

EXHIBIT B

(Transcript of April 15, 2024 Hearing before the
Jamestown Board of Water and Sewer Commissioners)

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
TOWN OF JAMESTOWN

PROCEEDINGS AT HEARING *
IN RE: *
*
Town Council sitting as the*
Board of Water and Sewer *
Commissioners *

Jamestown Town Hall
93 Narragansett Avenue
Jamestown, RI 02835
15 April 2024

BEFORE:
Nancy A. Beye, President
Mary E. Meagher
Michael White
Randall White

PRESENT:

For the Application - Saletins and Frechettes:
Christian S. Infantolino, Esquire
MURPHY PRIOR & INFANTOLINO
77 Narragansett Avenue
Jamestown, RI 02835

For the Application - Andreonis:
Joelle C. Rocha, Esquire
DUFFY & SWEENEY, LTD.
321 South Main Street, Suite 400
Providence, RI 02903

For the Applicants - Gagnon and Zimniski:
Suzanne Gagnon, Pro se
Stephen Zimniski, Pro se
7 Seaview Avenue
Jamestown, RI 02835

For the Town of Jamestown:
Peter D. Ruggiero, Esquire
RUGGIERO BROCHU & PETRARCA
1130 Ten Road Road, Suite D102
North Kingstown, RI 02852

IN RE: Town Council sitting as the Board of Water
and Sewer Commissioners

15 April 2024

Page 2

ALSO PRESENT:

Edward A. Mello, Town Administrator

Robert J. Fagan, Town Clerk

Denise Jennings, Water and Sewer Clerk

I N D E X

OPEN FORUM

Paul A. Robertson - Statement	5
Charlotte Zarlengo - Statement	14

REPORT OF TOWN OFFICIALS

Michael Gray - Statement	17
--------------------------	----

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:Application of Saletins:

BRIAN THALMAN

Direct Examination by Attorney Infantolino	27
--	----

ROBERT F. FERRARI

Direct Examination by Attorney Infantolino	31
--	----

JEFFREY SALETIN - Statement	68
-----------------------------	----

Application of Andreonis:

BRIAN THALMANN

Direct Examination by Attorney Rocha	74
--------------------------------------	----

ROBERT F. FERRARI

Direct Examination by Attorney Rocha	75
--------------------------------------	----

GLENN ANDREONI - Statement	87
----------------------------	----

Application of Frechettes:

Attorney Infantolino statement	92
--------------------------------	----

Application of Gagnon and Zimniski:

SUZANNE GAGNON - Statement	105
----------------------------	-----

STEPHEN ZIMNISKI - Statement	105
------------------------------	-----

IN RE: Town Council sitting as the Board of Water
and Sewer Commissioners

15 April 2024

COUNCILOR BEYE: Good evening, everyone,
and thank you for coming.

We will begin by roll call. As you can see
Councilor White is here, Councilor Meagher, myself,
and we're expecting Councilor Randy White in a
little while, but we're going to go on anyway.

I'm going to call the meeting to order. Would
you please join me for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. I will entertain a
motion to sit as the Water and Sewer Commissioners.

COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So moved.

COUNCILOR MICHAEL WHITE: Second.

COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor.

(Voice vote.)

COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

And I -- just one minute. I just want to go
over the housekeeping for tonight at least while
we're sitting as Water and Sewer Commissioners.

Tonight we're going to -- we have a
stenographer here, and she will swear anyone in
that is going to speak at this point -- at this

1 part of our meeting. Okay? And then we'll go from
2 there. I'll explain a little more in a minute.
3 But we would like someone who would like to speak
4 in open forum.

5 PAUL A. ROBERTSON: Thank you.

6 COUNCILOR BEYE: So, you're going to get
7 sworn in.

8 **PAUL A. ROBERTSON**

9 having been first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

10 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

11 PAUL A. ROBERTSON: Paul A. Robertson.

12 THE STENOGRAPHER: Robertson?

13 PAUL A. ROBERTSON: Yeah.

14 R-o-b-e-r-t-s-o-n.

15 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

16 (Councilor Randall White entered.)

17 PAUL A. ROBERTSON: Let's see if this
18 thing works (Indicating). Nick Robertson, 109 Carr
19 Lane, Jamestown.

20 I would like to speak in regards to the crisis
21 that seems to have developed at the water plant as
22 of recently. I realize we're shorthanded there,
23 and there has been consideration of bringing in
24 private enterprise to assist in the operation of
25 that plant. Unfortunately, we're short on

1 manpower, and it seems that we're having difficulty
2 trying to provide that manpower, and it's not
3 everybody that can work in the plants. You must be
4 licensed by the State to do so. It's not like you
5 can take a truck driver and stick him in there and
6 do it. These plants are not conducive to that type
7 of individual who is not familiar with it. They're
8 not only somewhat different but they are also
9 dangerous. There is gases and chemicals there that
10 can kill you. So, you'd have to know what you're
11 doing when you're working in these facilities.

12 Not too long ago when I was on the council I
13 toured these facilities. And what struck me, and I
14 know that all of you have toured them more than
15 once, obviously, but what struck me, when I went
16 there, is that these plants operate 24/7, 365 days
17 a year. But what even more was impressive was the
18 fact that they're operating with only three
19 employees. In my mind, you're operating
20 undermanned at these facilities. It's a skeleton
21 crew. And I have worked in one of these facilities
22 myself in the past, so I have a little bit of
23 experience there.

24 I realize probably the reason for that is the
25 budget constraints. These plants are not supported

1 by the tax base, they're supported by the users,
2 and that's a small percentage of people that live
3 here in Jamestown. And it means that they don't
4 generate a great deal of money to run these plants
5 and, therefore, corners do get cut. And manpower
6 happens to be one of them.

7 Now, we're faced with that issue as of now
8 because we have a shortage of personnel at the
9 water plant that has to be licensed. And the
10 management has indicated that they cannot find
11 someone to fill that position and, therefore, they
12 may have to go outside to find someone to do that,
13 whether it's temporary or permanent.

14 Personally, I think that we need to take
15 another look at how we operate. And it wasn't that
16 long ago that Bob Sutton made the suggestion that
17 these facilities should operate much as the school
18 under the tax base and not necessarily the user.
19 And in order to do that, you're going to need the
20 acceptance of the voters to get to that point, and
21 that hasn't happened. And when he made that
22 suggestion it wasn't very popular. A guy that is
23 paying the taxes or somehow helping to support the
24 water and sewer plant isn't getting the benefit of
25 it, so therefore he's not too interested in doing

1 so. But you need to point out the fact that it's a
2 community, it's not an individual. And the day is
3 going to come when that taxpayer may need one or
4 both of those facilities and he's not going to be
5 able to get it. But if we look at the long-range
6 plan, it's possible that he could get it and get
7 that service.

8 You already have had numerous requests to
9 extend your water lines, and I know the very reason
10 why you don't. You don't because you don't have
11 adequate water. And we haven't done much other
12 than create some additional wells to do that. And
13 I know you have some probably on your agenda now to
14 try to do so. But there is no guarantee putting
15 that well in is going to provide enough water to
16 extend those water lines, for instance, to The
17 Shores.

18 So, therefore, I would suggest that we get a
19 committee together and we look at the possibilities
20 of doing some of these things of extending them,
21 and we look at a 20-year long-range plan to
22 accomplish that.

23 We have had water issues in this town for
24 years. I remember when we had the National Guard
25 and the military bringing trailers of water in

1 here. We ran an emergency water line across the
2 old Jamestown bridge. That's no longer there.
3 North Kingstown, I don't believe, has any interest
4 in providing water for Jamestown at this point in
5 time either.

6 We have also looked at maybe trying to take
7 the south pond and utilize that water and find some
8 way of storing that water. Victor Ridges, an
9 engineer, did a study on that quite sometime ago,
10 and we'd have a million gallons a day running
11 overboard during the wet season. If we could have
12 salvaged and stored that water, would that have
13 that addressed our issue? The answer is it
14 certainly would have helped. But there is another
15 issue with that water. It costs more to process
16 that water than it did the north pond, and that
17 contamination supposedly and may be from the
18 vegetation that grows around there, but that could
19 be overcome if we had the finances and the means to
20 support it. We haven't had that. And there has
21 been no push to do it.

22 The first thing we did do, and I think it was
23 one of the council members made an indication that
24 we should take and run that water line back to the
25 south pond and pump that water up there, which we

1 did. I think it was Fred Pease and that did help,
2 and it also deleted that, and we were able to treat
3 that at a much less lower cost than we could
4 directly from the south pond.

5 So, we have done and we have made some
6 improvements, but we have a long ways to go and the
7 more populated and more dense we get the more
8 problems it's going to be. And unless we do
9 something now, it's only going to get worse. And
10 it's a lot easier to fix these problems when we're
11 not in a crisis mode.

12 Now, they -- the problem that I see with
13 having adequate help at these plants is the fact
14 that maybe the criteria that we set for our own
15 personnel -- and we're trying to hire our own
16 personnel -- maybe it is a little different for the
17 private enterprise. Because I often wondered why
18 the private operators are able to get this
19 personnel and the towns can't. There has to be a
20 reason for that. What that reason is I'm not sure.
21 Is it that they pay better? Is the workload less?
22 Are the licensing less? I don't know. But I do
23 know what we require when we run these ads for the
24 personnel that the town is looking for, they've got
25 to have CDLs and a number of other licenses, they

1 have a broader workload and they work for less
2 money. Those are some of the criterias that we
3 have to address.

4 And there again, I understand why, because we
5 need to broaden our ability to finance these
6 operations. They're a Town asset. They're one
7 that is going to be needed as long as there is
8 civilization here. We can't just ignore it and
9 shut it down.

10 So, basically I'm thinking that a committee
11 put together to look at some long-range planning is
12 in need. We need to think about how we're going to
13 address these problems now and not later.

14 To get this immediate one, I understand that
15 you're thinking about maybe a temporary employee to
16 take and assist that through a private company.
17 That's fine. But we need to look beyond that, and
18 we'd liked to know at -- how we got there, and I
19 think that one of the things that we need to figure
20 out is how can we take and properly staff these
21 facilities so that we don't run into that.

22 The other thing that happens is this Town
23 doesn't have an on-call list. An on-call list
24 means that you have an employee who is on call when
25 he's off duty. If you have a problem, or an alarm,

1 or a pump goes down, or a generator switch, or you
2 spring a leak at two o'clock in the morning,
3 someone has to respond to that. It doesn't
4 necessary wait until the next day or until the crew
5 comes in in the morning. It needs to be handled
6 now. Fortunately, Jamestown has had dedicated
7 employees who come in and who stand by and they're
8 not necessarily getting paid to be on standby, but
9 they do, and they have done it since the beginning
10 of time, and they're doing it to this day. So, you
11 got a good employee there now, but that doesn't
12 guarantee that tomorrow you will have, so you need
13 to think about that. Do you have an on-call list?
14 I know that that private operator does. It's
15 buried somewhere in his finances, because he can't
16 afford to take and have no one show up when he has
17 got a turn crack going on. So, the Town needs to
18 address that issue as well.

19 I would hope that in the future here, in the
20 near future, that we could get a committee
21 together, and we could look at these answers, and
22 we could address them.

23 I know that The Shores is always a potential
24 problem. You got quarter-acre lots with wells and
25 septic on them. Forty years ago those were not

1 necessarily fully occupied there. You have a lot
2 of summer cottages, that's what they were; they
3 were there a for a few months and they were gone.
4 Today, most of them are larger, and they live there
5 year-round. So, the potential is still there, and
6 the potential will certainly grow for possible
7 contamination.

8 At one time, when we built the sewer plant
9 forty-some years ago, the plan was to run the sewer
10 lines there and take the septic out of there. The
11 problem was you take the septic out, you take the
12 water out, and there's the potential that the wells
13 will go dry. The solution was suggested that we
14 put retention ponds there and we trip the treated
15 water back to those retention ponds to rehydrate
16 the land in and around there so that we don't have
17 the wells go dry, but there is a cost factor
18 attached to that, and it never got traction to ever
19 have that happen. Is that the answer? I'm not
20 sure that that's the only answer, but it's
21 certainly was a thought that was there.

22 But there is another factor that's most
23 important and that's finances. Once again. And if
24 you are operating on the budget that only the users
25 support, that is going to be difficult. I think

1 you need to put this here proposal before the
2 taxpayer and let the taxpayer vote on it, and let
3 him know what the facts are, that somewhere down
4 the road you're going to need that service, you're
5 going to want that service, and it's not going to
6 be there. Think about that.

7 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Thank you.

8 PAUL A. ROBERTSON: I don't want to take
9 up anymore of your time. I could go on for another
10 hour, but I don't think I can stand here that long.

11 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay.

12 PAUL A. ROBERTSON: Thank you for your
13 time.

14 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you, Nick. Thank
15 you.

16 Is there anyone else that would like to speak?

17 (Pause.)

18 COUNCILOR BEYE: Come on up. You have to
19 be sworn. I know you just came in. You have to be
20 sworn in, so -- no. Come on up. Come on,
21 Charlotte.

22 **CHARLOTTE ZARLENGO**

23 having been first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

24 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

25 CHARLOTTE ZARLENGO: Charlotte Zarlengo.

1 THE STENOGRAPHER: Spell your last name.

2 CHARLOTTE ZARLENGO: Z as in

3 zebra-a-r-l-e-n-g-o.

4 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

5 CHARLOTTE ZARLENGO: Okay? I would like

6 to make a statement relative to the Seaview Avenue

7 water hookups. Would you like me to do that now or

8 wait until the time came when you bring it up at

9 the agenda?

10 COUNCILOR BEYE: I think now would be

11 fine.

12 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes, that is fine.

