

## **Longmeadow Ad Hoc Committee Meeting – 4/21/17**

Members Present: Bob Andrews, Craig Baldwin, John Bergendahl, Lisa Semancik, Greg Short, Glen Warner

Guests: Paul Magyar P.E.

Location: Pomfret Town Hall, Conference Room

Time: 6:30 PM

Summary: The final report of an engineering study completed by Paul Magyar P.E. of Lenard Engineering Inc. of Glastonbury, Ct. dated April 20, 2017, had been emailed to committee members for review earlier in the week. Mr. Magyar presented this report and allowed the committee members to ask questions and to comment on the report.

Mr. Magyar began his presentation by thanking the committee members and stated that he has learned a lot from the information compiled by the committee. He went on to describe the changes to the report from the 4/12/17 draft version and stated that he hoped the final version answered all our questions and concerns. The report describes four options but the conversation focused on Option 1 and Option 3 as these are considered the two most viable options.

Option 1: Mill 1" and overlay with hot mix asphalt (HMA). This option would result in essentially a new road and would accomplish the goal of removal of all the PDC. Mr. Magyar recommends replacement of the catch basin grates only to aid in appearance but did not think replacement of the concrete catch basin tops was necessary as the quantity of PDC that will remain is very minimal. Any wear of the PDC over time would release in such a minimal quantity that it would be a non-factor. By milling approximately 1-1/2" from the top of the asphalt and returning the final asphalt topping to the original elevation, there will be no need to adjust the catch basins or driveway aprons. The contractor would remove the milling debris and it would be added as aggregate to other asphalt mixes. This approach has been approved by Ct. DEEP.

Option 3: Shot blast and overlay with hot mix asphalt (HMA): This technique would result in removal of approximately 1/4" of the existing asphalt and would probably leave behind some of the PDC that has absorbed into the roadway. In the future, if the road requires further work, this would need to be addressed at that time. Even with a relatively thin coating of 1", this option would probably require raising of the catch basins. Of further concern is the fact that Mr. Magyar had identified three contractors who have the equipment to accomplish this work and after repeated attempts to contact them, only one contractor responded; a contractor from Marcus Hook, PA who said they have done work in New England in the past. In speaking with this contractor, Mr. Magyar learned that the cost to shot blast is slightly lower than his estimate, but the cost of disposal of the waste as a "special" waste must also be factored in. Shot blasting is best performed in cooler weather as the asphalt gets softer in heat, resulting in less effective penetration. At this point, if this option is chosen, this work would probably not be accomplished until the fall due to the higher temperatures.

Unanimously, the committee members preferred option 1, but the need for tight dust control during the milling operation is of utmost importance. There was discussion of the actual operation and the fact that the water is sprayed directly on the cutters and that the dust, debris, and water would be immediately vacuumed from the road surface. Mr. Magyar included information on silt bag media in

the final report which detailed the availability of tighter micron products to catch waterborne particulate prior to its entering the catch basins.

Mr. Magyar stated that milling could be done relatively quickly and that this time of year, with frequent rain is actually beneficial to the operation as it will aid in dust minimization if the work is performed in rain conditions.

Craig Baldwin stated that ideally, he would like to see this work completed prior to the end of the school year and felt that we could realistically begin the project in the month of May 2017. He cautioned that there is a possibility that small quantities of milling debris may end up on the first few feet of the lawns but part of this area will be reworked and reseeded as part of the curb work. As an added precaution, he stated that he would instruct residents to remain off this first few feet of lawn for a few days. Doing this work early in the season would also ensure we get the best construction crews as it is prior to the start of the heavy road work season. The committee asked again about a trial of milling or if we would be given the opportunity to view the equipment in use at another jobsite. Craig stated that he plans to visit Allstate next week with Mr. Magyar and discuss the importance of dust control. He has asked Mr. Magyar to develop detailed technical specifications to be added to the contract based on what they learn during this visit.

There was some discussion about the technical aspects of the work:

- There will be a percentage of recycled materials in the asphalt mix as required by Ct. Statute.
- The paving would be in 2 layers (lifts), a base coat, and then a finish top coat. By applying in this fashion, two layers are compacted individually resulting in greater overall compaction which reduces future cracking and results in greater longevity of the road. While 1-1/2" will be removed, 2" of new hot mix asphalt topcoat will be added resulting in approximately 1.5" after compaction. If necessary, there will be minor tapering of the surface at the catch basins which is common practice.

Craig asked about the results of our informal survey of residents regarding removal of island at the Route 44 entrance to Longmeadow Drive. The Town Highway Department had expressed concern over the complications of plowing this area around the island that results in a safety issue for plow crews as they work near Route 44. An email survey was sent to most residents and the overwhelming majority favor leaving the island. Craig suggested that shortening the island on the Route 44 end would help reduce the problem and said he would ask the road foreman to look at the island and mark out where he would propose the island be shortened. There was some concern that if the island were shortened too much, it might not be obvious to drivers entering the neighborhood who might go to the wrong side of the island. The suggestion was made to consider adding painted markings to make this area more obvious.

The question was asked if this work would need to go out to bid and Craig stated that since Allstate is on the State approved contractor list, there is no need to competitively bid the work. The town has a good history of working with Allstate and finds that they are usually the low bidder as they have their own asphalt plant. If we were to move forward with the shot blasting option, we would need to go out to bid as there are no shot blasting contractors on the State bid list. This would result in a delay and make it impossible to complete this work before the fall.

Action items:

- Complete Ad Hoc Committee meeting minutes which will be distributed to committee members in draft form for comment. – R. Andrews
- Finalize meeting minutes, post on the Town website, distribute to the BOS. - R. Andrews/C. Baldwin
- C. Baldwin and P. Magyar visit Allstate during the week of 4/24. - C. Baldwin
- Prepare contract specifications addressing dust control. – P. Magyar
- Mark the island to indicate the proposed shortening of the island. – C. Baldwin
- C. Baldwin to discuss with BOS at the 5/1 BOS meeting at 8:00 AM – C. Baldwin
- If BOS are in agreement with plan to move forward with option #1, C. Baldwin will set up a special informational meeting for residents. - C. Baldwin
- C. Baldwin asked the committee members to assist in communicating details of the project, especially logistics of the plan, to Longmeadow residents as we move forward – Committee Members

Submitted by: R. Andrews