

INLET CLEAN WATERS PROJECT
Current status as of November 2, 2004

1. Need
 - a. Economic need – what’s at risk
 - i. 69% area income from tourism
 - ii. Master plan states town needs to develop infrastructure
 - iii. Risk of consent orders from DOH
 - iv. Maintain property values and tax base
 - b. Water
 - i. Potable water for residents and businesses
 - ii. Needs for public facilities i.e. school, churches, library, town parks, town hall
 - iii. Most wells in community are shallow wells 15-20 ft. in very porous sand
 - iv. Many commercial wells in hamlet failed coliform tests requiring disinfectant units
 - v. Private wells????
 - vi. Other forms of contamination may be present – road salt, leaking fuel oil from tanks in cellars, surface contamination
 - c. Wastewater treatment – Hamlet
 - i. ALL properties adjacent to 5th Lake outlet nonconforming to DEC requirements
 - ii. Majority of septic systems in rest of hamlet could conform to DOH requirements if public water was available
 - iii. Tyler Rd. area nonconforming to DEC requirements
2. Background info
 - a. History
 - i. At least two attempts at public water both projects partially installed and abandoned
 - ii. Many private systems i.e. Woods Inn supplying adjacent businesses and current Turkey Water Works
 - iii. Recent sewer project failed 2-1, 6.5M for approximately 80 parcels, area if non critical need
 - iv. Clean Waters committee did a critical needs assessment
 1. Identified business area of hamlet as highest priority based upon critical needs
 2. Tyler Rd. second critical need
 - v. Critical needs broken down into small projects
 1. Easier to get funding for smaller projects
 2. Easier to get citizen acceptance for the smaller projects
 - b. Political

- i. Extremely conservative community
- ii. Limited income \$32,000 per household
- iii. Small family owned businesses with low cost profit ratio
- iv. Diverse groups/needs
 - 1. Critical need for waste treatment on south side of Route 28
 - 2. Critical need for water on north side
 - 3. Tyler Rd. seasonal thus large economic burden for limited use
 - 4. Businesses outside of hamlet see need for water long term but do not see as a critical issue currently
 - 5. High end lakeside cottages/camps need to protect investment
- v. Aversion to discharge in lakes and streams for treated wastewater, low risk but high impact if spill

3. Current Status

- a. Engineering alternatives short term projects
 - i. Water for hamlet
 - 1. Construction cost \$1.48M
 - 2. Operational cost \$20,000 annum
 - 3. Average household cost at 70% funding \$455 or \$38 mo.
 - 4. Property owner has control over individual cost by controlling personal water usage (metered water)
 - ii. Cluster septic system for south side and 3 north side parcels in hamlet
 - 1. Construction cost \$880,000
 - 2. Operational cost \$9,000 annum
 - 3. Average household cost \$535 or \$45 mo.
 - 4. User able to control costs by metered water usage
 - 5. Leach fields in town parks with room for replacement system should first fail
 - 6. Designed with 50% over capacity
 - iii. Conventional sewer system for all of downtown hamlet
 - 1. Construction cost \$2.02M
 - 2. Operational cost \$27,000 annum
 - 3. Average user cost \$763 or \$65 mo.
 - 4. Without water for metering, cost would be fixed based upon EDU, owner has no control over individual costs by water conservation
- b. Additional info
 - i. Cluster septic alternative not feasible without water as it would leave north side with no viable alternative should they vote water down.

- ii. South side would have to pay for both water and septic average \$933 or \$82 mo. Minus fire insurance savings vs. \$763 or \$65 mo. for sewers.
 - iii. North side would pay average of \$455 or \$38 mo. vs. \$763 or \$65 mo. for sewers.
 - iv. Possibility of DOH forcing water in future
- 4. Current resources
 - a. Grant approved for \$28,000 for water quality studies and engineering.
 - b. Hamilton Co. Soil and Water Conservation District continued monitoring of lakes for nitrates, phosphates, ph, etc.
 - c. HCSWCD limited conductivity testing of shorelines
 - d. Sixth & Seventh Lake Association shoreline conductivity of Sixth & Seventh Lakes
 - e. DOH test results from commercial wells
 - f. DOH will do a limited coliform testing if we supply the samples
 - g. NYS Rural Waters has volunteered to dye testing of all wells for free
 - h. NYS Rural Waters has agreed to do hydro geology testing for locations of deep wells
 - i. RCAP Solutions will provide free assistance with surveys, finding available funding, engineering and consulting firms
 - j. Kim Farrell, director Public Management and Finance of Maxwell School Syracuse University has agreed to meet and consult with us to advise us what needs to be done for successful completion of this project.
- 5. Where to go from here
 - a. Get stakeholders more involved with project
 - i. DOH
 - ii. DEC
 - iii. Downtown merchants and residents
 - iv. Funding sources
 - v. Code enforcements officer
 - vi. RCAP
 - b. Environmental studies
 - i. Hire appropriate consulting firm to do studies
 - ii. Pull together all resources and data to one report
 - iii. Review with regulatory agencies for completeness
 - c. Survey community for what they feel they need
 - i. Use RCAP to assist here
 - ii. Door to door for hamlet
 - iii. Mail for rest of community
 - d. Get better handle on funding
 - e. Formulate a long term comprehensive plan

- i. Short term downtown
- ii. Tyler Road
- iii. Extension of water east and west along Route 28 corridor
- iv. Any other area identified by studies for either water/wastewater or both
- v. Form permanent Clean Waters Board in Town to implement long term plan
- vi. Finalize plan for review and acceptance by Town Board