13 COUNCILOR BEYE: Go ahead, Charlotte.

14 CHARLOTTE ZARLENGO: Okay.

15 In Mike Gray's letter to the board of Water

16 and Sewer Commissioners dated February 13, 2023,

17 regarding water extension service to four houses on

18 Seaview Avenue asking for water hookups in the

19 rural water district, on page 4 of his letter Mike

20 states that in the water system management plan,

21 including a build-out analysis, states that the

22 current supply does not produce enough water to

23 meet maximum daily demands presently. And the

24 average daily demand at build-out, within the

25 existing district, exceeds the available capacity

1 of our wells and reservoir. Extensions of water
2 mains outside of the district boundaries will place
3 additional demand stress on the limited supply with
4 a single aquifer.

5 I would like to remind the council that in
6 previous councils in the past The Shores residents
7 were having problems with a water situation. We
8 had wells drying up, saltwater intrusion. We had a
9 lot of different problems; people having to put
10 second wells in. And many times we approached the
11 previous council, not this council, but councils in
12 the past, and we were told that was our problem,
13 the Town has nothing to do with your water. If you
14 need to do that, if you have a problem, then you're
15 going to have to truck in the water, you're going
16 to have to put in a tank underground, or you're
17 going to -- but you have to take care of your own
18 problems. The Town is not responsible for the
19 water in your area.

20 I have complete sympathy for the people on
21 Seaview Avenue. We have been through this in The
22 Shores with all kinds of different problems because
23 we all depend on that single aquifer. Everybody in
24 town depends on it. Everybody in The Shores
25 depends upon it. We have small pieces of property

1 oftentimes in The Shores, and our septic systems
2 and our wells are close together. We can't move
3 things to make it more feasible for us to have --
4 not have a problem.

5 So, as I said, I appreciate the Seaview Avenue
6 problems that they're having. And I'm asking and
7 hoping that if the time comes when we have a
8 problem the Town is going to be there for us. We
9 need to have water just as well as anybody else.
10 And we have a huge area of people that live in The
11 Shores that all depend upon septic systems and
12 water.

13 So, I'm asking you to consider that in your
14 discussions this evening.

15 Thank you very much.

16 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you, Charlotte.
17 Thank you.

18 Is there anyone else that would like to speak?

19 (Pause.)

20 COUNCILOR BEYE: No? Okay. Let's move on
21 then.

22 Okay. We have the report. Mike's report?

23 **MICHAEL GRAY**

24 having been first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

25 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

1 MICHAEL GRAY: Michael Gray.

2 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

3 MICHAEL GRAY: Good evening. Just a few
4 things to note. First item we're talking about the
5 staff. As you know, we are still struggling to
6 find that third person in the water department. We
7 did have someone who was interested in the job;
8 unfortunately, it didn't -- it did not -- could not
9 get over here for a second interview with Ed and I,
10 so we are still at the same place we were at last
11 month.

12 I appreciate what Nick has said, and a lot of
13 what he said is certainly true about the staffing
14 levels at both facilities. As you know, we talk
15 about it often. The three people in both
16 facilities, and you know how taxing it can be, you
17 know, during emergencies, and after hours, and
18 callouts, and all of that.

19 What is important, when we talked about
20 contractors, if you go into the Veolia's website
21 and look at their job openings, it's in the
22 hundreds. This an industry-wide issue. It's not
23 a -- it's not a local issue here in Jamestown.
24 It's an issue in the industry. It's having people
25 filling these jobs that are interested in these

1 careers, and it's across the board. The Veolia is
2 having this as well. But with a company -- I'm not
3 saying one model is better than another. I'm just
4 saying what options are available to us for
5 staffing.

6 At a company situation, they have the ability
7 to expand and contract where needed. I am not
8 saying that we're making a recommendation that
9 we're going in that direction. I mean, we're
10 making an effort to staff. We want to manage it.
11 Locally. We do. It's just that at some point we
12 have got to figure it out, and that's where Ed and
13 I are.

14 So, we're going to -- hopefully this person
15 who is interested -- he's working at another
16 facility. So, what will happen is he'll move here
17 and there will be a vacancy there. And that's just
18 the way things are.

19 This is also in the wastewater industry. I
20 sit on the Board of Water Operators for the State.
21 It's quarterly meetings. We have facilities all
22 over the state that come in seeking waivers from
23 the State because they don't have the staff. They
24 don't have a licensed staff. They're asking for a
25 waiver, accepting an individual in a management

1 role while they're getting a license to operate. A
2 lot of these facilities are in the same position,
3 trying to fill these jobs because licensed people
4 need to operate these plants.

5 So, I just -- you know, I really do appreciate
6 what Nick has -- has talked to you about, and it's
7 a problem, and it's not just here, it's everywhere.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think we just -- I
9 would -- I just want to acknowledge, as we have
10 acknowledged before, but particularly with Nick in
11 the room, we recognize that the folks who work for
12 our water and our sewer department, 24/7, three
13 people on each staff, it's extraordinary, as well
14 as you, Mike, because you're the guy who jumps in
15 when that call comes in the middle of the night. I
16 think somebody drives down from your -- from
17 Glocester to come down to Jamestown.

18 MICHAEL GRAY: But --

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: But they're just --
20 they have done wonderful work for us and --

21 MICHAEL GRAY: They all do.

22 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: -- the town needs to
23 know.

24 MICHAEL GRAY: And they all should be
25 commended for it.

1 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Absolutely. Mark --

2 MICHAEL GRAY: I mean, Mark, as I have
3 been telling you, has been working seven days a
4 week.

5 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: 24/7. Practically
6 24/7. So, I mean, if they didn't know it they
7 certainly should know my fellow councilors share
8 it, of just how -- what service all those guys have
9 given to this town.

10 MICHAEL GRAY: Yeah. And even, you know,
11 when we advertise for internships -- we haven't
12 advertised now for an internship. An opportunity
13 to get young people into the -- you know, into
14 these jobs and getting them interested in the
15 field.

16 We had a great oppor -- we had a great intern
17 a few years ago at the wastewater department. He
18 is running facilities now. It changed his whole
19 career path, and he's excelling in it.

20 We don't have one single applicant for these
21 internships jobs. It's just unfortunate.

22 But anyway, so moving on, so Pare, as you
23 know, we have finalized that, that was submitted on
24 Friday's deadline, the water system supply
25 management plan.

1 PFAS, the notice that you reviewed last month,
2 that did go out in the quarterly billing. I have
3 received one call on that, questioned some of the
4 information and health questions mostly.

5 Distribution system. We're continuing to
6 flush, annual flushing. It does have an impact on
7 certain streets, but pressures, you may or may not
8 receive calls from some for repairs.

9 Fort Getty will be opening soon, so we have to
10 get that open towards the middle of May.

11 Average flows for the month. Wastewater
12 treatment facility, 12 inches of rain statewide and
13 9 inches locally here in March. It did have an
14 impact, wastewater. Again, staff working around
15 the clock manning pumps to make sure we're not
16 having overflows from our infrastructure collection
17 system to the bay. It's just a lot of -- to ask
18 for our staff to be out, because we're still having
19 issue with inflow and infiltration, but we're
20 working on that.

21 So, what I have explained in the next section
22 here is we're working with Weston and Sampson. As
23 you know, this team we're working with, that we met
24 with, is evaluating in the collection system. And
25 what we're going to do is determine segments that

1 we're interested in studying further as possibly
2 going out and doing close-circuit television
3 inspection and flow measuring to try to tackle some
4 of this inflow that we're having issues with in the
5 collection system.

6 And I have provided you with our transfer for
7 the month of March, and as you can see the rainfall
8 is just off the chart. It has an impact.

9 Any questions? About my report?

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No.

11 COUNCILOR BEYE: No?

12 Thanks, Mike.

13 MICHAEL GRAY: Thank you.

14 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Before we move on
15 to Unfinished Business, I just want to explain how
16 we're going to handle this, how we're going to --
17 how we're going to conduct this.

18 So, we're going to -- we have four applicants
19 tonight for water line extension. So, we're going
20 to hear each one individually, and then at the end
21 we'll just figure out what we're going to do.

22 Okay?

23 So, the first one is -- the applicant is
24 for -- is Jeffrey and Deborah Saletin. Are they
25 here?

1 Okay. Okay. You don't need to be.

2 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Good evening.

3 Christian Infantolino. I'm with Murphy Prior &
4 Infantolino. I'm here tonight representing Jeffrey
5 and Deborah Saletin on their application for water
6 extension for their property located at 14 Seaview
7 Avenue, Tax Assessor's Plat 7, Lot 135.

8 I would like to request that the application,
9 all submitted documents, be marked as exhibits for
10 this presentation. So, if we could just mark those
11 just as exhibits when they come through.

12 COUNCILOR BEYE: Can you --

13 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: A little louder.

14 COUNCILOR BEYE: Yeah. I thought it was
15 me.

16 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No problem. I was
17 toning it down because of the speaker. I'll speak
18 up. That's fine. I can do it. If I go too loud,
19 just holler.

20 COUNCILOR BEYE: I'll tell you to use your
21 inside voice.

22 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: My hands start
23 going like this (Indicating).

24 So, tonight I have with me Brian Thalmann with
25 DiPrete Engineering as well as Robert Ferrari with

1 Northeast Water Solutions, and then the applicant
2 Jeffrey Saletin is here as well in the event that
3 there's any questions for him as well.

4 Jeff and Debbie Saletin have been calling
5 Jamestown home for the last 23 years. We're here
6 before you tonight because ever since 2018 the
7 applicants began continuing to experience both
8 water quantity and quality issues at their home.
9 They've experienced the well running completely dry
10 more than once. And on their last load test
11 experienced yields of less than 1 1/2 gallons per
12 minute, at the maximum it was like 1.1.

13 In 2018, they installed a storage tank and a
14 reverse osmosis system, which we'll have them talk
15 about. And they have continued to have issues,
16 they continue to have water issues. On top of
17 virtually a non-existent yield, the applicants are
18 also experiencing the water quality issues, which
19 are very severe and could cause public health
20 problems.

21 The applicants' well is deep, and they're --
22 they're also experiencing -- part of the water
23 quality is saltwater intrusion.

24 And based on what you're going to hear
25 tonight, you're going to see that there is really

1 no other feasible options to cure the health issues
2 and the salt water intrusion problems.

3 Tonight's experts', once introduced, testimony
4 regarding existing conditions of the property,
5 including low yield rates, unhealthy water test
6 results, the inability to locate a well in another
7 area and that there is no other real feasible
8 options other than to extend the line and connect
9 in to the Town.

10 This testimony you hear tonight will meet all
11 of the standards of RIGL 46-15-2.

12 Inside the application, I want to note that
13 the Town Planner made a comment stating that in the
14 rural district only -- water is only provided only
15 to existing lots that are not subdividable lots.
16 It's further stated that the lot was both existing
17 and not subdividable. And that the fire chief
18 stated that this request will not reduce the level
19 of fire protection of the community.

20 With that being said, I'd first like to call
21 Brian Thalmann from DiPrete Engineering.

22 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: Excuse me, one
23 minute.

24 Madam President, when you mark the exhibits,
25 could you just make a selection between using

1 numbers or letters, so the stenographer can record
2 how the exhibits are listed.

3 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay.

4 **BRIAN THALMANN**

5 called as a witness and having been first duly
6 sworn, testifies as follows:

7 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

8 THE WITNESS: Brian Thalmann. The last
9 name is spelled T as in Tom-h-a-l-m-a-n-n.

10 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

11 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: As part of the
12 application, we did provide a CV. I think we
13 brought a CV for Brian.

14 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO:

17 Q. But if you could just give the board a brief
18 explanation of your expertise.

19 A. Sure. My name is Brian P. Thalmann. I am a senior
20 project manager with DiPrete Engineering. I am a
21 registered professional engineer in the state of
22 Rhode Island. As such, I am qualified to offer
23 opinions on matters related to civil engineering of
24 which anything associated with utility extensions
25 would fall under that purview.

1 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Thank you.

2 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Will this council,
3 Town Council, accept Brian as an expert witness?

4 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes, I do.

5 COUNCILOR BEYE: Yes.

6 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Thank you.

7 BY ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO:

8 Q. Brian, can you please briefly describe the existing
9 site conditions of the property?

10 A. Sure. Mrs. Saletin's lot designation is as AP7,
11 Lot 135. It is a lot that was created when Seaview
12 Avenue was kind of reconfigured, if you will. It
13 was originally part of a larger group of lots that
14 essentially became these three lots right here
15 (Indicating). The lot currently has a single-
16 family dwelling with three bedrooms and is serviced
17 by both an on-site wastewater treatment system as
18 well as a private well in the northwesterly corner
19 of the property. As Mr. Infantolino indicated, the
20 past several years there have been many issues
21 related to the existing well both as far as its
22 capacity and its water quality. I am going to
23 speak only to the physical constraints that exist
24 on the lot now related to resiting a well to try
25 and find a different location. What I can tell you

1 is that when you apply all the required setbacks
2 from the 25-foot setback from the street, the
3 100-foot setback from both the on-site wastewater
4 treatment system that is on the site as well as the
5 abutting lot and then the 50-foot -- sorry, the
6 100-foot radius to the existing well, we
7 essentially do not have any area left on the
8 property that does not meet either the State or EPA
9 requirements related to siting a well.

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, there is a
11 100-foot distance a well has to be from the septic?

12 BRIAN THALMANN: Correct.

13 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Are there ever
14 variances given by RIDEM or are they given to the
15 septic?

16 BRIAN THALMANN: They're given to the
17 septic.

18 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: And how old is the
19 septic?

20 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can't
21 really tell you what the exact age of --

22 THE STENOGRAPHER: He's not sworn in.

23 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Okay. It predates
24 your ownership.

25 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's

1 correct.

2 BY ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO:

3 Q. So, just to get this item on the criteria, is it
4 your opinion that the unique characteristics of the
5 property and constraints of the subject property
6 that make the drilling of the new well not feasible
7 on the property?

8 A. Yes. Given to the fact that it's a waterfront lot
9 associated with flood zones and then the collection
10 of both on-site and adjacent infrastructure related
11 to the septic systems and wells, there is no
12 reasonable alternative on the site to site a new
13 well.

14 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Does the council
15 have any other questions for Brian?

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Not yet.

17 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: We can always bring
18 him back up. If there is questions, I'm sure.

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Well -- yes.

20 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Yes, I do.

21 COUNCILOR BEYE: Sure.

22 Randy, Councilor White, has a question.

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Were you
24 involved with the testing of the well for a yield?

25 BRIAN THALMANN: No. That would be my

1 colleague, Mr. Ferrari, who is going to testify.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. Thank
3 you.

4 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No further
5 questions?

6 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Not at this
7 point.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Not at this time.

9 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Excellent. Thank
10 you. I'm not closing you off. Just didn't want
11 him to run away.

12 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

13 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: What I would now
14 like to do is call Robert Ferrari of Northeast
15 Water Solutions.

16 **ROBERT F. FERRARI**

17 called as a witness and having been first duly
18 sworn, testifies as follows:

19 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

20 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Robert F. Ferrari.

21 THE STENOGRAPHER: Spell your last name.

22 ROBERT F. FERRARI: F-e-r-r-a-r-i.

23 DIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO:

25 Q. Mr. Ferrari, could you, please, give the board a

1 brief explanation of your expertise and licenses?

2 A. Okay. I'm a registered professional engineer. I
3 have a degree in Civil Engineering from WPI.
4 Forty-six years of experience. I am a wastewater
5 registered engineer. I'm a licensed general
6 contractor. And until about a month or so ago, I
7 was a certified public water system operator. And
8 if you're wondering why I don't have my licenses
9 anymore it's because I voluntarily decided that I
10 had plenty of other people working in the company
11 who can do that work, and I could, you know, not go
12 out on calls at three o'clock in the morning.
13 So -- anyway. Perfectly happy being president of
14 the company.

15 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Will the council
16 accept Mr. Ferrari as an expert witness?

17 COUNCILOR BEYE: Do we need to vote on
18 him?

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No.

20 COUNCILOR BEYE: No?

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No, we don't need to
22 vote.

23 COUNCILOR BEYE: Do we need to vote on
24 that? The question was --

25 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: Vote to accept him,

1 you should know --

2 COUNCILOR BEYE: That's what I was --

3 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: Should name the
4 expert field is what.

5 COUNCILOR BEYE: And do what?

6 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: Name the expert
7 field.

8 COUNCILOR BEYE: Oh, okay.

9 BY ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO:

10 Q. This would be professional survey in water,
11 water --

12 A. Yes. My area of area of education is in water, and
13 for that matter wastewater. But in this case it's
14 water treatment, water supply development, you
15 know, wells, et cetera.

16 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I make a motion to
18 accept Mr. Ferrari.

19 COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor?

20 (Voice vote.)

21 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay.

22 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: And also, belated, I
23 make a motion to accept Mr. Thalmann.

24 COUNCILOR MICHAEL WHITE: Second.

25 COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor?

1 (Voice vote.)

2 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Thank you.

4 BY ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO:

5 Q. Mr. Ferrari, your firm conducted extensive tests on
6 the site per your memorandum of findings. Could
7 you please just give us an explanation of what you
8 have done on the property and what your reports
9 have found?

10 A. Okay. We were originally involved in 2018. We did
11 an evaluation of the existing well on the site at
12 that time. We also did some water quality
13 analysis. We worked with a well contractor to do a
14 pumping test program, and it was an attempt made to
15 redevelop the well at that time. We came back in
16 2023. We -- because they were having --
17 Mr. Saletin was having a lot of problems with the
18 well, loss of capacity, the well was going dry, it
19 wasn't recovering very well, and we did some
20 additional work, additional water quality analysis,
21 we evaluated the well capacity and the water
22 quality. Also, in 2018, it was apparent that the
23 water quality of the well did not -- it was not
24 potable water. Okay. It wasn't close. It was
25 classified as brackish water, meaning it had

1 seawater intrusion. And this is -- this is a
2 coastal, you know, property. It's not totally
3 surprising. At the time total dissolved solvents
4 was about 2,200. If you are wondering, the EPA
5 water quality limit is 500. Sodium was at 450,
6 chloride was about 1100, all greatly exceeding --
7 well, the chloride water quality requirements
8 hardness was about 900. The water quality was very
9 corrosive. The reverse osmosis system was
10 installed to desalinize the water. The reject
11 stream was discharged on site back into the ground.
12 The well was determined to have an effective yield,
13 best case scenario of about just over 1 gallon a
14 minute, about 1.1 gallon per minute. However, the
15 well had what we call negative recovery. If you
16 pump it for an hour, it took far more than if you
17 drew the well down. It took more than an hour to
18 recover. In fact, one of our tests. We pumped for
19 an hour and it took four hours to recover, so that
20 is -- it's called negative recovery, and that
21 demonstrates that the well doesn't have sufficient
22 effective yield. The well is -- it's a fairly
23 conventional 6-inch diameter drilled bedrock well.
24 The well is 500-foot depth, and it is set at -- the
25 pump is set at about 350 below the ground surface.

1 So, within the context of does the -- does the well
2 meet certain capacity criteria? Relative to the
3 capacity criteria established by the State of
4 Rhode Island you can argue that the answer is yes.
5 With a total depth of 500 feet of well, the pump
6 set at 350, having a little more than 1 gallon a
7 minute is theoretically correct. The problem is
8 the well, when you draw it down, it doesn't have a
9 truly effective recovery, so it slows down the
10 recovery and, therefore, reduces the yield. We
11 came back this past year, in 2023, we questioned
12 Mr. Saletin, and what we found was the water
13 quality had degraded further. Total dissolved
14 solvents was over 3400. Sodium was over a
15 thousand. Chloride was almost 1300. Water, of
16 course, remains corrosive. And, again, since it
17 remains nonpotable, he cannot drink this water, so
18 he has to use the reverse osmosis system. The
19 problem becomes -- and this is probably going to be
20 true for anyone on relatively small lots that if
21 you're treating the water using a reverse osmosis,
22 which is a very effective methodology for treating
23 seawater or brackish water so it is potable, you
24 have the reject stream to get rid of. And
25 typically the reject stream is the majority of the

1 water that actually goes into the RO system. So,
2 if you put a -- to make it simple, if you put a
3 hundred gallons of raw well water in, you'll
4 probably get out 30 to 40 gallons of potable water,
5 and the rest is what we call the reject water where
6 the rejected dissolved solids is concentrated. And
7 that is what is happening. You're seeing this slow
8 concentration build, you know, in the groundwater
9 underlying the site.

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, it's 3 to -- about
11 3 to 1? 3 --

12 ROBERT F. FERRARI: At best, it's probably
13 closer to 4 to 1, realistically, but between 3 to 1
14 and 4 to 1. And that can vary a little bit
15 depending on the water temperature and some other
16 factors.

17 A. In any event, we -- we did this in 2018. We came
18 back and examined it again. We said, "Well, what
19 other alternatives could there be?" And we looked
20 at hydrofracking and quickly concluded that would
21 not be a good idea because if we actually were
22 successful in hydrofracking we were probably going
23 to be bringing in more seawater making the problem
24 worse. Drilling deeper? We are already at
25 500-foot depth. And knowing the geology underlying

1 a lot of Jamestown, it's not prone to finding more
2 fractures in water bearing yield as you get deeper.
3 Some areas, by the way, are, but Jamestown is not
4 one of those. There is a -- on some of the islands
5 in the bay we have some better luck and there are
6 some areas of Jamestown you might, but this isn't
7 one. So, drilling deeper wasn't considered to be a
8 really viable option there. And we were still
9 going to have brackish water content. Looking for
10 a new well? There is nowhere on the site that is
11 viable for a new well. We have, you know, those
12 contaminate threats, everything from the bay, to
13 septic, to the house itself, the Seaview Drive.
14 So, it would be complete nonconforming. And there
15 was no real option for an alternative well
16 location. And even if we felt we could find a new
17 well location that at least met the protective
18 setback criteria, we're still in a situation in all
19 likely we're going to have brackish water. We
20 didn't see and really don't see any means of
21 getting away from that in this area. So, really
22 the situation hasn't changed. Our summary was that
23 the well is inadequate to meet the needs because
24 even if at the, say, 1 gallon a minute going
25 through the reverse osmosis system the more

1 effective yield as far as drinking water being
2 produced is probably at best .4 gallons a minute,
3 and you cannot support a house off of .4 gallons a
4 minute. Now, Mr. Saletin has a storage tank. It's
5 a 500-gallon tank. He has taken whatever steps he
6 can take, but it is still extremely problematic.

7 And I'd like to keep in mind also that two
8 people live in this house. Their day-to-day on
9 average use -- and this is actually validated by
10 work recently performed, I believe, by Pare
11 Engineering on your buildout study and your water
12 supply management plan, you're probably about
13 40 gallons per person per day on average. And I'm
14 not going to suggest that the Saletins are being
15 flagrant in their water use. And the well is --
16 you know, with the RO system is inadequate to meet
17 their needs. So, what -- what do we do? We have
18 no other opportunities on site that we think are
19 viable. There is no other treatment alternative
20 really worth talking about because any treatment we
21 do is going to have a reject stream. And we don't
22 have potable water, and technically the house is
23 not viable as a domicile without potable water.
24 So, the owner has a problem and trying, trying to
25 solve the problem.

1 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Can I --

2 A. That is a summation, probably a tad long winded, I
3 apologize.

4 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Can I just ask you,
5 for the layperson who does -- the reverse osmosis
6 system that you take -- it comes from the well, and
7 you treat it, and then put it in the storage?

8 ROBERT F. FERRARI: That's correct.

9 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: As opposed to pumping
10 out to the storage and then treating it through
11 reverse osmosis?

12 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Correct. Yes.

13 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Okay. And why is
14 that? So, you're -- I read in your -- and thank
15 you, by the way. I want to thank you for -- your
16 report was terrific.

17 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Oh, thank you.

18 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: And all the reports,
19 the information that we gotten from you has been
20 great. Why is it done that way as opposed to --

21 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, it's done that
22 way because we need to have a supply of potable
23 water that is -- that is available to meet, let's
24 say, peaking demands in the house. It's not
25 different than your municipal system. You have to

1 have storage, okay, because your demand is not
2 uniform during the day. It's going to -- you're
3 going to go up and down. So, we need -- the
4 storage assures the owner that if they have some
5 short-term peak in demands it can be met by pumping
6 from the storage tank into the --

7 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No. I understand. I
8 get that.

9 ROBERT F. FERRARI: All right.

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

11 ROBERT F. FERRARI: So, that's why we do
12 it this way. So, the well pumps to the treatment
13 system, and the treatment system discharges to the
14 storage tank.

15 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right. I guess I was
16 just wondering, because it's a relatively small
17 storage tank, 500-gallon -- I mean, it's large in
18 comparison to what the Salitens or any two
19 average --

20 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Right.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: -- Jamestowners use
22 per day. But I just didn't know if they -- if
23 there is a process of gathering pumping less
24 robustly and then gathering the water, the
25 untreated water, and then reverse osmosis to

1 another storage facility.

2 ROBERT F. FERRARI: I mean this sincerely.
3 Excellent question. I wish more people would ask
4 that question. Having said that, here is our
5 dilemma. The reverse osmosis system needs to have
6 a certain capacity on a 24-hour basis.

7 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: That's what I was
8 thinking.

9 ROBERT F. FERRARI: So, what is happening
10 is we have to pump at a certain flow rate --

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

12 ROBERT F. FERRARI: -- into that system
13 because it's sized with -- with -- it's modular.
14 Okay? What's really happening is that system is
15 operating 10, 12, 15 hours a day --

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

17 ROBERT F. FERRARI: -- to make up that
18 water, whatever they use during the day, because
19 it's producing at a pretty -- at a pretty low
20 rate --

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

22 ROBERT F. FERRARI: -- you know, as far as
23 looking at what's -- what's the well producing
24 versus what is the net potable water.

25 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think you said that

1 the reverse osmosis needs is like 6 gallons a
2 minute, or something like that?

3 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yeah, we need to pump
4 into that at about 6 gallons a minute, and -- which
5 is overpumping the well. So, that's why we
6 have --

7 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

8 ROBERT F. FERRARI: -- we have controls on
9 the well.

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

11 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Okay.

12 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yeah. We got that.

13 ROBERT F. FERRARI: So, we don't want to
14 overdraw the well, which unfortunately has -- has
15 been known to happen because the well recharge
16 isn't consistent.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

18 ROBERT F. FERRARI: That becomes the next
19 problem. So, it's -- we work our way from -- you
20 know, we're working our way back through all these
21 problems, and we try to -- you try to resolve them
22 all, but it can be tough because the well doesn't
23 recharge at a uniform rate, and the water -- the
24 raw water characterization can change. Okay? And
25 that becomes problematic. Also, the demands can

1 change. The Saletins are here seasonally.
2 They're -- in this particular case, they happen to
3 be in Florida probably four or five months a year,
4 the winter months, but they are, of course, here
5 during the summertime and the fall. So -- and even
6 with that, it's still a problematic situation for
7 them.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, it's seasonal,
9 because they're saying, I think, that they use
10 73,000 gallons in the -- that's what it says in the
11 in the application, and then 200 gallons per day.
12 I thought they were using less, but there --

13 ROBERT F. FERRARI: I -- I --

14 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I used the 40 --
15 the gallons --

16 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Right.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: For five people?

18 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: -- as an average
19 amount without it giving -- basically, the
20 estimates that have been going out to keep
21 everything consistent with the totality of usage
22 and all, we used the 40-gallon per person --

23 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Okay.

24 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: -- per bedroom per
25 day, so that's how you -- you could see what is the

1 total build-out actually is.

2 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, it's a three-
3 bedroom home. So, that would be 6 people --

4 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: -- 40 gallons per
5 day.

6 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: -- 40 gallons per
7 person would be 240 gallons.

8 ROBERT F. FERRARI: That is correct.

9 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Is the math --

10 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I'm a lawyer.

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Got it. Okay.

12 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes. You know, what I
13 would suggest to you is the current usage with two
14 people living there is not bad.

15 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: It's not bad, yeah.

16 ROBERT F. FERRARI: But, obviously, at
17 maximum occupancy --

18 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

19 ROBERT F. FERRARI: -- it would be a lot
20 higher.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think, the Andreonis
22 who I think they determined to 82. So, I apologize
23 for that. Yeah. Okay.

24 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: So, may I ask a
25 question?

1 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Go ahead.

2 ROBERT F. FERRARI: By all means.

3 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: All right. When
4 did you say that you first met professionally the
5 Saletins for this purpose?

6 ROBERT F. FERRARI: 2018.

7 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: '18?

8 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. And were
10 there two people living there then?

11 ROBERT F. FERRARI: I didn't personally
12 meet them at the time, but I believe that was the
13 case, but I can't state that with absolute
14 certainty.

15 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And how -- over
16 the period that you have been involved with them,
17 how many times have you interacted with them?

18 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, my company has
19 interacted with them numerous times, because we
20 provide periodic service work for the reverse
21 osmosis, so we have -- we have field technicians
22 that come out and do work for them. So, it's, you
23 know -- it's multiple times a year, I'll put it
24 that way.

25 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. And are

1 you personally aware or have you heard reported
2 from any colleague whether or not there has ever
3 been more than two people living there?

4 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Honestly, the
5 occupancy hasn't been something that we've
6 discussed in our periodic review meetings, no.

7 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay.

8 ROBERT F. FERRARI: So, I can't speak to
9 what -- you know, I would like to think
10 Mr. Saletin can testify to that. I can't.

11 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. I'll ask
12 Mr. Saletin.

13 So, I understand your testimony, with respect
14 to the qualifications against the State of
15 Rhode Island rules and regulations regarding
16 relative -- relating to the drilling of drinking
17 water wells, that's something that DEM puts out,
18 right?

19 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, they used to,
20 but they probably about, I don't know, eight or ten
21 years ago they transferred that responsibility to
22 the Department of Health.

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay.

24 ROBERT F. FERRARI: But, again, it's the
25 State of Rhode Island. So, either way it's the

1 State of Rhode Island.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: So, I hope I'm
3 quoting the right standard. But is it fair to say
4 that the standard required by the State reflects
5 that a well with a minimum depth of 450 -- you said
6 this one is 500?

7 ROBERT F. FERRARI: This well's depth is
8 500 feet.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. That --
10 and is the -- is it 6 inches in diameter?

11 ROBERT F. FERRARI: It's a nominal 6-inch
12 diameter drilled bedrock well.

13 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. And am I
14 correct to say that the standard is for use for an
15 individual household bedrock well of 6 inches in
16 diameter shall be satisfactory when it meets the
17 following minimum criteria with the yield to half a
18 gallon per minute, a minimum depth of 450, and a
19 yield of 1 gallon per minute is required for a
20 minimum depth of 300? Are those standards correct?

21 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Those standards are
22 correct. However, there is a caveat here. And the
23 caveat is that that's assuming that that, say,
24 half-gallon a minute or 1 gallon a minute is
25 potable water, and that's not what we have coming

1 out of this well.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. Is there
3 a place in the regulations of the State, whether
4 it's from DEM or DOH, that would provide that
5 qualification?

6 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, what's in the
7 DEM -- I'm sorry, the Department of Health water
8 quality regulations is what -- what the water
9 quality requirements are, and this well does not
10 meet them. And they require the wells, whether
11 it's public or private, to meet those quality
12 standards. So --

13 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I believe Mike
14 provided you guys within his memorandum a list of
15 the quality standards for the State of
16 Rhode Island.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Which one?

18 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: In Mike's original
19 memorandum, and he revised it for this particular
20 hearing.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Oh. Mike Gray?

22 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Mike Gray, yes. It
23 provided you guys with both the State standards on
24 yield as well as the State standards on quality.

25 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Right. And

1 that -- that distinguishes between what they refer
2 to as secondary and primary contaminates or
3 problems, correct?

4 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes. Primary and
5 secondary standards, that's correct.

6 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I guess I'm
7 looking for where in the regulations -- and I
8 understand the logic of the length you're making
9 between quantity and quality. But where in the
10 regulations does it provide that the -- the yield
11 for the depth has to be of a particular quality?

12 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: The -- the State
13 law states that if we don't meet the quality
14 standards of the State along with a quantity
15 standard of the State. And the quality standards
16 are what Mike -- was what Mike presented to you,
17 along with what you're reading for the volume and
18 the yield quality questions. So, Mr. Ferrari's
19 here testimony testifying that the quality does not
20 meet the State standards. The quality of the water
21 does not meet the State standards. He did not
22 testify that the well did not meet the flow yield
23 standards; however, he did put on the record that
24 given the flow capacity, potable water, and
25 currently the yield at 1.1 gallons per minute,

1 which was tested, was not potable water.

2 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I guess I understand
3 that -- the dilemma is, and why should we be
4 surprised at this, that the State of Rhode Island
5 regulations are a little less than clear in the --
6 in the Appendix C which talks about the depth, it
7 doesn't talk -- it doesn't make reference to
8 potable water at all. And that's all.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: That's the basis
10 of my question.

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: That's what I
12 understand.

13 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I understand
14 that your understanding of the potable --

15 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That's the
16 professional expert has given testimony to those
17 facts. So, unless there is another expert that had
18 something to say differently. I mean, I can't tell
19 you that it is anything different other than that.
20 He can.

21 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I guess I'm just
22 hoping to understand and apply correctly the
23 standard as set forth in the statute. And the
24 statute doesn't refer to quality.

25 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Yeah, it does.

1 ROBERT F. FERRARI: May I offer some
2 additional testimony?

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Please.

4 ROBERT F. FERRARI: We're talking two
5 standards. They're -- they're separate but
6 related. One standard is what's the expectation
7 for the effective well yield based upon the certain
8 drill depth of the well. Okay? That's -- I
9 believe this is the Appendix B of the Department of
10 Health regulations; for example, 1 gallon a minute
11 at a depth of 300 feet, or a half-a-gallon a minute
12 at a depth of 450 feet. That's one set of
13 criteria. And --

14 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: It's Appendix C?

15 ROBERT F. FERRARI: By the way --

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No worries.

17 ROBERT F. FERRARI: There is a lot of
18 them. The other set of criteria is the water
19 quality requirements, okay, that are actually set
20 by U.S. EPA, and they have all been adopted in
21 total by the State of Rhode Island, and actually
22 Rhode Island has gotten a little more stringent on
23 a few things. So, we have two parallel sets of
24 regulatory requirements. Okay? The issue -- from
25 my perspective, the issue here is that, yes, we

1 have a well that theoretically can produce 1 or
2 1.1 gallon a minute with -- it's a 500-foot deep
3 well, so you could theoretically have water coming
4 in from water bearing fractures anywhere in that
5 water column at that drilled depth. The pump is
6 set at 350 feet, so you have 1.1 gallon a minute,
7 which can meet this requirement, but the water
8 doesn't meet the water quality requirement. So, at
9 that point you need treatment which, you know,
10 again, the treatment requirements are in the
11 regulations. And the treatment process, you are --
12 more than half of the water coming out of that well
13 ultimately is reject water; it's not drinkable
14 water. It's -- we're -- that RO system is working
15 probably, at best, 40 percent recovery efficiency
16 to produce potable water. So, ultimately, these --
17 these regulations here, as far as yield of the
18 well, it's predicated upon, you know, the accepting
19 that the water is drinkable, it's potable water.
20 And in this particular situation it's not. Okay.
21 But you are right, Mr. White, in the context of
22 you're not going to go through the regulations and
23 find those two sets of requirements side by side or
24 from one page to the next. It's not going to
25 happen.

1 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Well, integrated.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: For another time
3 I guess later in the analysis, I am -- my problem
4 is not -- I understand of the number of times you
5 have said it.

6 CLERK FAGAN: Councilor White, could you,
7 please, speak into the microphone.

8 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: What you're
9 saying with respect to all of them, quality and
10 quantity, I'm just looking for, and I don't see it
11 in 46-15-2. And they refer only to yield. And I
12 was asking you, and you've answered that the yield
13 is above the minimum requirement, correct?

14 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes. The gross yield
15 of the well is above the minimum requirement.

16 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. The other
17 question I have is -- perhaps you can explain
18 again -- the concept and the analysis of the
19 so-called reject water.

20 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Uh-huh.

21 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And I'm not sure
22 you have addressed it yet, but somewhere in the
23 application it talked about a supposition that the
24 degradation of the surface water that might be
25 feeding the well is attributable to the repeated

1 reject water being deposited in the ground,
2 correct?

3 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Not entirely. The
4 water was brackish. It was pretty strongly
5 brackish to begin with, okay, when we first
6 evaluated the well before there was any treatment.
7 Moving forward, you know, five to six years, the
8 water quality has degraded. My expectation is it's
9 degraded for two reasons. One is that I think we
10 have additional -- we have more -- greater seawater
11 fee component coming into the well, and I think
12 it's also degraded because of the reject stream.
13 It's being discharged back on -- you know, on the
14 property, because there is a little -- you can't
15 discharge it off the property, and that is a
16 contributing factor also. I think there is
17 multiple factors contributing to the ongoing
18 degradation of the water quality.

19 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. I
20 didn't -- I didn't credit both explanations. But
21 the one that relates to the reject stream going
22 onto the property, can the reject stream be
23 captured and carted away and not be returned to the
24 property?

25 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, yes, you could

1 put it into a tank and you could have it, you know,
2 pumped out and taken out periodically. Again, in
3 the current operation, the current water demands,
4 you know, it might be a tank truck going out once a
5 month, but at higher occupancy of the house it
6 might be -- depending on how big a tank you have,
7 it could be every week. You know, it depends on
8 how big a tank do you have and how much wastewater
9 are you generating.

10 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: If you, in your
11 expertise, had suggested the possibility that one
12 of those two alternatives, one being the reject
13 stream going onto the land was at least partly
14 responsible for the problem, have you recommended
15 or attempted or done anything with respect to
16 relative to try to collect the reject stream and
17 cart it away?

18 ROBERT F. FERRARI: We looked at all the
19 alternatives here. And the fact of the matter is
20 that putting in a tank is going to require, in all
21 likelihood, a -- something to house the tank and
22 you're going to need a building structure, because
23 you have freeze protection unless you buy a tank
24 with freeze protection, or I suppose burying a tank
25 in the ground. I'm not sure that would be the best

1 idea to do in this area, bury a tank in the ground.
2 It would be extensive. It be would extremely
3 difficult to maintain over a long period of time.

4 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: How do you know
5 it would be expensive?

6 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Because we've priced
7 out systems, and they can be very expensive. I
8 mean, I don't know what the building cost would be,
9 but, you know, it's going to be a very substantial
10 expense to do it.

11 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: So, what expense
12 are you referring to? The purchase of the tank?

13 ROBERT F. FERRARI: The purchase of the
14 tank would probably be the least of the cost.

15 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. So, what
16 other costs would be involved besides the purchase
17 of the tank?

18 ROBERT F. FERRARI: You're going to need
19 some kind of a building to put it in.

20 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay.

21 ROBERT F. FERRARI: The building is going
22 to have to be heated, for example, and you're
23 probably going to need a light. You have to
24 conform to your building code here. And you're
25 going to need a -- you know, a cast-in-place for

1 reinforced concrete floor to support that tank.
2 And you're going to probably need some secondary
3 containment, because you don't want to have any
4 kind of a release from the tank. So, the costs are
5 adding up. You're going to need piping. You're
6 going to need, you know, power out there. And
7 then, of course, you have -- at the minimum you
8 have that. You have to have access to it. I am
9 sure there is room in the front of the -- front of
10 the house to do this, so you're going to be doing
11 this in the back of the house, and now you have to
12 have a vehicle access to the rear part of the house
13 or a long suction hose, and then you're going to be
14 bringing in a tank truck periodically. And
15 whatever -- that frequency is going to be the
16 function of how much water do you use, and -- and
17 how hard do you work the reverse osmosis system
18 and, therefore, how much wastewater do you
19 generate, reject water, if you will, from your RO
20 system, and at what frequency is it going to be?
21 Is it going to be -- are you going -- is it going
22 to be a once-a-month trucking? Is it going to be,
23 you know, once a week, once a month? I don't know
24 what that will be. We have to examine that. But
25 that is a significant cost. I haven't taken the

1 trouble to examine the building codes in Jamestown
2 to see what you can and can't do. But, you know,
3 you basically have three options here, for getting
4 rid of reject water from the reverse osmosis system
5 option. Option One is you put it into a dry well,
6 okay. Option -- or back into the ground. Option
7 Two is put it in the tank, truck it off. Option
8 Three is you get permitted for an outfall, a
9 discharge outfall into the bay. Okay. And that is
10 going to involve CRMC and DEM, and the likelihood
11 of that happening is probably very close to zero,
12 if not zero. I'm not going to say it's absolutely
13 zero, but it's highly unlikely. So, you have got
14 limited number -- again, a very limited number of
15 options here what you can do and what is practical
16 and reasonable. So -- the fourth option, as we
17 have discussed with Mr. Saletin, and other folks in
18 this area of the world, is making a connection to
19 the existing public water system, you know, you
20 have to extend a transmission main to serve the
21 houses. That's the other option, so -- which
22 eliminates the need for the well and the reverse
23 osmosis system and makes some of the problems go
24 away that they're experiencing right now.

25 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I recognize this

1 hypothetical is hard to apply, because this -- you
2 don't have a hypothetical situation. You have a
3 real one. But imagining for a minute this house
4 were located not where it is in a town where an
5 application can -- can be made and the possibility
6 at least exists that water can be provided.

7 Imagine you're in upstate Maine or a Nova Scotia
8 coast, and there is no municipality in which to
9 turn. You're not suggesting that this house is
10 uninhabitable and you, the Saletins, should walk
11 away, correct?

12 ROBERT F. FERRARI: I'm recommending that
13 the owners should explore the options and try to
14 work what's the most, you know, cost and
15 functionally effective way to go. That's what I'm
16 suggesting.

17 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I understand
18 that. I'm just trying to get to the meat of what
19 would happen were that not an option. What would
20 you be telling him? Would you be telling
21 Mr. Saletin, "I'm sorry to break you this news, but
22 I'm prepared now to do what we hoped to avoid which
23 is to do the actual nuts and bolts and dollars and
24 cents analysis of what it will cost to get that
25 tank, to find the heated space, to do the piping"

1 and whatever it was you said before. Would that be
2 among the things you recommend if hookup wasn't an
3 option?

4 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, first of all, I
5 already had that conversation with Mr. Saletin.
6 And it was had a while ago. And the reality was
7 that the conclusion was that the -- in all
8 likelihood, the best option, from the standpoint of
9 protection of public health and minimization of
10 other risks was to connect to the municipal system
11 if a connection was possible to be made.

12 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I understand
13 we're talking by each other. Maybe you don't
14 understand the hypothetical.

15 ROBERT F. FERRARI: No. I understand the
16 hypothetical.

17 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I guess what I'm
18 asking is the situation, if hookup -- if the
19 hooking up to the Town water is not a possibility,
20 is theoretically and scientifically remediable,
21 correct? It can be done. It can be done. It's
22 just costly and difficult, and you think this is a
23 better option?

24 (Pause.)

25 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Right?

1 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes. I think this is
2 a better option. Absolutely.

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Let me rephrase
4 that for a second here because --

5 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Who are you
6 rephrasing, me or him?

7 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I want to rephrase
8 the question to Mr. Ferrari, because I want to make
9 sure that he didn't get caught up in a little bit
10 of spin right there. Because, really, what was
11 coming down here is, you know, based on the
12 existing regulations today and the constraints that
13 are on this lot, in your opinion, what's the best
14 option, and is there a best option, and I think
15 that you stated that already.

16 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Uh-huh.

17 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: It was to, you
18 know, have Mr. Saletin hookup.

19 BRIAN THALMANN: Yes. That's -- that's
20 the best option, from my perspective. Yes,
21 absolutely. It would be the recommendation every
22 day.

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: You also
24 answered my question there are other options,
25 correct?

1 ROBERT F. FERRARI: There -- there -- yes,
2 there are. You know --

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Are there other
4 options to meet the yield with potable water?

5 ROBERT F. FERRARI: At this point in time,
6 no, not -- not the yield requirements of potable
7 water, no, there aren't. We don't have the well
8 that can produce the volume of water we need,
9 that -- to make the amount of potable water to
10 support the functioning of the residence. And
11 that's the bottom line; we don't have that right
12 now. Okay?

13 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: How does an
14 expert like you determine, other than by some
15 additional or maybe experience from other
16 situations, the proposition that hydrofracting --
17 hydrofracking would more than likely increase
18 saltwater intrusion?

19 ROBERT F. FERRARI: They have already
20 hydrofracked this well. Following the
21 hydrofracking, there was a modest increase in the
22 water, and the water was very, very brackish. And
23 I have been involved in thousands of wells in my
24 career. And when you're in a coastal area, one of
25 the most important considerations you make is when

1 you hydrofrack a bedrock well in a near coastal
2 area, which is what we have now, there is a very
3 strong probability that you will bring in brackish
4 water. And I can tell you, this as a matter of
5 fact. You may or may not be familiar with the
6 Sakonnet Point Club. I purposely hydrofracked
7 wells for them so they would draw in brackish water
8 and -- for their desalinization system; however,
9 that was a vastly different situation, and they did
10 have to go and get permitted from the Department of
11 Health for an outfall -- not -- the DEM for
12 outfall. It was a year's long proposition and
13 extremely expensive. And now, in fact, they --
14 because they did not have enough water to run that
15 club. And right now we're looking at possibly
16 eliminating the wells and going to a seawater
17 intake, again a very involved year's long
18 proposition. The situation for this house, you
19 frack that well -- we already had brackish water
20 before it was fracked, and neighboring wells had
21 brackish water in them. You have got a lot of
22 wells in that area that have brackish water, and
23 they haven't been fracked. And then when you frack
24 them it gets worse. So, this is not supposition on
25 my part. It's science. Okay?

1 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: But help me out,
2 because I'm not a scientist. The fracking
3 dramatics, I assume, is likely, as you have said
4 before, or -- to increase prospect of brackish
5 water. But you said elsewhere in our discussion
6 that having more water would help the RO system to
7 function. So, is there -- is there any value to be
8 said that Hey, while ordinarily hydrofracking and
9 running the risk of and potentially yielding more
10 brackish water is a bad thing, in this situation
11 might it be different? Might be it be actually
12 helpful because now we got enough water that we can
13 treat?

14 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Probably not
15 because --

16 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Why not?

17 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Let me explain.
18 Because let's assume we did -- that we had the well
19 fracked again. This well has gone under
20 development a couple of times. Let's assume that.
21 And we managed to increase the inflow of seawater.
22 And now you're increasing the dissolved solids in
23 the water. You're going use your reverse osmosis
24 system. The problem is your as dissolved solids
25 content go up your recovery ratio is going down, so

1 you're going to be pumping more and more water just
2 to keep up with the same level of finished potable
3 water coming out, which means you're going to be
4 producing even more wastewater. This gets you
5 into -- for lack of a better term, you get into a
6 very vicious cycle here. Okay? And you're going
7 to be cycling up your contaminate level in the
8 ground. Another aspect is if you -- if
9 you -- when you frack wells, you have got to be
10 very careful about other contaminate threats in the
11 area, such as on-site wastewater disposal systems.
12 We don't want to start introducing or risking the
13 introduction of, say, bacteria because we are
14 pulling in leaching. So, there is a lot of things
15 that can happen, and while theoretically it might
16 be possible to increase the inflow, it doesn't
17 necessarily make -- improve the situation, because
18 we're probably going to be actually producing more
19 reject wastewater than -- we certainly wouldn't be
20 producing less, we'd be producing more. So,
21 again --

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Earlier in this
23 discussion, that is something that could
24 theoretically at least be trucked away, right?

25 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, if you had a big

1 enough tank and had enough trips from the tank
2 truck, yes, it could be possible, but it's going to
3 be, again --

4 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Didn't you say it
5 could be tanked away. The recovery rate isn't
6 enough to --

7 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, you're going to
8 be producing more and more wastewater to meet the
9 same water requirement as you increase the brackish
10 content in your water. And so you're just ramping
11 up, producing more wastewater, you're going to need
12 more storage capacity, and you're going to be
13 disposing of more water. And, obviously, that --
14 you know, that is going to be problematic.
15 You're -- you know, most of homeowners would be not
16 be involved doing that, and I can understand why,
17 and I can understand that being in this business
18 for the length of time I have been.

19 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Thank you.

20 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think we have three
21 others to hear from. And so I don't know if you
22 have more people, but I would like to have
23 everybody have the opportunity. I also -- there is
24 a whole audience full of town folks here, too.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Christian, I would

1 to like make one statement.

2 **JEFFREY SALETIN**

3 called as a witness and having been first duly
4 sworn, testifies as follows:

5 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

6 JEFFREY SALETIN: Jeffrey Saletin,
7 S-a-l-e-t-i-n.

8 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

9 JEFFREY SALETIN: This has been very
10 painful for us. And I just wanted to respectfully
11 request that you allow us to extend the line.
12 We're willing to pay for the cost of the extension
13 ourselves. It's very, very important to us as a
14 family. There -- it's just my wife and I. We are
15 getting older. It's incredibly difficult to come
16 home and have no water, and it's very, very
17 difficult to hear -- you have heard a couple pieces
18 of the testimony that we've gone dry, but it's been
19 a struggle to get clean and quality and healthy
20 water. And I respectfully request that you give us
21 the opportunity to get Town water.

22 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Mr. Saletin, can I
23 just clarify one thing? It's mostly just you and
24 your wife. So, that would be about 80 gallons.

25 JEFFREY SALETIN: Yes.

1 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: But in your
2 application you recommend you -- I guess it was
3 Christian who wrote in --

4 JEFFREY SALETIN: It was annualized. It
5 was annualized.

6 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: It was annualized, and
7 it was also for the maximum --

8 JEFFREY SALETIN: Of the house.

9 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: -- of the house.

10 JEFFREY SALETIN: Of the whole house.

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, at which
12 Mr. Infantolino's math is about as good as my legal
13 skills. It was 240 gallons is what you wrote, but
14 really it's 80.

15 JEFFREY SALETIN: It's really 80.

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: All right.

17 JEFFREY SALETIN: And my wife is a retired
18 school teacher for 35 years. I still work at 79
19 years of age. But we are taking some time off now
20 in the winter.

21 Thank you very much.

22 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

23 JEFFREY SALETIN: Appreciate it.

24 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That's all I have
25 for this application. Thank you very much.

1 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

2 All right. Okay. Our next application is
3 Glenn and Marjorie Andreoni. And I believe counsel
4 is here.

5 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Good evening. Joelle
6 Rocha for the applicants.

7 This is my whole speech (Indicating), so bear
8 with me. No.

9 (Laughter.)

10 ATTORNEY ROCHA: I want to start off by
11 bringing a little bit back to center and also
12 trying to expedite this given we have the same
13 experts, but when I say "bring it back to center"
14 is even for the public as this board/council knows
15 that there is a State standard governing this
16 application. And there are several standards for
17 an applicant to meet. This isn't "I don't really
18 want my well anymore. Hey, give me water." The
19 State statute is significantly high, which is why
20 you should only see applications that meet these
21 standards.

22 And I want to walk through them, because our
23 application really hones in on just one or two of
24 those standards. The first standard is the
25 application must not be prohibited by the specific

1 language of the water supply management plan.
2 There is no language outright prohibiting this
3 application in your plan.

4 Second is the application must comply with the
5 design and construction standards and
6 specifications established by the public water
7 supply system for the sizing and location for the
8 infrastructure. This is -- gets dealt with when
9 the design happens and the engineer fully designs
10 the line. We are fully aware of DiPrete
11 Engineering, who Mr. Thalmann worked for, just
12 designed the extension on East Shore Road, and that
13 we certified in our application that if we were
14 granted the extension it would comply with the
15 design regulations.

16 The third is the extension shall not reduce
17 the necessary level of fire protection for the
18 community. In our application, that form is filled
19 out by your local fire marshall, and he asserted
20 that we have met that standard.

21 The fourth standard is that all water main and
22 service connection materials, construction and
23 inspection required shall be at the sole cost and
24 expense of the applicant. I have one of the
25 applicants, Mr. Glenn Andreoni, here today. We

1 also certified to this in our application that it
2 would be at his sole cost and expense.

3 The fifth is that the public water supply
4 system shall be granted an easement in the form
5 acceptable for the maintenance, repair, replacement
6 that's routinely done. That is not an issue as
7 well.

8 And the sixth one is where we get into the
9 standards that we really are here to talk about.
10 The sixth is that for applications for
11 single-family residential lots the applicant must
12 show that, one, the existing or proposed well for
13 the property does not meet the well industry
14 standard as described in the department of
15 environmental regulations for the, quote, yield per
16 depth of well channel, which is required by the
17 Department of Health for a dwelling unit. That's a
18 mouthful. That's what you were just conversing
19 about. And we'll talk about ours in a minute.

20 And the second part of that is that due to the
21 unique characteristics of the property that a
22 drilling -- the drilling of a new well is not
23 feasible. And we will focus now with our experts
24 on those two standards.

25 And I bring it back to center for a minute

1 because the standard is not there on no other
2 options. While we're going -- our experts are
3 going to testify we actually don't have any other
4 options. The standard is not that there is no
5 feasible options. Those are the two standards to
6 look at.

7 So, enough from me, I'll close it out, because
8 I talk a lot. But I'm going to turn it over. We
9 have -- you have accepted and certified these
10 witnesses. I don't know if you want me to do it
11 again, or if we can just recognize on the record
12 they're not testifying to anything outside of their
13 expertise, but if I could bring Mr. Thalmann up.

14 And are we good in --

15 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

16 COUNCILOR BEYE: Yes.

17 ATTORNEY ROCHA: -- transferring the vote
18 to accept Mr. Thalmann?

19 COUNCILOR BEYE: Yes.

20 THE STENOGRAPHER: Do you want him
21 resworn?

22 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I'm sorry?

23 THE STENOGRAPHER: Do you want him resworn
24 for this applicant?

25 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Peter, does he need to

1 be resworn for this application?

2 ATTORNEY ROCHA: You're still sworn in.

3 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: You can just say that
4 he was previously sworn in and just enter it into
5 the record.

6 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: He was previously
7 sworn in and recognized as an expert.

8 BRIAN THALMANN: Thank you very much.

9 **BRIAN THALMANN**

10 called as a witness and having been previously
11 sworn, testifies as follows:

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 BY ATTORNEY ROCHA:

14 Q. Mr. Thalmann, can you talk about there is a plan in
15 the record. Can you just describe this property a
16 little bit and its surroundings?

17 A. Sure. Mr. Andreoni and his family own what is
18 described as 10 Seaview, APC 7, Lot 134 in the Town
19 of Jamestown Assessor's records. The parcel is
20 just under an acre of property, about 0.9 acres,
21 and it has a single-family dwelling, it has a
22 driveway that enters off of both East Shore Road
23 and Seaview Avenue and is serviced by an on-site
24 wastewater treatment system as well as a private
25 well, again in the northwest corner of the

1 property.

2 Q. All right. And can you talk about the unique
3 characteristics of this site with respect to
4 potentially drilling another well?

5 A. Similar to Mr. Saletin's application, there is a
6 confluence of on-site wastewater treatment systems
7 in and around the subject parcel as well as a
8 collection of private wells. When you factor in
9 the flood zones and the overlapping radiuses of
10 those various appurtenances, you are left with
11 essentially no area of which to resite a well to
12 replace the one that exists now.

13 Q. Based on those standards and setbacks -- which are
14 set by the State, correct?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. -- is it your expert opinion that due to the unique
17 characteristics of 10 Seaview Ave. that the
18 drilling of the well location-wise is not feasible?

19 A. Correct.

20 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Questions?

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Not specifically. Not
22 that.

23 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Okay. Mr. Ferrari, round
24 two.

25 **ROBERT F. FERRARI**

1 called as a witness and having been previously
2 sworn, testifies as follows:

3 ATTORNEY ROCHA: We can confirm on the
4 record the vote?

5 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Mr. Ferrari is
6 accepted as an expert and does not need to be sworn
7 in.

8 COUNCILOR BEYE: Right he was previously
9 sworn in.

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Again.

11 COUNCILOR BEYE: Again.

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 BY ATTORNEY ROCHA:

14 Q. Mr. Ferrari, can you talk about how and why you
15 were retained for 10 Seaview Avenue?

16 A. Well, we were retained because they were having
17 problems with well yield and water quality, similar
18 to their neighbors. What we did is we conducted an
19 inspection, via a camera inspection of the well.
20 And it's a 6-inch diameter drilled bedrock well.
21 This one is 195 feet in depth. It has got a yield
22 of about .6 gallons a minute and has got seriously
23 negative recovery. We did do a pumping -- we did a
24 pumping test program. And, in fact, we did it,
25 that pumping test program, after the house had been

1 unoccupied or at least not occupied, I should say,
2 for a period of time and we'd had a lot of rain,
3 which if you're going to maximize recharge that it
4 will be following an extended period of
5 precipitation. So, poor performance of the well.
6 Water quality, again -- I'll keep it briefer this
7 time -- but again it's again very brackish water,
8 and the -- very high dissolved solids, over 2,000,
9 very high chlorides, very high sodium, et cetera,
10 very massively high hardness, very corrosive. But
11 the well had one water-bearing fracture, about
12 65 feet below ground surface. Okay? And we went
13 through a similar examination of alternatives for
14 Mr. Andreoni, and the hydrofracking, drilling
15 deeper, looking for an opportunity for a new well
16 on the site, and we also looked at possibly
17 treatment using reverse osmosis. Our conclusion --
18 and it was, in part, based upon our experiences in
19 the neighboring property -- is that hydrofracking
20 was in all likelihood going to be problematic,
21 probably increase in the brackish water content.
22 Drilling deeper had no necessarily any significant
23 probability of success. So, we have got a
24 neighboring well that made it to 1 gallon of
25 500 feet. There is no location for a new well and

1 no approvable location for a new well on the
2 property. And going with treatment, there is --
3 realistically speaking, there is no location for
4 discharge of the reject water from a reverse
5 osmosis system that isn't going to create other
6 problems on the site, either problems with the
7 septic system or problems with the ground water
8 quality impacting the well.

9 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Can I just ask you?
10 Did you say no approvable location for a well or
11 approved?

12 ROBERT F. FERRARI: No approvable. No
13 approvable.

14 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Approvable.

15 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Approvable. Every
16 location on the site is nonconforming. Okay?

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: You got it.

18 A. Again, it's just the nature of the particular site.
19 So, we are finding ourselves again -- we have got a
20 well with inadequate capacity, we have got
21 extremely poor nonpotable water quality, no viable
22 treatment or location alternatives. And without
23 water, without potable water, it's fairly difficult
24 to live in a house. So, that's where we are.

25 Q. Mr. Ferrari, is it your opinion that due to the

1 unique characteristics of this property that the
2 drilling of a new well is not feasible?

3 A. It's not realistically feasible.

4 Q. And then in this case, if you look at the well, the
5 depth chart, this property actually does not meet
6 those standards, correct?

7 A. It does not meet the standard at this point in
8 time, no, it does not.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Does it not meet
10 the standard both -- you suggested that there -- as
11 you see it there are two standards. Reasonable
12 minds might differ. But that there is the yield of
13 well per depth. It doesn't meet that standard for
14 sure, correct?

15 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Correct.

16 ROBERT F. FERRARI: It does not meet the
17 yield standard. It does not meet the water quality
18 standard.

19 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: It does not meet
20 the water quality standard?

21 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Absolutely not. Not
22 even close.

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Not to beat a
24 dead horse, but with respect to the discussion we
25 had earlier about fracking -- I'm very new to this,

1 as can you probably tell, but as people discuss the
2 prospect of hyrdofracking and the potential for
3 saltwater intrusion, if you're -- if there is
4 available in the ground both salt water and
5 brackish water and nonbrackish water, the kind
6 you're looking for, is it correct to say that the
7 nonbrackish water sits above the salt water?

8 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Fresh water is -- has
9 a lower density than seawater, so it will be
10 sitting on top.

11 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. And in
12 this case, you have a 194-foot well; is that
13 correct? Is that roughly right?

14 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Yes.

15 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Roughly, yes.

16 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And did you say
17 that a fracture that you saw that might even
18 potentially lend itself to hyrdofracking was at the
19 63-foot mark; am I right?

20 ROBERT F. FERRARI: 65, 65 feet for ground
21 surface.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: 65. Which,
23 relative to the entire depth of the well, is
24 relatively high up in the column, correct?

25 ROBERT F. FERRARI: That's correct.

1 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Would it then
2 not be logical, based on your discussion of the
3 lens of clear water sitting above the saltwater
4 that you might get lucky and find clear water if
5 you hydrofrack at 63 feet as opposed to
6 hydrofracking deeper?

7 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, that, that
8 fracture, which is the only water-bearing fracture
9 in the well, is bringing in brackish water already.
10 So, whatever might be sitting on top of it, fresh
11 water or not, we're bringing in brackish water
12 already.

13 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And is there is
14 no fracture higher than the 63 feet?

15 ROBERT F. FERRARI: No, there is no
16 fracture higher.

17 BY ATTORNEY ROCHA:

18 Q. And based on that, the well as is, even if you
19 found anything, isn't it correct it's yielding
20 .6 gallons per minute?

21 A. Well, the well, yes, the effective yield was
22 measured at .6 gallons per minute with negative
23 recovery.

24 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Can you educate
25 me about hydrofracking? Is there more than one way

1 to hydrofrack?

2 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well --

3 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Dynamite. No.

4 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Well, years ago they
5 used to drop a stick of dynamite down a well and
6 light it off. I'm not kidding. That's -- I mean,
7 I have found -- I have found a blasting wire and
8 caps down in wells.

9 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: The Bill Murray
10 method?

11 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes.

12 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: The Bill Murray of
13 hydrofracking.

14 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Yes, exactly.

15 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: So, obviously,
16 that seems ill-advised. But what is the --

17 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Mr. White, we agree on
18 that. Totally.

19 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I'm sure. I
20 think we agree on more than you think.

21 ROBERT F. FERRARI: No. I'm sure we do.

22 No. There is two principal methods of
23 hydrofracking wells. They're closely related. And
24 making it simply, typically a single-packer or
25 double-packer. A single-packer hydrofrack, you

1 basically put an inflatable plug at the top of the
2 well and you pressurize the well. Typically they
3 bring it to about 3,000 pounds of pressure, and
4 they wait to get what they call a breakover, like a
5 release, and then they start pumping the well like
6 crazy and start flushing the material out. It's
7 trying to open the fractures. Double-packer
8 method, which I actually use quite a bit, it's
9 definitely more expensive, but you have a -- you
10 have what they call a tool, it's like a piece of
11 pipe, you got a bladder on the bottom. You go
12 about 50- or 60-foot spread you have a second
13 bladder. You put that down the well, and you're
14 hydrofracking in sections as you come up the well.
15 You start at the bottom and work your way up. That
16 is usually a more effective means of doing it. The
17 key here, though, is you have to have fractures to
18 work with. Okay? And our camera inspection of
19 this well and -- it demonstrated that there was one
20 very small water-bearing fracture, and all we had
21 the rest of the way down the well -- and you have
22 the copy of the inspection report there so you can
23 see it. We took screen shots of those fractures.
24 They're very thin, seam-tight fractures that
25 weren't getting any water. So, there is not much

1 opportunity to do a hydrofracking with any
2 expectation of a significant improvement yield. I
3 mean, it's always possible to get a slight
4 improvement, but a significant improvement would be
5 highly unlikely based upon the bedrock material and
6 what we observed in the well.

7 BY ATTORNEY ROCHA:

8 Q. And for a reverse osmosis system, you said you need
9 probably 6 gallons a minute?

10 A. We would certainly need to operate the RO system
11 favorably with at least 6 gallons a minute. So, we
12 would be operating in very short cycles because we
13 would be drawing this well down very quickly. We
14 just shut the pump down and wait for it to recover,
15 which is a negative recovery. So, it's a long way.

16 COUNCILOR BEYE: I just have a -- I'm
17 sorry. If this is somewhere I didn't see it. Is
18 this a seasonal residence as well?

19 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Well, I'm going to bring
20 him up.

21 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay.

22 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Hold that thought.

23 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think -- I just have
24 a -- the notion of yield seems to be something that
25 is a little strange because if, in fact, recovery

1 is maybe the more applicable understanding. I
2 mean, I'm just -- how you can say something has a
3 yield when it has a difficult recovery seems to me
4 would be --

5 ROBERT F. FERRARI: You talk to a lot
6 people about wells and you get very confused real
7 quick.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Oh, that is good to
9 know.

10 ROBERT F. FERRARI: So, starting from
11 there.

12 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

13 ROBERT F. FERRARI: If you put a pump in
14 the well, I'd say pumping at 5 gallons a minute, it
15 doesn't mean the well has a true effective yield of
16 5 gallons a minute.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: That's what I mean.

18 ROBERT F. FERRARI: That's what you're
19 pumping actually until you draw the well down to
20 the pump then you turn it over.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: That's what I mean.

22 ROBERT F. FERRARI: The effective yield of
23 the well is basically what is -- as you're pumping
24 the well, what is your effective recharge rate,
25 what can it sustain for a period of time.

1 Typically you want -- for a residential well, you
2 want to do an absolute minimum of four-hour pumping
3 test, if not a five-hour or six-hour pumping test.
4 Okay? You can sustain a certain capacity where you
5 draw out -- you draw it down and it stabilizes, it
6 doesn't go down anymore. That's what's your
7 effective yield point. We've got -- so, when I
8 talk about effective yields here, our effective
9 yield for this well was .6 --

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

11 ROBERT F. FERRARI: -- gallons a minute,
12 even though there is a pump in the well that is
13 pumping, you know, at a higher rate on the outcome.
14 We have to throttle it back to do the pumping test
15 because the well got drawn down real quick.

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: And that would be the
17 accepted understanding from the aforementioned
18 Appendix C, the Department of Health?

19 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Correct. That's
20 correct. Correct.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I'm sure I have more
22 questions for you, but I can't think of it right
23 now.

24 ATTORNEY ROCHA: We'll hold onto them.

25 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Okay.

1 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Good?

2 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Yes. Don't run away.

3 ROBERT F. FERRARI: Not going far.

4 **GLENN ANDREONI**

5 called as a witness and having been first duly
6 sworn, testifies as follows:

7 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

8 GLEN ANDREONI: Glenn Andreoni.

9 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

10 GLEN ANDREONI: A-n-d-r-e-o-n-i.

11 Good evening, counsel members. I think as
12 board members, I'll make this brief, relatively
13 brief.

14 I am Glenn Andreoni, 10 Seaview Avenue. I am
15 here this evening respectfully, almost pleading
16 with you, to allow an extension and connection,
17 because we're pretty desperate right now. Relative
18 to us moving there, we can't. We'd like to make
19 Jamestown -- we live in North Smithfield right now.
20 We love Jamestown. I have a lot of -- I'm an
21 attorney also. I have a lot of clients that live
22 in Jamestown. By the way, no -- many of them have
23 wells. No issues with their wells. I have a lot
24 of friends that live in Jamestown. We would like
25 to make Jamestown our permanent residence, but we

1 can't. We can't because of the water situation.
2 When we bought it we didn't have the water problem.
3 It's been getting progressively worse every year.
4 Really, really bad. Now, in fact, we hired
5 Mr. Ferrari -- not to testify in front of you, not
6 to write the reports up -- to get a reverse osmosis
7 system. It's a lot cheaper, and it's the best for
8 what you can get. That's why we hired him. We
9 hired him last year way before, you know, this
10 moratorium and all these issues came up, just to
11 put a reverse osmosis system in. And he and his
12 company, being the honest people that they are,
13 could have sold me a system. It wouldn't have
14 worked. They said, "Glenn, we can't. We can't
15 give you a system. It's not going to work. You
16 are only producing .6 gallons per minute at a high
17 peak time," where we haven't been in the house for
18 three months. In the summer, we probably produce,
19 I don't know, about a quarter a gallon. We can't
20 even take a shower without running out of water.
21 It's disgusting. And the water is pure salt. And
22 it wasn't that way when we first bought it. And we
23 have no feasible option, unfortunately.

24 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Wait. I'm sorry
25 to interrupt. When did you buy it?

1 GLENN ANDREONI: I think nine years ago,
2 maybe? Eight or nine years ago.

3 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: 2015 I think it says.

4 GLENN ANDREONI: Yes. So, nine years ago.
5 2015 I believe.

6 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And did you --
7 is the well the same well now as it was then?

8 GLENN ANDREONI: Yes.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And did it --
10 what was yield then? Did it have any issues?

11 GLENN ANDREONI: Much better, yeah. We
12 never ran out of water. It was good enough. Right
13 now I couldn't get a mortgage on the property. I
14 couldn't sell it. I couldn't get a mortgage. It
15 doesn't yield enough right now. Again, it yielded
16 a little over a half-a-gallon peak season after
17 rainstorms. In the summer, I'll bet you, again, a
18 tenth of a gallon, a quarter of a gallon. And
19 every year, for some bizarre reason, it's getting
20 progressively worse. I don't understand it. It's
21 beyond my comprehension as to why it's getting
22 worse, but it's getting worse. Again, it would
23 have been cheaper for me to get a reverse osmosis,
24 and that's the best water you can get, but I can't.
25 So, what can I do? I mean, we're trapped. We

1 love -- we love Jamestown. And, again, everybody
2 talks about "Well, we'll have to give it to
3 everybody else." No. There is people six houses
4 down from me, their well produces 20 gallons a
5 minute. They don't have an issue. It's bizarre.
6 But my -- apparently my neighbors, we have a
7 problem. I am not making it up. I mean, again, I
8 didn't -- I'm -- I didn't hire Mr. Ferrari for this
9 purpose. I hired him to put this reverse osmosis.
10 He was honest enough because if he would have sold
11 me a system it wouldn't have worked. We can't use
12 a dishwasher. We have two dishwashers; we can't
13 use them. Our faucets are corroded. It's
14 horrible. Can't shower, it's pure salt. The --
15 our piping, every year it springs leaks in it.
16 And, again, it's only the last couple of years it's
17 getting really, really bad, to be honest with you.
18 As the testimony indicated, our water doesn't come
19 close to meeting any U.S. EPA and Rhode Island
20 Department of Health drinking water standards.
21 It's not feasible. We can't do anything else right
22 now. I have no alternative but to hook up to Town
23 municipal water. I didn't want to, but --
24 otherwise, my house is worthless. What can I do
25 with it? I can't sell it. I can't mortgage it.

1 No one will buy it. I don't have any alternative.
2 I really don't. The -- and the approved extension
3 is literally one lot away from me. Miss Paolino's
4 house is one lot away. It's one house lot away.
5 It's a hundred feet away. I have told friends of
6 mine that live in the town, I have told people that
7 I know, and they can't even understand why the Town
8 may deny us. I'm not saying you will deny us, but
9 could deny us, have the power to deny us when it's
10 like a -- basically a basic public health issue or
11 right, I should say, I think, water. I do
12 understand the council's position with respect to
13 other people lying, but nobody else in front of
14 you. Nobody else has proven that -- the State law
15 says it, nobody has proven their wells are bad.
16 They have. At least I have. I can't testify for
17 anybody else, but I -- in my opinion, based on my
18 experts telling me that, we have clearly met the
19 burden. Anyway, I don't want to go on. I respect
20 you. I appreciate you. And I respectfully plead
21 you to grant us the extension and the connection.
22 Thank you for your time.

23 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Thank you.

24 COUNCILOR BEYE: Did you have a question?

25 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No, I don't. I just

1 want to say that I appreciate that some people
2 don't understand our position, and I recognize that
3 as Miss Zarlengo said many people have been --
4 heard about this, as Mr. Robinson said, but the
5 law -- we should know that the law was indeed
6 changed in, I believe, 2022, and the law which
7 affects us now is not the one that was available
8 for many years before, and so it has caused us and
9 I think all communities like this great
10 consternation. So, that's why.

11 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

12 (Pause.)

13 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Our next applicant
14 is Paul Frechette. Did I say that right?

15 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I think so. That's
16 how I say it.

17 Good evening. Christian Infantolino with
18 Murphy Prior & Infantolino here representing Paul
19 and Gail Frechette on their application for water
20 extension.

21 The property is located at 19 Seaview Avenue,
22 Tax Assessor's Plat 7, Lot 101. Unfortunately, the
23 applicants weren't able to be here tonight. They
24 were here for the original meeting, but they were
25 in Florida.

1 And I also want to bring to the attention,
2 because my math was a little off on the last one.
3 I think when I was talking with Mike I think I was
4 using 39 or 40 gallons. And I probably used 39.

5 COUNCILOR BEYE: 39.4.

6 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Okay. See, close
7 to that. And I did the same thing with
8 Mr. Frechette. I took his maximum on the bedrooms.

9 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Your 39.4 doesn't get
10 you close to what you -- but that's okay.

11 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: But -- but that's
12 what -- you know. So, with Mr. Frechette I used --
13 I used the similar calculation. So, when you see
14 that higher number, it is only him and his wife in
15 the property, even though it's a four-bedroom
16 house. Here, at this particular time, you know,
17 they are gone for four or five months a year but
18 here residentially seasonally.

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I don't think any of
20 these folks would want to restrict their houses to
21 just --

22 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That is why I used
23 the number that I used.

24 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I understand.

25 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Of course, we're in

1 front of the board. I want you to have a full
2 picture. The board should use it. For consistency
3 reasons, that's what you're using.

4 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: That's what we have to
5 think about.

6 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Moving down the
7 road.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yeah.

9 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: So, that's why I
10 used it with the statement that, you know, it's
11 just Mr. Frechette and his wife in the house.
12 Again, they're here only about six months of the
13 year moving forward.

14 So, the applicants were -- have been
15 experiencing water-related issue at the property
16 since 2016. They were -- they -- at first they
17 were just the saltwater intrusion issues. They had
18 plenty of yield or volume, but it was these -- it
19 was quality issues that were going on. They
20 retained a licensed -- licensed professionals to
21 assist with the problem, eventually needing to
22 drill a new well.

23 In 2017, Precision Well drilled a new well on
24 the property. They were able to find a second
25 location for the property. They drilled the second

1 well at 300 feet. And you guys have that report.
2 It was -- that well at the time was providing
3 1 gallon per minute of yield.

4 Since the new well has been installed, there
5 has been many occasions where they have run out of
6 water where they can't, you know, take one shower
7 and then they're done, they can't run another load
8 of clothes, or anything like that.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Is that in the
10 application?

11 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: What's that?

12 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: What you just
13 said.

14 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That they have been
15 running out of water?

16 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: On multiple --

17 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: On multiple
18 occasions, yes, it is. There is -- there is a note
19 from Mr. Frechette, within the application, a
20 letter from Mr. Frechette, stating that he's run
21 out of water many times.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Well, can I be
23 more specific? You said they couldn't come
24 tonight?

25 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No. They're not in

1 the state.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. Can they
3 come some other night?

4 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: To be honest, I
5 don't know when they're going to be here. The
6 letter was the addendum for utility service.

7 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: It's what?

8 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: It was an addendum
9 to the application for utility service and
10 connection letter from Mr. Frechette.

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: At the very end, at
12 the very end, I think, of the letter.

13 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I don't think I
14 have it.

15 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I don't know where
16 it is in your packet.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: We may not have it.

18 (Pause.)

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: No. We do. We do.

20 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Yes. This was
21 received March 21.

22 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: It's right before the
23 Aqua Science information.

24 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I'm sorry. I
25 can't put my hand on it. Can I just borrow yours?

1 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Sure, (Hanging).

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Thank you.

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: You're welcome.

4 (Pause.)

5 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: The one that you
6 don't have in your packet, which I am hoping I can
7 pass around my phone and show you the letter, and I
8 can submit a copy with the clerk before the end of
9 tonight's meeting. It is the newest well report or
10 the newest flow test, which I'll get to in a
11 moment.

12 (Pause.)

13 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Okay. So, after
14 the well was reported, they had many other issues
15 where they were running out water. They started to
16 contact the different companies, Well Works,
17 Precision Well, to discuss what options they had.
18 Again, like you've heard tonight many times from
19 Mr. Ferrari, it was always talk that fracking
20 really wasn't an option in that area for them and
21 for multiple different reasons, but increase of
22 intrusion was a huge one. And then all of the
23 other companies said you already have two wells on
24 the property, there is really no other location
25 based on the regulations for a third well. The

1 Precision Well report does show that and state
2 that.

3 This is the document that -- I apologize for
4 the size of it, but if you're more than willing
5 to -- I'll print that out and get it to you guys.
6 I just got it today. I apologize it's not in your
7 package.

8 COUNCILOR BEYE: We don't have that?

9 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: The report just
10 came in. It was done February 23 of 2024. This
11 was the latest flow test, which, from Precision
12 Well, states there is no other options, you know,
13 places to put the well and that fracking is not
14 recommended. And this particular flow test on the
15 second well, the one that was at 300 feet, came out
16 at .075 gallons per minute.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: .075?

18 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: .075 gallons per
19 minute on a 300-foot well, which is --

20 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: .75?

21 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No. .075. And
22 that's on that report that I'll submit as well.

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Obviously, you
24 can only do what you can do, but it's almost
25 impossible to read it on a 4-inch screen.

1 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Right. And like I
2 said, I'll submit a paper one before the end of
3 tonight's meeting.

4 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Is that expert
5 here?

6 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No. I will read
7 this into the record for you. The Precision
8 Well is not, but this Precision Well statement --

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: The reason I'm
10 asking is I -- when I read the two times it's
11 offered in the application, I thought it was a typo
12 because he was getting 1 gallon a minute and then
13 he tests it in February. And it's not .75, it's
14 .075?

15 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That's correct.

16 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Is that in the
17 report?

18 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That's in that
19 report.

20 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And is that
21 expert available to say that?

22 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I mean, it's in his
23 report with his signature, and I will -- I'm going
24 to admit it as an exhibit to this testimony --
25 absolutely -- you know, to be relied upon. And if

1 it goes further and he needs to be available for,
2 you know, rebuttals then that's what we'll have to
3 do. But his report is that it is .075. It was
4 1 gallon per minute in 2017 upon the completion of
5 the well. And since 2017 to date, it's reduced
6 that much. So -- and that is where we're at, well
7 below the industry standards.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Well --

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Well, I guess
10 the reason I would --

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

12 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: -- interested,
13 among other things, Mr. Frechette's availability.
14 And I know you can't control that, and I -- I don't
15 know what the explanation is. I hope it's not
16 disinterest in his application.

17 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No, it's not.

18 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: All right. But
19 you're talking about a dramatic reduction from 1 to
20 .075.

21 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Absolutely.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And the
23 application itself talks about the need arises
24 because you can't wash more than two washes of
25 clothes, or if trying to power wash outdoor

1 furniture. In my uninformed unprofessional
2 opinion, the inability to power wash outdoor
3 furniture is a far cry from .0175.

4 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: .075.

5 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: If you follow
6 me.

7 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I completely follow
8 you. And I think, you know, you're talking about a
9 layperson who filed -- filled out that application
10 prior to engaging myself, and that was in his
11 brain, what he was thinking about as to what the
12 things were. The professional expert's report
13 and -- is what should be relied on.

14 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think -- I think I
15 share Randy's concern that the expert is not here
16 for us to ask or, I mean, maybe we put Mr. Ferrari
17 through the --

18 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: That's fine.

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: -- the grilling. I
20 think --

21 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: If you guys would
22 prefer to have an expert here, I would respectfully
23 request to an extension to find out if I can get an
24 availability of the Precision Well expert.

25 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And is there any

1 reasonable expectation that Mr. Frechette himself
2 would be available?

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I'm hoping that he
4 can be. I mean, obviously, he made -- he made a
5 special trip to come here for the last meeting and
6 was told to wait another meeting.

7 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

8 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: And so --

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Right.

10 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: You know, at that
11 point in time, he couldn't rearrange --

12 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: He doesn't live
13 here?

14 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: -- anything else.

15 Like I said, he lives here seasonally. And so
16 that's why there is minimal usage on the property.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Again, sorry, but we
18 need to continue it.

19 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: If that's -- if
20 that's what is going to hold up on the decision on
21 this to get a Precision Well guy in here to tell
22 you that the report that he produced and signed is
23 really the report that he produced and signed, I'll
24 do it.

25 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

1 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Okay.

2 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Especially since that
3 is available to us on a four-inch screen. That's
4 small.

5 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I was going to
6 submit it to you at the end of the meeting or
7 before the end of the meeting.

8 I just respectfully request that continuance.

9 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Do we need to vote
10 on that?

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes. Do we need to
12 vote on this?

13 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: Yes.

14 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Or what --

15 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: What I'd suggest you
16 do, see what you would like to do with the other
17 two. You can leave this for now because it doesn't
18 look like you're going to finish tonight with all
19 of these. It's your prerogative if you want to
20 continue this one now, you could. You could wait
21 until you see -- you have one more to hear still.

22 COUNCILOR BEYE: No.

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Do you have
24 anything else on this?

25 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No. That's where I

1 was going to go.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay.

3 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I mean, basically
4 that's the evidence has shown the well is not
5 meeting the standards of the State.

6 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I think I concur
7 with our solicitor that we're unlikely to finish
8 all four applications tonight, so maybe --

9 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: But can we just
10 take this one for itself? I mean, you're not -- I
11 mean, I don't understand why we need to continue
12 this.

13 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: The continuance
14 is fine. I'm just -- the date of the continuance
15 will depend on -- we think we're going to have to
16 continue it anyway.

17 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Okay.

18 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And we'll be
19 picking a date. I just want you to know the date
20 so that you can --

21 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Thank you.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: -- so you can
23 figure out when you're going to be here.

24 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you.

25 And our fourth applicant is Stephen Zimmiski

1 and Suzanne Gagnon. Are they here?

2 **SUZANNE GAGNON** and **STEPHEN ZIMNISKI**

3 called as witnesses and having been first duly
4 sworn, testifies as follows:

5 THE STENOGRAPHER: Your name, please.

6 SUZANNE GAGNON: Suzanne with a Z,
7 G-a-g-n-o-n.

8 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Stephen Zimniski,
9 Z-i-m-n-i-s-k-i.

10 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

11 SUZANNE GAGNON: Okay. Shall I go first?

12 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Sure.

