a strong focus of this Innovation Places project will be to strengthen connections between our communities and anchor institutions. Enhancements to transportation, infrastructure and communication systems will help to promote the continued revitalization of the technology, business, workforce, housing, and cultural centers of this region. To facilitate the actions that will be needed to transform Northeast Connecticut into a dynamic leader in research and innovation, we envision the development of an Innovation Hub that brings together the collective knowledge, experience and commitment of several key sectors. The Hub is envisioned to be both a physical space and an organizational construct. The **organizational construct** will be a formal network with a membership and management structure, based on a collective impact model to ensure that the shared vision of the group fosters collaboration within sectors and deep and active connections between sectors. All elements will seek to be mutually supporting to benefit students, entrepreneurs, workers, businesses, and communities. The **physical space** will be a Hub headquarters, located within one of the vibrant urban centers, where partners, entrepreneurs, resources, and processes can connect, meet, work, and drive innovation and growth forward. At the end of the Planning Grant phase, which will be driven by extensive outreach and collaboration, a plan for a physical location and space for the Hub and an organizational/business structure for the Hub will be delivered.

9. Mobilitie Siting of Micro-Cell Utility Pole Placement. Recently towns, including Putnam, received notice from a company, Mobilitie, to construct new 120 foot high pole-towers in the public rights of way. Mobilitie's Putnam proposal is to install a 120 foot tower on Mill Street, one block off Providence Street. They have reached out to the town to discuss their proposed siting application. Fred Wojick is the town contact. Working through CCM, a number of towns have expressed concern about these applications, including:
- a. Do these applications need approval of the Siting Council?
 - b. Impact on local zoning ordinances?
 - c. Development of clear process that guarantees adequate municipal and public input before new towers are constructed.
- CCM is working with towns that are impacted and will develop a coordinated statewide municipal response. There is a PURA (Public Utilities Regulatory Agency) Technical Meeting on 9/28/16 to discuss the Mobilitie issue.

10. Future of Connecticut's Trash-to-Energy Plants. I have attached a recent article from Crains Connecticut publication entitled: "Trash-to-Energy Plants May Wither in Connecticut's New Waste Strategy". It examines the implications for the future of trash-to-energy plants based on the assumption that Connecticut's plans for increased recycling "will mean less revenue for those facilities and cutbacks in their operations." The article follows (continued on next page):

Connecticut officials are planning a future with fewer trash-to-energy plants on the assumption that increased recycling will mean less revenue for those facilities and cutbacks in their operations.

While operators of trash-to-energy plants are not talking publicly about possible downsizing, a state law calls for Connecticut to divert 60 percent of its trash from disposal by 2024, up from 35 percent today. If Connecticut residents continue to generate 3.5 pounds of trash per day then the total bill for trash disposal will be \$25 million higher in 2024 than it is today, the state Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) predicts.

The higher costs will be caused by added expenses for transporting garbage out of state in expectation that some of the five trash-to-energy plants in Connecticut may cease operations, said Lee Sawyer, policy adviser to DEEP Commissioner Robert Klee. Some plant operators are experiencing declining revenue and have spoken to department officials about possibly curtailing services or closing their facilities all together, according to Sawyer.

The five plants handle 87 percent of Connecticut's disposed waste, DEEP says in its updated Comprehensive Materials Management Strategy report, released last month. About 35 percent of discarded materials, or 1.25 million tons, is recycled annually. A 10 percent reduction in waste along with increased recycling would stabilize costs and help meet environmental goals including clean-air targets, the department says.

The department intends to renew air and water permits for the "aging" plants if those are sought, Sawyer told Crain's Connecticut. Plant operators' tightening financial circumstances is more of a concern to the department than future permits, he said.

More recycling means lower revenues for the state's five trash-to-energy plants. Cities and towns are charged between \$10 and \$20 per ton at recycling plants while trash disposal costs range between \$70 and \$80 per ton, Sawyer said. Recycling saves businesses and taxpayers \$75 million per year on disposal payments, the department said.

At present, 44 percent of Connecticut's trash is not recoverable through current recycling systems, "underscoring a need to promote new processes, new uses and markets and design changes to increase recyclability," the department said.

