

REGULAR MEETING OF THE LITCHFIELD BOARD OF SELECTMEN
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012
TOWN OFFICE BUILDING - 5:30 P.M.

Call to Order: Leo Paul, Jr. called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. with all Selectmen present: Jonathan Tarrant, Jeffrey Zullo, Paul Parsons and Diane Knox.

Approval of Minutes: Motion: J. Tarrant moved and D. Knox seconded a motion to approve the regular 12/4/12 minutes. All voted aye and the motion carried.

Public Requests/Comments: None

Selectmen's Requests: Motion: P. Parsons moved to add to Interviews d) Reappoint Ed Ryle to Sandy Beach Commission, term expiration 12/2015 and under Tax Refunds, add 3 Tax Refunds, Total of \$100.29. J. Tarrant seconded, all voted aye and the motion carried. L. Paul then explained our town's response to the tragedy in Newtown last Friday. He said he has offered help to Newtown and has met at the school with Deb Wheeler, the Police, the principals, athletic Director and custodians to review policy and processes for safety in the schools. The schools are set up well, and everything is in place. He called for a moment of silence for those killed in this incident.

J. Zullo said Registrar Marie Wallace has asked him to raise the Registrars' salaries in this budget, as they are paid well below the expected requirements of the job.

Resignations: Abby Conroy from Inland Wetlands, alternate, effective 11/20/12; received and noted.

Interviews, Appointments & Reappointments

- a) Reappoint Aaron Devaux to Bantam Lake Authority, term expiration 12/2015
- b) Reappoint Charles Dyson to Conservation Commission, term expiration 12/2015
- c) Reappoint John Baker to Conservation Commission, term expiration 12/2015
- d) Reappoint Ed Ryle to Sandy Beach Commission, term expiration 12/2015

Motion: J. Tarrant moved to reappoint a) through d) above and D. Knox seconded. All voted aye and the motion carried.

Liaison Reports/Commission-Committee Minutes: 11/28/12 Economic Development Commission minutes; 11/28/12 Board of Education minutes; 11/15/12 Sandy Beach minutes; 11/27/12 & 12/11/12 Capital Improvements minutes; 11/5/12 P&Z minutes

Vacancies: The list of current appointed vacancies with term expirations is as follows:

Beautification Commission: 2 regular members 2/2015, 2/2014; 1 alternate 2/2013
Economic Development Commission: One regular member 6/2013; 1 alternate 6/2013
Inland Wetlands Commission: 2 alternate members 6/2013
Litchfield Housing Authority: 1 regular member 8/2013
Milton Historic District Commission: 2 alternate members 1/2015
Park & Recreation: 2 alternate members: 6/2013, 6/2014
Recycling Committee: 4 members, 2/2015, two 2/2013, 2/2014
Social Services Board: 1 member, 2/2015
Town Hall Building Committee: 1 member, 3/2015
Veteran's Advisory Committee: 2 regular member 8/2013, 8/2015; 2 alternate members 8/2015
Water Pollution Control Authority: 1 regular member 1/2013; 1 alternate member 1/2015

Tax Refunds: Motion: J. Zullo moved to approve 3 refunds for a total of \$100.29. J. Torrant seconded, all voted aye and the motion carried.

Transfers: None

Old Business

a) Town Hall Building Committee Update – J. Zullo: No report.

New Business

a) Adopt Resolution for Cooperative Purchase of Mobile Materials Screeners: Mr. Paul explained this is through the Regional Performance Incentive Program and is managed by the Litchfield Hills Council of Elected Officials (LHCEO). It is an equipment cooperative between 11 towns. The resolution needs to be adopted so he can sign it and send it back to LHCEO. He then read the Resolution of Endorsement. Motion: D. Knox moved to approve the Resolution of Endorsement as read by Leo Paul. J. Torrant seconded. P. Parsons asked about payment, and Mr. Paul said there is State money, with a chance that the money may not be available with the Governor's current mitigation plan forming. This was a new program the Governor introduced under his last budget that may not continue. J. Zullo noted the return on investment was low, but P. Parsons said that it helps provide equipment to many towns that may not otherwise have access. Upon voting, all voted aye and the motion carried. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution of Endorsement

