

MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY (WPCA) MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2013, AT 7:30 P.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410.

Present

Timothy Pelton, Chairman; Matthew Bowman, Steve Carroll, Mark Kasinskas, John Perrotti, Thomas Scannell.

Staff: Walter Gancarz, Town Engineer

Guest: Town Council Liaison David Schrumm and Donald Chelton, AECOM

The roll was called and a quorum was determined to be present.

Mr. Pelton read the emergency evacuation notice.

1. PERSONAL SAFETY ORIENTATION IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION by Mr. Bowman; seconded by Mr. Carroll.

MOVED that the WPCA enter Executive Session at 7:31 p.m. for the personal safety orientation.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

MOTION by Mr. Bowman; seconded by Mr. Scannell.

MOVED that the WPCA exit Executive Session at 7:55 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

2. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

None

3. APPLICATIONS

None

4. PROJECTS

a. WPCD Plant Upgrade design

AECOM invoice #37352417 dated June 17, 2013 in the amount of \$12,178.88

b. Update on the Plant Upgrade bid advertising

Mr. Chelton advised that the project has been advertised; bids are scheduled to be received on July 24th; and the Cheshire project has been following the New Haven project per DEEP's direction. New Haven's bid has been pushed out to July 9th.

There have been discussions with contractors and Mr. Chelton reported that the New Haven project is very large, with little time to put the bids together from the time of advertising and acceptance of bids. The contractors have stated that between June and July 9th their focus will be on the New Haven project. Mr. Chelton's recommendation is to push Cheshire out another week or two to give contractors more time for a better price. According to Mr. Chelton the New Haven project is very complicated, and it could be pushed out again. This should be considered by WPCA as the Cheshire project moves forward.

Councilor Schrumm stated that the Town Council would like to have the "number" for the plant upgrade project before the capital budget is finalized, and this would be the 3rd week in August.

Chairman Pelton asked about pros and cons in giving contractors more time to sharpen their pencils on the numbers. He also commented on Cheshire not wanting to be behind New Haven, and from a construction perspective the longer we wait the more we get into winter. It was hoped to have a shovel in the ground by late Fall.

With one contractor getting the New Haven project, Mr. Bowman said other contractors will go after smaller jobs and there could be a better number for the Cheshire project. The bid could be put off for another week.

After the New Haven bids are out, Mr. Chelton will check with contractors about Cheshire waiting for another week, and if it makes a difference. The turn around time from bid to award is about two (2) weeks; WPCA votes an intent to award; all this documentation goes to DEEP for approval; then the award becomes final, and the contractor can get his bonds and insurance. The total time frame could be 6 to 8 weeks.

According to Councilor Schrumm, knowing the amount of the low bid before the capital budget is decided would be beneficial to the Town Council. The project is in the capital budget at \$30+ million. The Council would look at the capital budget, and determine where there could be funding for other Town projects. There is a public hearing on the capital budget in August.

There was a pre-bid meeting last week, with about 30 attendees, and Mr. Chelton said his recommendation is to extend the date, pushing the Cheshire bid out one week after the New Haven bid. The current deadline is July 24th, at 2:00 p.m. and extending this date two weeks would be August 7th. Once the bids are open the contractors will know who will receive the award, and most of the general contractors have the ability to do two projects at the same time.

A listing of the general contractors who attended the 6/20/13 pre-bid conference, and a plan holder's list was distributed to the Authority members by Mr. Chelton.

To get a look at the list of ongoing projects, there is a web site www.biddocsonline.com which people can access.

Mr. Gancarz, Mr. Dievert and Mr. Chelton will evaluate the time frame for the bids, and report to the Authority at the next meeting.

MOTION by Mr. Bowman; seconded by Mr. Pelton.

MOVED that the WPCA authorize staff (Mr. Gancarz, Mr. Dievert, Mr. Chelton) to make a decision on extending the bid deadline up to two (2) weeks, to August 7, 2013.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

c. Possible enhancement to the Phosphorous funding grant.

Mr. Chelton reported on the increase in the grant funding for phosphorous removal from 30% to 50%. There is a limitation to three (3) communities with 0.2 mg or less, signing a contract with a contractor, and Cheshire is in a favorable position right now.

DEEP staff felt that Cheshire could be the first plant in a position to get the money; Bristol is a close 2nd; and Danbury is 3rd. A signed contract is required by 2018.

Mr. Gancarz noted there is a “tie breaker” procedure in the bill if more than three (3) communities meet the requirements.

Authority members reviewed the pages of the bill.

The funding would be about \$1 million to \$1.5 million for the Town; the grant application was formally submitted last week; and the cover letter noted awareness of this bill and expressed Cheshire’s eligibility for the additional funding.

