First Name	Last Name	Street Address	Written Testimony (will be read to record during meeting)
Chip	Geer	86 Sunset Drive	No comments. Questions: Because MDC (since 1929) does this, why is Town thinking an outside engineer is crucial to laying out and installing new water piping? How will person, uniquely, help? What uranium remediation know-how will engineer have? How many homes will public water system target? Is Town testing for possible kidney disease in these well drinkers? Timetable for installation? Estimated cost? Will overall well-water uranium test results ever be disclosed? Public water is sole solution?
Beverly	McGraw	68 Sulky Lane	I am against spending \$50000 for a study of this issue. I think it is a done deal, thus the money would not be well spent.
John	Michalik	69 Sunset Drive	It appears that the Town believes that extending MDC water to parts of Glastonbury that are currently not served by the MDC is the only solution to elevated levels of uranium. Have other options been discussed? My wife and I are one of seven households served by a community well. Since 1950, our well association has provided potable water to our member families that meets State Department of Public Health standards for drinking water. Is it possible that similar community wells could be installed in those areas impacted by higher levels of uranium? Has anyone tested the cost feasibility of this alternative to MDC water?
Miles	Ingram	61 Boulder Circle	I am opposed to the extension of the public water system to the Sunset Drive area. I have heard estimates that this will cost each resident upwards of \$10,000, for a service most do not need or want. Most residents in the area do not have harmful levels of uranium in our water, and forcing us to pay for the construction is socializing the costs for privatized benefits that will primarily accrue to the out of town developer looking to cram way too many houses onto the Carini property. Thank you.
Charles	Hewes	72 Sunset Drive	We thank the Council for their service during this difficult time. We are against the appropriation of \$50,000 to plan for the MDC to extend public water to homes with high levels of uranium. Any extension of public water will incur a significant cost to both the town and local residents, whether or not a homestead contains high levels of uranium. Moreover, starting a public water extension project of this proportion when future Town revenue is unknown is, in our opinion, fiscally irresponsible.
Daniel	Horvath	17 Sunset Drive	Homeowners with uranium in their water in greater concentrations than federal guidelines recommend have treatment options from local well contractors, at considerably lower cost than extension of public water. I struggle to see how a consultant will provide added value to Town residents. As such, I am opposed to the hiring of a consultant. Question for the Town Council: Considering the financial implications of the COVID-19 crisis, is this a justifiable expenditure of Town funds at this time?
Rob	Hale	832 Hopewell Road	Please explain why \$50,000 or even \$30,000 is needed for a study. How many dwellings or businesses are affected by uranium in well water? What is the cost of filtering the water to remove uranium from well water? What is the effectiveness of filtration? For example, how often does filter need to be changed? Why isn't MDC footing the bill for the study? Why is the cost so high? Please answer these questions, before you vote. Thank you.