Despite the push for greater recycling, economic opportunities remain, said James Regan, spokesman for New Jersey-based Covanta Holdings Corp., which owns trash-to-energy plants in Bristol and Preston as well as a transfer station in Wallingford. The 16.3-megawatt Bristol plant opened in 1988 and can handle 650 tons per day. The Preston site, which generates 18.4 megawatts of electricity through burning 689 tons daily, began operating in 1991.

Trash-to-energy plants will be "an important part of the sustainable waste management system for many years to come" and represent a far superior method to sending trash to landfills, Regan said in a written statement. Covanta supports an increase in recycling and thinks more can be done to recover organics, Regan said. Its plants can take trash from other states to make up for lost revenue in Connecticut, he explained.

"The 60 percent (target) still leaves room for us," he said during an interview discussing Connecticut's recycling, waste and energy strategy.

Connecticut "has been a leader in trash disposal," Regan said. It has the lowest rate of landfilling of any state, according to DEEP.

"Look at the rest of the country," Regan said. "The rates for landfilling are much higher. Connecticut is more like Europe in getting rid of its trash."

Covanta's second-quarter revenue rose \$10 million to \$418 million, although its North America same-location energy revenue was down \$4 million from a year earlier. Same-location waste and service revenue climbed by \$4 million during the period thanks to "strong market dynamics" in the Northeast, President and CEO Stephen Jones said in a July 26 news release.

Waste and service revenue of \$297 million was more than three times energy revenue. Recycled metals revenue was just \$17 million, unchanged from last year's second quarter. Full-year financial targets for 2016 were reaffirmed with Jones saying he expects a "solid finish to the year."

The quasi-public Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority and its predecessor organization, the Connecticut Resources and Recovery Authority, has been operating a trash-to-energy plant in Hartford since 1988. Last year, DEEP issued a request for proposals to redevelop the plant site. The 45-megawatt plant is still operating and is permitted to process 888,000 tons per year. The request for proposals covered other authority-administered sites including the Hartford Regional Recycling Center as well as transfer stations in Ellington, Essex, Torrington and Watertown.

Eight proposals were received and three finalists will be announced in September and invited to make presentations, Sawyer said. The winner will be announced in July 2017. The intention is to keep the plant functioning although its capacity may be reduced, he said.

"We are impressed with the quality of the proposals and the experience of the bidders in developing modern materials management throughout the U.S. and the world," Sawyer said.

"The resulting project will significantly increase the recovery of recyclable materials and

decrease the amount of trash that is combusted."

The plant is part of the history of the Hartford Landfill, which operated from 1940 until accepting its last shipment of trash on Dec. 31, 2008. The landfill, located on Leibert Road in the North Meadows section of the city, was officially closed last year by the Rocky Hill-based authority. A 1-megawatt solar energy plant, which can power 1,000 homes when running at full capacity, began operating atop the capped landfill in 2014.

The Bridgeport Resco trash-to-energy plant, run by Wheelabrator Technologies Inc., also began operations in 1988. The plant burns 2,250 tons of trash per day to generate 67 megawatts of electricity. Wheelabrator also operates the 15-megawatt trash-to-energy plant in Lisbon, which handles up to 500 tons daily. It began operating in 1995. The Portsmouth, New Hampshire-based company also operates an ash landfill in Putnam, where residue from trash-to-energy plants is accepted. A spokesperson from Wheelabrator declined to comment.

The five plants no longer participate in the energy capacity market with its supply obligations to the regional electricity grid operator, ISO New England Inc. They instead sell into the daily energy market, where prices fluctuate hourly, meaning greater volatility in what participants get for their electricity, said Marcia Blomberg, an ISO spokeswoman. The capacity market and its supply obligations offer a more predictable revenue source.

A future without capacity supply obligations is less rosy, Regan said. "The economics become more challenging given the current low price of energy," he said. "We are working to ensure the long-term viability of the facilities."

Eversource Energy, the largest distributor of electricity in Connecticut, contracts with the trash-to-energy plants for a "very small" amount of power, Eversource spokesman Mitch Gross said. If that quantity of electricity was no longer being produced Eversource would not have to raise rates, Gross said.

"We have a sufficient number of suppliers and we always negotiate to get the best rate for our customers," he said.

Anticipating possible losses of trash-to-energy plants while also boosting the recycling of food waste, several composting and anaerobic digestion energy facilities are in the works. The proportion of food waste in the trash disposal stream increased between 2010 and 2015, DEEP noted.