There have been discussions with CL&P about energy rebates at the plant, and Mr. Chelton said it looks promising, but the amount of the rebate is uncertain.

Invoice #37352417 - \$12,178.88. This invoice was discussed by Mr. Chelton and the Authority members. Mr. Pelton noted that \$1.5 million has been spent, and WPCA does not want to extend its appropriations, and asked Mr. Chelton to share information regarding the billing.

In response, Mr. Chelton explained that the Town has spent \$1.951 million; this invoice is \$12,178 when AECOM costs were about \$50,000; the charges have exceeded the limit contained in the agreement by \$38,136; and this number will increase to about \$42,000. It took longer for AECOM to do the work, things happened which were not planned, and the DEEP process was more protracted than in the past with more submittals. Time was spent on the data room and many other small things, and AECOM did the application which was not in the scope of work. Most of the charges this month are for subcontractors.

Mr. Gancarz commented on AECOM working very hard, but advised that he is seeing this invoice for the first time.

The Authority members held a brief discussion on the invoice costs, and it was noted that 2/3rds of the cost is for contractors.

Mr. Chelton stated that AECOM went through a challenging period negotiating the final amendments for this project. He requested that the WPCA consider some relief on the balance of the \$38,136, i.e half of the balance.

Stating the WPCA wants to be fair, Mr. Bowman suggested that Mr. Gancarz review this matter, and that it be considered for payment at the next meeting.

Chairman Pelton questioned deferring action on the invoice pending review and approval from Mr. Gancarz. At that time WPCA can make a determination on reconciling the balance. It was decided to move the invoice forward for payment, and for Mr. Gancarz to review the pending balance and related charges.

MOTION by Mr. Carroll; seconded by Mr. Scannell.

MOVED that the WPCA approve payment of the AECOM Invoice #37352417, in the amount of \$12,178.88.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

**d. West Johnson Pump Station
 AECOM Invoice #37352365 dated June 17, 2013 in the amount of \$3,024.00**

MOTION by Mr. Bowman; seconded by Mr. Kasinskas

MOVED that the WPCA approve payment of the AECOM Invoice #37352365, in the amount of \$3,024.00

Discussion

Mr. Chelton reported on a letter dated June 10, 2013 to WPCA on this project. The estimate is \$2.3 million for construction, plus engineering and contingencies at 30%, the proposed budget would be \$3 million. West Johnson Avenue pump station had only enough funding to get 90%, and there is still 10% design to happen for final completion.

A question was posed by Mr. Pelton regarding that design and if the north end project was built into the pump station project.

Mr. Gancarz said there was 100,000+ gallons, and an extra 50,000 gallons in special flows included.

Mr. Perrotti asked about any advantage of coming in under budget, and accelerating this project based on what happens in the north end.

There is plenty of capacity and Mr. Gancarz said it is more of maintenance, bringing pumps up to date, without a need to accelerate the project. In putting together the Public Works Department capital projects for submission to the Town Manager, this number was revised, and it has been carried in the past at \$1.8 million in the Five Year Plan.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

a. Update on insurance claim against Cariati Developers

There is no further resolution on this claim.

b. Status of CT-WARN Membership

There is nothing new on this issue.

Mr. Pelton advised that CT-WARN membership documentation has been sent to the Town Attorney for legal review. This is an organization for mutual aid for water pollution control plants in Connecticut if there is loss of a generator, pump, etc. The group works out rental fees, workers comp, liability exposure, and other issues.

c. Operating the plant after major rain events

After the recent heavy rains, Mr. Pelton stopped at the plant. Crews were working hard to keep things moving; material was moving through at a great rate; there were zero overflows, zero manhole covers; and Supt. Dievert and his crews managed the heavy rain and make things work to keep the plant in regulatory compliance.

6. TOWN ENGINEER'S REPORT

a. I/I Update

The flow metering information was received a week ago, and Mr. Gancarz noted that during the month of measuring flows it was the driest period of the year. The key is the provision of a good look at the baseline flow. The 2.1 million gallons per day is an accurate flow as to what the treatment plant will see with no I/I in the system.

Mr. Gancarz distributed a status sheet showing the pump stations and the Cheshire Sewer System Flows for dry and wet weather. He reviewed the chart and the flows with the Authority members, noting the variations of flow in dry and wet weather. He noted that the area tributary to Elmwood is the area to zero in on, as other areas are in decent shape; sealing the interceptors in low lying areas a few years ago has been effective in reducing flows from other areas.

The Authority members discussed flow meters, the cost of these meters, and Mr. Gancarz will be meeting with representatives of the manufacturer. Mr. Chelton will also get prices and advise the Authority.