13 SUZANNE GAGNON: So, we're not lawyers,
14 we're not experts, but we are the residents. And
15 the reason why we're here is because we are smack
16 in the middle of the Andreonis, the Saletins and
17 the Frechettes. So, the Frechettes are north of
18 our house, the Saletins are east, the Andreonis are
19 south of us. We live on the smallest lot.

20 Our house was built in 1953. We moved in in
21 2019. At that time our water was not adequate, and
22 you have that report. That report was sent to you
23 with the application. And we were required with
24 Michael Gray -- and we were required to put in two
25 huge storage tanks, because one would not fit in

1 our house. So, we put in the two huge storage
2 tanks.

3 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: On "huge," do you have
4 any sense of --

5 SUZANNE GAGNON: Total is 500 gallons.

6 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: 250 apiece.

7 SUZANNE GAGNON: 250 apiece.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: The tanks themselves
9 would you call them 4 by 4, do you know; 4 feet by
10 4 feet?

11 SUZANNE GAGNON: They're bigger than that.

12 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Yeah.

13 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: But they're bigger
14 than that?

15 SUZANNE GAGNON: Yes. Each one.

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Okay.

17 SUZANNE GAGNON: And so we did that, and
18 that allowed us to close on our house and to move
19 in.

20 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: At the time there
21 was -- they did look -- this was Well Works. They
22 looked to see whether they could pick another well.
23 There was no place on our property to do that. I
24 mean, we have a septic system in the front and
25 side. We had one well in the back. There was no

1 other place to do it. And we were told that. So,
2 the only solution was to put this cushion, this
3 buffer of 500 gallons there.

4 We're surrounded by people, you know, and us
5 (Indicating.) Our well is not sufficient, and all
6 the people around us don't have sufficient wells.
7 I don't know how many experts you need to keep on
8 saying that's the situation, because that's what
9 we're living with.

10 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Well, I --

11 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Except someone made
12 representation to the fact somebody up the street
13 had 20 gallons a minute. So --

14 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Yes. How far? Not on
15 our street.

16 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I understand that
17 completely. I understand.

18 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I also respect
19 the fact that -- commend the fact that you're not a
20 lawyer.

21 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Thank you.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: However, the --
23 you have mentioned something a little earlier. In
24 fact, some of the things you have talked about
25 about the people you have contacted in getting the

1 storage tanks, the application doesn't say anything
2 about any of that, unless I'm missing part of it.
3 The only thing I have in the application says --
4 beside identifying information about you guys is
5 all of Seaview Avenue is at risk. Several
6 properties have intermittently undrinkable water.

7 SUZANNE GAGNON: The report was submitted
8 with the application.

9 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I don't --

10 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: By Water Works.

11 SUZANNE GAGNON: Yes.

12 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. I hate
13 to -- do you live here?

14 SUZANNE GAGNON: Yes. 7 Seaview.

15 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: No offense.

16 SUZANNE GAGNON: No offense taken.

17 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I hate to
18 suggest this, but I think I would hope to catch up
19 with things you suggested you submitted that I
20 don't have.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I apologize.

23 Even though he's still here, there was a presenter
24 earlier who I thought I didn't have a piece of
25 paper from and it turns out I found it.

1 SUZANNE GAGNON: Uh-huh.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: But this time
3 I've only gotten --

4 SUZANNE GAGNON: Right.

5 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: -- three pieces
6 of paper that relate to your application, and none
7 of them has anything about the stuff you're talking
8 about. I'm not suggesting that you can't talk
9 about it --

10 SUZANNE GAGNON: Uh-huh.

11 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: -- but in order
12 for us to really evaluate your application, we'd
13 have to see it, and work from it, and see the
14 reports. And if you have any receipts about
15 purchasing the tanks and when you did, and that
16 kind of stuff.

17 SUZANNE GAGNON: But we did submit it to
18 you.

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I understand, but we
20 don't seem to have it.

21 SUZANNE GAGNON: Okay. We can, obviously,
22 get it again.

23 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: And, again, I think
24 not -- but as we said --

25 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: And we are under oath,

1 so we are telling the truth.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I don't have any
3 doubts that that's the case. It's just for
4 whatever reason -- I'm not challenging you we don't
5 have it. Even if you say you did submit, I still
6 don't have it.

7 SUZANNE GAGNON: Sure. I think, actually
8 our main point is that we are right in the middle
9 of these -- of these three applicants. Okay?

10 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Do you know
11 whether any of the stuff you submitted directs
12 itself to the thing that -- you have been here for
13 the other presentations?

14 SUZANNE GAGNON: Uh-huh.

15 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Does it direct
16 itself to the productivity, like how much your well
17 yields in terms of loads per minute?

18 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: It was below the State
19 minimum, and that's why --

20 SUZANNE GAGNON: That's why we were
21 required to put the tanks in.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Do you know what
23 the number was?

24 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Offhand, I think it was
25 about 2.5 gallons, but I don't know how deep the

1 well is and all that. So, we were told it was
2 one-quarter of what the State required.

3 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. And that
4 was something that was included in this report that
5 we can't put our hands on?

6 SUZANNE GAGNON: Uh-huh.

7 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Okay. Then to
8 me it's all the more important that we connect with
9 that.

10 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Okay.

11 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: So,
12 respectfully, and I'm sorry to inconvenience you if
13 this causes another trip back, but we just can't
14 evaluate it without having all the information that
15 you provided.

16 SUZANNE GAGNON: Okay.

17 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, yes, I think --

18 SUZANNE GAGNON: Any other questions for
19 you?

20 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Well, I'm sure we will
21 have more when we read that.

22 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: At another time.

23 SUZANNE GAGNON: That's fine. I mean, I
24 think that I'm not a lawyer, I'm not an expert, but
25 I am a doctor. And I would like to treat the

1 patient before they're moribund, and that's where
2 we are, in the middle of these other three houses.

3 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Understood.

4 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Thank you.

5 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Thanks.

6 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, I think --

7 COUNCILOR BEYE: What do you want to do?

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Well, I would like --
9 I recognize folks have come out, and I recognize
10 that they're anxious for a decision, but I'm not
11 prepared at this point. I may have some more
12 questions, but I would like to just continue it, to
13 continue the decisions for all, for all four with
14 the with Saletins and Gagnons, if we get that
15 information for sure. With Mr. Infantolino, if we
16 can get the additional information, that's great.

17 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: And I would like
18 to put people on notice.

19 ATTORNEY ROCHA: I'm always sneaking up.
20 Sorry.

21 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: What?

22 ATTORNEY ROCHA: I'm always sneaking up.
23 I just wanted -- I don't know if there are -- I
24 know every application is different. I'm not clear
25 if there are outstanding issues on ours and,

1 obviously, this is the second time.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I'm sorry.

3 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Sorry.

4 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I was about to
5 address that.

6 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Sorry.

7 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I'll address it.
8 I intended to call as a witness Michael Gray to
9 speak about all four applications. And so if that
10 answers what you're about to ask why aren't we done
11 with the Andreonis, can't do it tonight. It's
12 going to have to happen another time.

13 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Mike Gray is right there.

14 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I know, but we
15 have a roomful of people. We just don't have the
16 ability to finish this hearing tonight.

17 ATTORNEY ROCHA: So, the board is going to
18 call its own witness, that's my understanding?

19 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I'm -- I would
20 like to hear from Michael Gray.

21 ATTORNEY ROCHA: On anything specific to
22 our application?

23 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: It relates to
24 whether or not these applications are consistent
25 with system capacity.

1 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Which -- and that's in
2 the State law.

3 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: That's in the
4 rules and regulations of the -- this board.

5 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Right. And now we have a
6 State law.

7 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Which, in all
8 due respect, reasonable minds can differ, I think
9 obviates the applicability of that rule and
10 regulation, and I expect to address that through
11 his testimony.

12 ATTORNEY ROCHA: You're going to address
13 system capacity through his testimony?

14 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: What is that?

15 ATTORNEY ROCHA: I just don't understand
16 why we need a continuance on, one, the standard
17 that isn't in the statute. And, two, he's here.
18 Your system capacity information is what it is. I
19 can testify to it as well.

20 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: We're not here
21 to debate the applicable law. I recognize you feel
22 strongly about it. You participated in the -- as I
23 understand it, the revision of the statute.

24 ATTORNEY ROCHA: You have -- this council
25 has a bill in to amend it. So, I don't think it

1 can now take the position that it doesn't apply,
2 so that's --

3 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: I'm not
4 suggesting that it doesn't apply. Reasonable minds
5 can differ about its reach and whether or not the
6 current rules and regulations of the JWSD are
7 somehow obliterated by the existence of the law.
8 And I respectfully, respectfully suggest that the
9 testimony I'd like to hear is relevant to the four
10 applications and the legalese will be left for
11 another day. We can debate it. We got into
12 this --

13 ATTORNEY ROCHA: I just have one question.
14 Will I be able to cross-examine Mr. Gray?

15 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: What?

16 ATTORNEY ROCHA: Will I be able to
17 cross-examine Mr. Gray?

18 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes.

19 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Sure. Why not?

20 ATTORNEY ROCHA: My objection is noted for
21 the record. And I guess we'll see you about
22 capacity next month. Do we know the date on that?

23 COUNCILOR BEYE: Well, our next meeting is
24 May 6.

25 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Before we get into

1 that, I just want really -- for the record, I want
2 to object on behalf of the Saletins' application as
3 well. Mr. Gray is here, our experts' testimony --
4 our experts are here. I mean, we can cross-examine
5 effectively and not have to spend more money on
6 having more experts come another month down the
7 road. It doesn't make any sense.

8 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: We understand. I
9 mean, I'm speaking only for myself. But your
10 experts are here. It was -- I appreciate their
11 testimony, both for the Saletins and Andreonis.
12 The testimony from Mr. Frechette was lacking.

13 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I'm objecting on
14 behalf of Mr. Saletin.

15 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I know you are. I
16 know you are, Christian. And I -- it's -- I need
17 to consider and -- what the testimony has been. I
18 have read through all of the applications, and I
19 have read and I have heard the testimony, and I
20 need to consider that. We are in the midst of
21 this, the beginning of a -- after this is the Town
22 Council meeting for which there is an entire
23 audience of people. So, I recognize -- I recognize
24 your experts are here. If we believe that you --
25 that we need additional expert testimony, we will

1 make that known to you.

2 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: No. That is
3 nothing to do with that. Our experts have to come.
4 But if you're going to put another expert up, we
5 have to have experts here to potentially refute any
6 information that is put on the testimony by
7 Mr. Gray.

8 With all due respect, I do understand that you
9 need time to digest the information that you heard
10 tonight, but that too should include the testimony
11 of Mr. Gray and our experts so that we can
12 cross-examine him effectively and in a
13 time-appropriate manner. That's what my objection
14 is.

15 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Thank you.

16 ADMINISTRATOR MELLO: The next regular
17 meeting is May 6.

18 COUNCILOR BEYE: Thank you. Does that
19 work for our counsel? They're busy.

20 Christian, May 6?

21 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: One moment.

22 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. May 6?

23 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: I'm okay with that.
24 I can't guaranty if Mr. Frechette will be there,
25 but I'll get witnesses and experts.

1 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Thank you.

2 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: So, I make a motion.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We will not be here
4 that day.

5 THE STENOGRAPHER: I'm sorry. Who's
6 speaking?

7 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Mr. Zimniski.

8 COUNCILOR BEYE: You have to go up to the
9 mike if you're going to address.

10 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Stephen Zimniski,
11 again. We will not be here May 6, but we will get
12 the form in to you in the interim.

13 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Okay.

14 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Thank you.

15 STEPHEN ZIMNISKI: Is there anything else
16 that needs to be done at that time? We answered
17 your questions tonight.

18 COUNCILOR BEYE: Just get that --

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: I think that form, and
20 if we have other questions for you we'll try to get
21 that to you before that.

22 COUNCILOR BEYE: Whatever you can, as much
23 as you can.

24 Were you going to --

25 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Yes. I make a motion

1 to continue this discussion, this review, until
2 May 6.

3 COUNCILOR MICHAEL WHITE: Second.

4 COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor?

5 (Voice vote.)

6 ATTORNEY INFANTOLINO: Can the motion
7 include that you're including the applications and
8 each application?

9 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: I was going to
10 suggest name each application.

11 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Go ahead. It's
12 your motion.

13 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: That's fine. I make a
14 motion that we are continuing --

15 Thank you. Okay, Christian.

16 -- the applications of Jeffrey and Deborah
17 Saletin --

18 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Second.

19 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: -- of -- should I put
20 them altogether?

21 SOLICITOR RUGGIERO: You can certainly
22 combine them. Just for the record it's clear that
23 all four are continued.

24 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Right. -- of Glenn
25 and Marjorie Andreoni, of Paul Frechette and of

1 Stephen Zimniski and Suzanne Gagnon.

2 COUNCILOR RANDALL WHITE: Second.

3 COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor.

4 (Voice vote.)

5 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Thank you.

6 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. Thank you.

7 There is no new business.

8 We have the consent agenda for Water and
9 Sewer.

10 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Move to approve the
11 consent agenda for the Water and Sewer.

12 COUNCILOR MICHAEL WHITE: Second.

13 COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor?

14 (Voice vote.)

15 COUNCILOR BEYE: Okay. I will entertain a
16 motion to adjourn from sitting as the Board of
17 Water and Sewer Commissioners.

18 COUNCILOR MEAGHER: Move to adjourn as
19 Water and Sewer --

20 COUNCILOR MICHAEL WHITE: Second.

21 COUNCILOR BEYE: All in favor?

22 (Voice vote.)

COUNCILOR BEYE: All right. Thank you.

-- -- --

C E R T I F I C A T I O N.

I, Brenda D. P. Hanna, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of my notes taken at the above-entitled hearing before the Town of Jamestown Town Council sitting as the Water and Sewer Board on 15 April 2024.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of April 2024.

BRENDA D. P. HANNA, NOTARY PUBLIC/
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER

IN RE: 15 April 2024 Jamestown Water and Sewer
Commission