The first of these projects, Quantum Biopower in Southington, is scheduled to come online late next year. It would provide 1.1 megawatts of electricity from 144 tons of food waste per day, according to figures supplied by DEEP.

A second Southington project - Turning Earth (1.6 megawatts from 326 tons per day) - is scheduled to begin operations in 2018 as are projects in Bridgeport (1.6 megawatts on 730 tons), North Haven (2.5 megawatts on 400 tons per day) and Milford (3 megawatts on 200 tons per day). The Milford facility, known as New Meadow Power, has not yet applied for permits, Sawyer said.

CARGILL FALLS MILL - BROWNFIELD MUNICIPAL PILOT GRANT

Architecture/Engineering

Date	Paid To	Inv.No.	Paid
4/30/2013	CME	20393	\$ 27,336.55
6/14/2013	CME	20494	\$ 4,107.50
6/30/2013	CME	20555	\$ 7,235.00
10/17/2013	CME	20765	\$ 7,139.00
11/15/2015	CME	20844	\$ 665.00
11/30/2013	CME	20893	\$ 4,005.00
12/31/2013	CME	20958	\$ 775.00
3/31/2014	CME	21123	\$ 1,485.00
5/31/2014	CME	* 21258	\$ 4,161.38
8/31/2014	CME	21445	\$ 2,718.50
9/30/2014	CME	21520	\$ 3,533.75
10/31/2014	CME	21630	\$ 116.25
1/31/2015	CME	21836	\$ 5,621.00
3/31/2015	CME	21946	\$ 3,431.82
4/30/2015	CME	21996	\$ 4,842.50
5/31/2015	CME	* 22042	\$ 5,367.50
6/30/2015	CME	22105	\$ 3,303.75
7/31/2015	CME	22160	\$ 3,713.75
8/31/2015	CME	22202	\$ 4,631.25
10/31/2015	CME	* 22323	\$ 28,640.03
11/30/2015	CME	22422	\$ 1,469.65
12/30/2015	CME	22455	\$ 743.75
1/31/2016	CME	22490	\$ 116.25
2/29/2016	CME	22561	\$ 697.50
03/31/16	CME	22637	\$ 467.50
04/30/16	CME	22652	\$ 271.25
05/31/16	CME	22759	\$ 208.75
06/30/16	CME	22794	\$ 195.00
07/31/16	CME	22870	\$ 2,462.50
Total A&E expended to date**			\$ 129,461.68

** Includes subcontractors i.e. Eagle Environmental, DiSalvo/Ericson Group

Construction

Date	Paid To	Paid
8/19/2015	SITECON Corp. Req. payment # 1	\$ 54,700.99
9/22/2015	SiteCON Corp. Req. payment # 2	\$ 118,473.32
9/29/2015	SiteCON Corp. Req. payment #3	\$ 54,111.99
10/29/2015	SiteCON Corp. Req. payment #4	\$ 20,237.31
Total Construction expended to date		\$ 247,523.61

CARGILL FALLS MILL - BROWNFIELD MUNICIPAL PILOT GRANT

Administration

Date	Paid To	Paid
8/2/2011	St. Onge & Brouillard-	\$ 855.00
10/12/2011	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 352.50
11/2/2011	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 82.50
12/5/2011	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 60.00
1/6/2012	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 285.00
2/3/2012	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 802.50
3/5/2012	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 105.00
4/5/2012	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 22.50
4/5/2012	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 345.00
5/4/2012	St. Onge & Brouillard-	\$ 232.50
6/4/2012	St.Onge & Brouillard	\$ 352.50
7/20/2012	Updike, Kelly & Spellacy, PC	\$ 6,948.34
8/1/2012	St. Onge & Brouillard	\$ 75.00
9/27/2012	Day Publishing-RFP Legal Ad	\$ 320.00
10/17/2014	Norwich Bulletin - Legal Ad	\$ 1,347.00
2/6/2015	Lockton Insurance CO	\$ 10,870.00
5/19/2016	Updike, Kelly & Spellacy PC	\$ 2,583.00
Total Admin. Expended to date		\$ 25,638.34

Total Grant	\$ 750,000.00
Total Expended to Date	\$ 402,623.63
Remaining Funds	\$ 347,376.37