Mr. Pelton said that the work should start at the south end of Town.

AECOM has some data on the south end, and Mr. Chelton said the biggest problem is sump pumps which flow at 15 to 60 gallons a minute, and everything points to sump pumps causing the overflows. With 50 sump pumps working that is 3000 gallons a minute, or 4 mgd. Some communities are offering residents incentives to remove sump pumps from the sewer system, in a set time period, with reimbursement of the cost (i.e. up to a maximum of \$500) to get it done, and these programs have been successful. If the sump pump removal is not done within this time period, residents are fined, and then ordered to do the disconnect at their own expense. He estimates no more than 200 sump pumps connected to the system in Cheshire.

The Authority was told by Mr. Gancarz that the discharge general permit fee was put in place to generate some of this revenue. The earlier study estimated 600 houses were inspected, and about 5% or 250 had connections. The disconnection program would be good for the costs involved.

Mr. Bowman said the simplest way to disconnect sump pumps would be to put them into the storm sewers as long as there was capacity with a back flow valve. If there was overflow it would not back up into the basement of the house. He also said that the \$500 payment would go a long way, and Mr. Gancarz could come up with a plan and specifications for connection to the storm sewers.

There was a survey done a few years ago for homes with sump pumps and Mr. Chelton said about 40 were found. A pilot study was also done on this, and not all houses have storm sewers nearby, and to tie into the storm sewer could be expensive. People can discharge water into their front or back yards.

Councilor Schrumm raised the idea of using cameras in neighborhoods late at night and catching the clear water flow into the sewer system.

At this time the sump pumps can be identified, but Mr. Gancarz said there is no mechanism in place to remove these pumps.

With the revaluation program, there could be identification of sump pumps, but this data is not yet available.

b. Water consumption billing update

Mr. Gancarz stated that the data has been received from RWA for 2012 on water supplied to Cheshire. He reviewed the data and the graph for residential gallons per day and the number of residential customers per range of usage.

Graph # 1 – Number of residential customers vs. gallons of water used per day. There are 6,333 residents supplied; 4,900 are sewer customers.

Graph # 2 – Number of non-residential customers vs. gallons used per day. 434 non-residential users, and they already pay for gallons consumed.

Graph # 3 – Option One: Cost of water use vs. number of people.

Using this option, all the water consumed is divided into the WPC budget, for cost per gallon and breakout of the water bills; 777 residence bills would go to less than \$100; 1672 residence bills would be \$100 to \$200; 1642 residents would be \$200 to \$300; 1028 residences would be in the same range as now; 492 residences would pay \$400 to \$500; 271 residences at \$500 to \$600; 144 residences at \$600 to \$700; 109 residences at \$700 to \$800.

A significant point in this option is that we would see 1000 residences having a dramatic increase in their sewer use invoice.

Graph # 4 – Option Two: In the WPCD budget, 77% of the water costs are fixed (salaries, benefits); 22.5% are variable costs tied to electricity, chemicals and other costs; under this option 1200 residence billings would be \$274 to \$300, and this would be for the majority of the 4600 residences; and 323 residences would see an increase in their invoice.

There is past data based on the number of fixtures in a household, and it was determined that this is not feasible. Mr. Gancarz has discussed programs and options with surrounding towns. For Cheshire residences on wells, discharging to the sewer system, there would be requirement to have a water meter installed to generate the data for billing. The advantage to Cheshire billing in arrears, is knowing the budget, how much water was used in the past year, and how much to charge to get to that number. Water usage changes from year to year. Some towns base their billing on the water usage; some do quarterly billings which include seasonal usage so there is a fluctuation in revenue with quarterly billings and need for a reserve account.

Mr. Gancarz will have a draft report for the Authority in advance of the next meeting, but wanted to share the data received to date with members.

c. Status CCI Back Bill

The Authority was informed by Mr. Gancarz that Town Manager Milone received a letter from the DOC commissioner which stated that Cheshire does not have enough hard data from 2003 to the time when the new meters were installed at the prison facility. A letter was drafted by Mr. Gancarz and Mr. Milone to the DOC commissioner which walks through 2003 to the present time. Research was done on the prison population over the 10 year period; this population has decreased significantly; the 310 bed Webster facility closed.

When Mr. Gancarz and Mr. Dievert met with the Cheshire prison staff, they were told that I & I work was being done over a period of years along with flow conservation measures. With reduction in prison population in Cheshire, steps done to reduce I&I and water use, the question is why the numbers were lower before than they are now, and it stands to reason that the more recent data is more accurate and reflective of what was going on before. There may be a meeting needed with the technical staff to review these issues.

d. Revised/consolidated WPCA application forms

The revised forms for "Application for Feasibility Approval for Extension of Public Sanitary Sewers" and "Application for Final Design and Award of Capacity Approval for Extension of Public Sanitary Sewers" and the "Agreement" between developer and WPCA were reviewed and discussed by the Authority members.