The legislative body* of the Town of Litchfield met on _____ and adopted a resolution by the vote of ____ to _____ which endorsed the Regional Performance Incentive Program proposal referenced in Section 5 of Public Act 11-61 (An Act Concerning Responsible Growth). Such proposal for the "Cooperative Purchase of Mobile Materials Screeners" is attached to and made a part of this record.

*NOTE: For the purposes of the Regional Performance Incentive Program, "legislative body" means the board of selectmen, town council, city council, board of aldermen, board of directors, board of representatives or board of the mayor and burgesses of a municipality.

b) Expand Charge of Town Hall Building Committee and Funding: Mr. Paul read the additional proposed language as follows in the resolution under Section 5. Duties: Insert after second sentence, "*The Committee shall prepare cost estimates necessary for code compliance, maintenance and renovation for the current Town Hall and Annex buildings as anticipated for 20 years. It shall prepare annual operational costs estimates for the conceptual new Town Hall and for the current Town Hall and Annex buildings.*" The Building Committee has voted to do this and has sent it to the Board of Selectmen for amending. There is additional funding of \$7,000 that will be transferred from Capital Non-recurring and will be ready for approval at the Jan. 2nd meeting, and then go on for Board of Finance approval at its Jan. 14th meeting.

Motion: D. Knox moved the change to the Resolution Establishing a Town Hall Building Committee and Mission as above and J. Torrant seconded.

In discussion, J. Zullo said there was no time frame or clear definition of what type of renovation would be done. Also there was not even a clear demonstrated need for a new Town Hall. If anything is added, he suggested expanding the charge to include a more global analysis of all Town facilities. It would be wise to look at other options, as there are school buildings that are underutilized. He felt the Committee had completed its work and this is an inappropriate

request of the Building Committee, and he questioned his ability to serve on the Committee if this addition is made.

Mr. Paul said that he did not think the Committee's work was complete without facts that would explain the whole picture to the residents at public hearings so they can make an informed decision. All the other locations have already been studied by the previous Building Committee. He said they need to find out what it would cost if the project does not go forward as there would need to be some improvements. It is at its capacity with its infrastructure. There are no more telephone lines, no ability to increase the IT structure, no ADA capatibility, windows, air conditioning systems and a boiler need to be replaced, and there are asbestos issues.

Mr. Zullo said this is piecemealing, trying to justify the expense on a new Town Hall. He said there is a need for a global strategy, analyzing all the buildings in Town and their functionality, potentially using another building for the Town Hall. Mr. Paul asked him if he would make that a motion, and Mr. Zullo said no. He would rather table this motion until the next meeting. Mr. Paul said if he would work with him to put that language in a motion for the next meeting so they will have an amended resolution to present to the Building Committee to see if they are willing to do what he suggested. Mr. Zullo agreed to table the motion to revise the Building Committee mission statement to include the global strategy review.

J. Tarrant asked to have the charge divided into Phase I and Phase II, where Joe Tofuri, the new Facilities Manager, could investigate this building study under Phase II. He also felt all the information should be available to the voters with an explanation of why this project is necessary.

P. Parsons said there is a need for an investment in the Town Hall, and supported further study of all buildings, but cautioned the use of a school building, as the Board of Education would need to release the building to the Town, which could be complicated.

D. Knox said that program changes are coming with increases in preschool and all-day Kindergarten. Alternative educational programming and alternative methods are coming in order to provide more services for the troubled students as well as other students. The scope of where education is going is changing. School space will be needed.

Mr. Paul cautioned against grouping a school regionalization plan with the scope of this study and Mr. Zullo said they would not. He said he was supportive of doing further studies, rather than doing nothing more, but cautioned not to be redundant in work the previous committee has done.

Rescind Motion: D. Knox then rescinded her motion, and J. Tarrant rescinded his second.

Motion: J. Zullo moved to table a motion until January 2 meeting to include additional information on the duties of the Building Committee with a more expansive review of other Town facilities as well as the existing Town Hall. J. Tarrant seconded. All voted aye and the motion carried. J. Zullo suggested the Committee members present the draft powerpoint presentation to the Selectmen at that time.

Correspondence: None

Motion: J. Tarrant moved to adjourn at 6:22 p.m. and P. Parsons seconded. All voted aye and the motion carried.

Leo Paul, Jr., First Selectman



Regional Performance Incentive Program
Pursuant to Public Act 11-61, Section 5

Form RPI-2
 Rev.08/2012

Proposal for Joint Provision of Service(s) or Study to be filed with the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management

Submit to: Office of Policy and Management,
 450 Capitol Ave. MS #54 SLP
 Hartford, CT 06108-1379,
 Att: RPI Program

Attach additional pages if necessary; identify project and related proposal element at the top of page.

Applicant Entity (RPOs, Two or more Municipalities, and/or Economic Development Districts):	
Name	Litchfield Hills Council of Elected Officials / Northwestern CT Council of Governments
Address	42D North Street
City/State/Zip	Goshen, CT 06756
Contact Person(s):	
Name	Richard Lynn/Dan McGuinness
Title	Planning Director/Executive Director
Telephone	860-491-9884/860-868-7341
Fax	860-491-3729/860-868-7342
E-mail	Lhceo1@snet.net/nwccog1@snet.net
Amount of Regional Performance Incentive Funding Requested: \$ 275,000	
Short Descriptive Title of Project: Cooperative Purchase of Mobile Material Screeners	
REQUIRED PROPOSAL ELEMENTS Items (1) through (15):	
<p>(1.) Proposed Shared Service(s) or related Study: Describe at least one service currently provided by a participating municipality or municipalities or study of the provision of such service, which is not currently provided on a regional basis, for which this proposal is being submitted (attach additional pages as necessary):</p> <p>All towns within the two regions currently generate various earth materials that require processing, storage, disposal, or re-use. These materials are the result of road maintenance scrapings, street sweeping, ditching work, sand and gravel processing, millings, and roadside shoulder work. Towns currently must rent a portable materials screener in order to process these earth materials for recycling and re-use. The recycled materials are typically used for roadway patching and filling, shoulder repair, and landscaping. Through the regional acquisition and sharing of two materials screeners, earth materials collected by municipal public works departments can be more cost-effectively processed and utilized. By recycling this material, there will be</p>	

less waste, avoided storage or disposal costs, and towns can reduce their need to purchase new material such as sand or topsoil.

(2.) Describe the need for such service (attach additional pages as necessary):

None of the towns in the LHCEO and NWCCOG currently own a materials screener that can be used to separate earth materials for recycling and re-use. As a result, towns incur a significant expense in renting the equipment or contracting for such services. While individual towns do not have the resources to purchase a materials screener for their own use, considerable cost efficiencies can be achieved through the regional acquisition of two materials screeners to share in the regional area. In addition to the added convenience of having a materials screener readily available, material costs will be reduced and more effective recycling can be achieved.

(3.) Describe the method of delivering such service on a regional basis and the organization responsible for delivering such regional service or study:

The LHCEO and NWCCOG have established a "Litchfield Hills Public Works Equipment Cooperative" to oversee the sharing of a catch basin cleaner and two street sweepers acquired with a previous Regional Performance Incentive Grant. This program has been in operation for over four years now, and is enjoying considerable success. The Cooperative consists of the Road Supervisors from the participating towns, which meets periodically and operates under the aegis of the LHCEO and NWCCOG.

It is proposed that the acquisition and implementation of the materials screener program be coordinated and operated through the existing Regional Public Works Equipment Cooperative with general program administration provided through the LHCEO and NWCCOG.

(4.) Describe the population that will be served (we are not looking for population numbers, but rather whether a project serves an entire region(s), applicant towns, or any particular segment of the population such as "disabled residents dependent upon public transportation" or "residents in need of 'affordable housing'", etc.):

All twenty towns in the LHCEO and NWCCOG region will be eligible to participate in the proposed program. Currently, fourteen of the towns actively participate in the existing Public Works Equipment Cooperative.

(5) Describe the manner in which regional service delivery will achieve economies of scale:

Most of the towns in the LHCEO and NWCCOG are small, rural communities and do not have the resources to individually purchase and cost-effectively utilize the proposed equipment. By sharing the equipment on a regional basis, however, participating towns will have access to the equipment for a period of time each year and will realize cost savings by reduced rental fees and manpower costs. In addition, by having easy and reliable access to the equipment within the region, towns can be expected to

recycle more material and therefore reduce the amount of material requiring storage or disposal.

(6.) Provide the amount by which participating municipalities will reduce their mill rate as a result of the savings realized (Exclude grant funds from calculations.):

Municipality	Savings	Mill Rate Reduction
Barkhamsted	\$1000	A modest reduction in the mill rate may be achieved by all participating towns through the projected cost savings.
Canaan (Falls Village)	\$200	
Colebrook	\$0	
Cornwall	\$0	
Goshen	\$1000	
Hartland	\$400	
Harwinton	\$200	
Kent	\$1000	
Litchfield	\$1000	
Morris	\$0	
New Hartford	\$0	
Norfolk	\$	
North Canaan		
Roxbury	\$100	
Salisbury		
Sharon	\$3800	
Torrington	\$2200	
Warren	\$0	
Washington	\$0	
Winchester	\$0	
TOTAL	\$10,900	

(7.) Provide a cost benefit analysis for the provision of the service by each participating municipality and by the entity submitting the proposal:

Attachment A identifies the projected annual equipment use and municipal savings for the proposed equipment based on information provided by area road supervisors.

Most of the participating towns rent a materials screener for a week or two each year at an average cost of \$400 per day. Through cooperative purchase of the materials screeners, a sustainable program can be offered in the region for an estimated municipal rental cost of \$300 a day. This results in a 25% cost savings for the participating towns. In addition to this immediate municipal cost savings, it is anticipated that more material will be recycled at the local level with easier access to a materials screener and more affordable rental rates. Several towns, including Cornwall, New Hartford, and Winchester have indicated that they will likely make use of the materials screener even though they do not now routinely screen materials for re-use. This could generate additional savings in that top soil for landscaping and road shoulders could be generated from material screenings and towns could avoid or reduce the need to purchase virgin topsoil material.

The regional savings to be achieved is estimated to be over \$10,000 per year under the proposed program. In addition to this direct cost savings, regional acquisition of

the proposed equipment will also enhance intermunicipal cooperation and coordination that will facilitate other cooperative ventures. Making the proposed regional equipment available at an affordable price will also serve to protect the natural environment and reduce the carbon footprint by facilitating the recycling of earth materials with regionally owned equipment that is located "close to home" for easy access and use .

(8.) Describe a plan of implementation for the delivery of the service on a regional basis (NOTE: The estimated time line and length of time to implement the proposal): Once the RPI Grant is awarded, the LHCEO and NWCCOG will jointly develop a Request for Proposals to select the equipment. A vendor demonstration of the most promising equipment will be scheduled in the region. The equipment will subsequently be purchased, and the administrative process put in place for the participating towns to rent the equipment. The City of Torrington has offered to store and maintain one of the material screeners at their public works garage for use in the eastern portion of the region. The Town of Salisbury has offered to store the other materials screener for use in the western portion of the region. It is estimated that the program will be operational within six months of the notice of grant award.

(9.) Provide a list of potential legal obstacles to the regional provision of the service and how these obstacles will be resolved:

The LHCEO and NWCCOG have already established the administrative framework for the program through the existing Regional Public Works Equipment Cooperative. It is anticipated that an updated Memorandum of Agreement will be signed by each participating town with the LHCEO and NWCCOG, similar to what was done for the shared use of the regional catch basin cleaner and street sweepers.

(10.) Describe how the proposed service will be sustained once it is established and all grant funding has been expended:

The program will be established to be self sustaining. An hourly rental fee will be charged to the participating towns for the use of the equipment. A percentage of this rental fee will be used to pay for equipment maintenance, program administration, and capital replacement. The rental fee can be adjusted each year as necessary to stay on target. Since there is no profit motive, the equipment should always be able to be rented at below market prices.

(11.) Provide a list of other public or private funding potentially leveraged by the project proposed herein.

Grantor	Amount of Funding	Purpose
No additional funds are anticipated for equipment acquisition. However, participating towns will be providing funding for on-going program operation through rental fees.		

(12.) Percent of municipalities in the applicant organization participating in the proposed regional service project: 100% (20/20).

(13.) Attach hereto a resolution by the legislative body of each municipality affected by the proposal, endorsing such proposal.

(14.) Attach the following material:

1. A site location map of the project location, (not the region or EDD), if applicable. Not applicable
2. A proposed Project Schedule (Outline the Proposed Project timeline) See Attachment B
3. Project cost estimates supporting the request for funding. See Attachment C.
4. A list of all necessary local/state/federal permits and approvals required for the project. None required.

(15.) Has a copy of the proposal been sent to legislators representing the participating municipalities? Yes No

If YES, please attach copies of cover letters.

(16a.) Certification by the CEO of the Applicant Organization(s):

I do hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Signature:

Name: Richard Lynn

Title: Planning Director

Date: December 29, 2011

(Please use following certification if more than one RPO is participating.)

(16b.) Certification by the CEO of the Applicant Organization(s):

I do hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Signature:

Name: Dan McGuinness

Title: Executive Director

Date: December 29, 2011

Litchfield Hills Council of Elected Officials and Northwestern CT Council of Governments
 Cooperative Purchase of Mobile Materials Screeners

Attachment A - Projected Municipal Savings

Participating Towns	Annual C.Y. of Material Processed	Current Annual Cost to Process	Number of Days Needed Per Town	Projected Annual Cost Through PWEC	Total Annual Savings
Barkhamsted	1,500	4,000.00	10	3,000.00	1,000.00
Canann (Falls Village)	100	500.00	1	300.00	200.00
Colebrook	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Cornwall	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Goshen	1,000	2,500.00	5	1,500.00	1,000.00
Hartland	200	1,000.00	2	600.00	400.00
Harwinton	300	1,400.00	4	1,200.00	200.00
Kent	500	2,500.00	5	1,500.00	1,000.00
Litchfield	500	4,000.00	10	3,000.00	1,000.00
Morris	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
New Hartford	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Norfolk					
North Canaan					
Roxbury	200	1,000.00	3	900.00	100.00
Salisbury					
Sharon	1,000	5,000.00	4	1,200.00	3,800.00
Torrington	1,500	5,200.00	10	3,000.00	2,200.00
Warren	150	0.00	5	1,500.00	0.00
Washington	500	1,250.00	5	1,500.00	0.00
Winchester	0	0.00	5	0.00	
TOTAL	7,450	28,350.00	69	19,200.00	10,900.00

Note: Source of projected equipment use and municipal savings based on LHCEO and NWCCOG survey of Road Supervisors and vendor estimates.

Attachment C – Project Budget

Cooperative Purchase of Mobile Material Screeners

December 2012

Material Screeners(2)	\$260,000
RPO Administrative Costs	\$10,000
Contingency	\$5,000
TOTAL	\$275,000