At the present time there is a three step process, and Mr. Gancarz said it can be onerous; some questions are asked three (3) times on the forms; and he would prefer a two (2) step process. The forms and agreement would be on-line for easier completion, and this will tighten up the process.

Authority members agreed that this revision was long overdue, and the process will be streamlined.

7. NEW BUSINESS

a. Approval of the revised WPCA application forms

MOTION by Mr. Bowman; seconded by Mr. Carroll.

MOVED that the WPCA approve and accept the revised/consolidated WPCA application forms.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

b. Discussion of raising the WPCA application fee.

There was a brief discussion on the raising the \$25 application fee, the fact that there have been few applications received in the past year, and if there should be a sliding fee.

Mr. Kasinskas stated that the fees imposed should cover the costs of the legal notice along with fixed costs.

If this fee does not cover the costs, Mr. Bowman said it just another tax.

The fees for IWW and PZC were revised in the past few years. Mr. Carroll explained that, for the WPCA to raise its fees, it must come before the Town Council which would refer the matter to the Ordinance Review Committee for approval to the full Council.

Mr. Gancarz will canvass other communities on their application fees as well as other Town fees, and report back to the WPCA at the July meeting.

c. Review and discussion of draft motions regarding feasibility and final design/award of capacity applications

Chairman Pelton and Mr. Gancarz will work together on streamlining and enhancement of the approval form with a draft motion at the July meeting.

Regarding the fee for general permit discharges to the system, Mr. Gancarz said a letter was received on the DOT project at Routes 68/70 at the intersection of the Farmington Canal. Over a five month period 6 million gallons was discharged to the system, which would have been about \$60,000 in possible revenue to the Town. There cannot be back billing on this discharge.

The Authority was informed by Mr. Gancarz that last week there was an issue at the Cook Hill Pump Station, with an emergency call from the resident of the lowest lying house in this area of town. In the past this house was flooded out during a heavy rainstorm, and the owner just refinished his basement. He heard a gurgling noise in the basement, called Mr. Dievert, and it was found that the pumps in the station were both clogged and not running. Water built up to 18 feet (out of 20 feet). Mr. Dievert mobilized three different septic tank haulers, pumped out the station, and a flooding disaster was avoided. The homeowner was most appreciative and sent Town Manager Milone a letter commending Town staff on how well the matter was handled.

Mr. Gancarz stated that this pump station should be moved up in the process, as there are continual clogging problems with the pumps, and we should revisit discussions with Elim Park about a shredder at the front end. One of the pumps is no longer attached to the rail, and another is not attached very well, and issues should be addressed at this station.

8. OLD BUSINESS

a. Status of new OPM Map

Mr. Kasinskas reported the newly approved application forms will have to be further adjusted because the legislature approved the Plan of Conservation and Development. OPM put in additional and stronger language regarding the map, and on the web site there is a message about the map, which Mr. Kasinskas read into the record. If there is a local plan that is more detailed and better and can be backed up, then the local plan will win out. Based on the well done Facilities Plan of Cheshire and updating process of the local Plan of Conservation and Development, the Town is in good stead with strong, well supported documents. They will supersede whatever the State has in its generalized statewide Plan.

The new OPM map will have to be consulted as part of the applications.

Mr. Bowman reported that the State has extended the submission of updated local Plans to July 2015.

According to Mr. Kasinskas, the message to the Authority is the importance of the Facilities Plan being migrated into the overall Plan of Conservation and Development.

Mr. Bowman commented on the changes in the OPM map, and said it might be advantageous for WPCA to have a plan for sewerage of areas not in its plan, and having a developer pay for this work.

b. Status of open WPCA position

Chairman Pelton stated that a nomination from the Republican Town Committee will be submitted to the Town Council for appointment to the WPCA.

c. Septic System Summary from Chesprocott dated June 3, 2013

The May list in the report from Chesprocott was extensive for failures discovered and repairs inspected.

d. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting of May 22, 2013, and Special Meeting of June 6, 2013.

MOTION by Mr. Carroll; seconded by Mr. Scannell.

MOVED to accept and approve the minutes of June 6, 2013 subject to corrections, additions, deletions.

VOTE The motion passed 4-02; Perrotti and Bowman abstained.

With regard to the May 22, 2013 meeting, Chairman Pelton stated that there was no quorum present so it was a non-meeting; discussions were held; no actions were taken; and approval of minutes was tabled to the July meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Bowman; seconded by Mr. Carroll.

MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 9:52 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk

