

Town of Cheshire Water Pollution Control Authority  
(W.P.C.A.)  
Regular Meeting  
Wednesday, April 23, 2014 at 7:30 p.m.  
Town Hall Council Chambers 84 South Main Street, Cheshire, CT

---

Members present: Chairman Timothy Pelton, Matthew Bowman, Ken Cianci, Steve Carroll, and John Perrotti.

Members absent: Mark Kasinskas and Thomas Scannell.

Staff: Town Engineer Walter Gancarz, Waste Water Treatment Plant Superintendent Dennis Deivert, and Town Attorney Andrew Lord.

Guest: Don Chelton from AECOM.

Pledge of Allegiance: All present recited the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call: The roll was called. Chairman Pelton determined there were enough members present for a quorum.

Emergency Evacuation Notice: Chairman Pelton read the emergency evacuation notice.

**1. Public Communications**

**Article "Fighting Clogs Efficiently at a Wisconsin Water Station"**

Chairman Pelton stated under public communications they have an article provided by Steve Carroll regarding a wastewater treatment facility in Wisconsin that is have some chronic problems with shredding material and wipes and it's an issue we are trying to deal with in town in an efficient and effective manner – so our situation is not unique to the Town of Cheshire.

**2. Applications**

**a. Informal presentation of proposed sewerage plans for WS Development**

Chairman Pelton item number two is an informal presentation from WS Development.

Attorney Anthony Fazzone of Fazzone, Ryan and Ricciuti, LLC and Daron Overton, PE from Milone and MacBroom were present on behalf of WS Development. Jeffrey Curley and Andrew Manning from WS Development were also present.

Jeanette Bothroyd of 1988 Highland Ave, Cheshire, CT and Bill Morgansen, 78 Jennie Road of Marlborough, CT were also present.

Attorney Fazzone addressed the Authority.

Attorney Fazzone said they were here this evening seeking direction from the Authority on the nature of the proposed sewerage of this project; this concerns the outlets at Cheshire North End Shopping Center located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Route 10 and I-691.

Attorney Fazzone stated the entire project was originally approved back January 2008 by both the Wetlands Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission and just prior to that in December of 2007 they had received feasibility approval from the Authority; the project was then delayed because of the downturn in the economy and ultimately changed from a full retail center to an outlet center – pretty much the same square footage and the other aspects – the residential and the hotel aspects remain as future stages but still part of the overall plan.

Attorney Fazzone said as March 4, 2014 they received final development plan which is considered a site plan approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission and the slight modifications to the Wetlands application was approved in July.

Attorney Fazzone said the feasibility approval included consideration of a gravity root to the sewer that would have passed under 691 to the pump station on West Johnson Avenue.

Attorney Fazzone said he thought they (the Authority) have been provided with a narrative prepared by Milone and MacBroom about the elevation of the plan for sewerage this project – that narrative contains copies of correspondence that are all related to discussions that the developer has had with the property owner to the south of 691 and their unsuccessful attempts to obtain an easement which would have been necessary to install a gravity system – he said the ultimate guidance that we’re looking for from the Authority is whether the system should be a public system or whether it should be a private system.

Mr. Overton addressed the Authority.

Mr. Overton said we did submit a brief narrative to the Commission – the narrative went through a description of the project – a little bit of the history of seeking the easement for the gravity sewer connection and in section is on the anticipated flows for the site; under the feasibility analysis we’re approved for a flow that’s slightly higher than what’s

anticipated right now for the overall site; the change to the outlet center based on the mix of what's in there has a slight reduction in flow.

Mr. Overton said they're estimating 91,800 gallons per day to serve the entire project; he said it's his understanding based on the research of the facilities plan that when it was updated that there was 105,360 gallons per day that was reserved for this project at that time; so we are still within that flow allocation that was reserved for this.

Mr. Overton said the plans that they submitted with this application – the plan was to design this all per the town standards – the gravity collection system – the pump station and then provide whatever easements are necessary to turn the system over to the town recognizing that there are areas beyond the site that could eventually be tied in the future.

Mr. Overton said he would go over the plan quickly – he highlighted some of the more important items – he showed on the plan the location of the gravity collection system that's proposed for the site; so we have a gravity main that's looped around to serve all the retail buildings; there's a main that runs to the west through the Great Fill into the location of a proposed pump station over along the western access road; there's an access road that runs all the way out as planned for the project to connect to Dickerman Road.

Mr. Overton said there's also planned what they are calling a future gravity extension which is under consideration for now but could be included in the plan as part of the design; highlighted on the plan is the gravity extension of the onsite collection system which would run up to Route 10; this was included in the feasibility analysis as an option for extension out to Route 10 for future connection if there were properties to be developed on the opposite side – the east side of Route 10.

Mr. Overton said lastly on the plan – is the forced main connection where the forced main from the pump station would be routed out through the development site starting in that access road to Dickerman – across the proposed timber bridge for the site – we would hand it in one of the bays on the timber bridge then into the central roadway system through the round-about and out through an emergency access out to Route 10; once in Route 10 the force main would then run southerly down towards the Johnson Avenue intersection; it would cross over the 691 bridge and again we would hang it on the existing bridge that's there and coordinate with DOT as far as the details of how that would be hung; we have researched the existing bridge – there's electrical communications and a gas main that's already hung under the bridge; we've looked at the various connection details that they've used

for that and have an idea of how DOT would want to see that connected on the bridge but we would still have to work out the details with them; from there it would go back in the ground in Route 10; the bays that are filled with the utilities now are mostly on the eastside of Route 10 on the bridge so we would have to run that forced main along the western side of the bridge and then switch back over to the eastern side of Route 10 – mainly because the gas main does the opposite – the gas main swings over and runs along the western side; it would run just past where we have two large gas transmission lines that cross Route 10 – one is a 30” pipe and the other is a 26” or 28” so we would cross that with the forced main and then connect into a gravity main extension; as the system currently exists there’s gravity sewer in the intersection at Route 10 with East and West Johnson so we would be proposing an extension of gravity sewer up to the point where the forced main would tie in just on the south side of those gas transmission lines.

Mr. Overton said so that’s overall how we planned the project to this point – we worked through the design based on how we’ve thought this through at this point – we are probably at a point where we’re 30% to 50% designed on this – and we are at kind of a critical point where input from the Commission would be helpful in order for us to get final direction on how to move forward with the design – so that’s one of the main reasons we’re here tonight – so if you have any questions or we would certainly welcome any feedback on what’s been submitted.

Chairman Pelton asked do the buildings in this layout represent just phase one or phase one and phase two together.

Mr. Overton explained what we’ve provided on the plans here is essentially the first phase of the approval which is gone through a final development plan approval with the Planning and Zoning Commission; right now we have a full local land use approvals on that part of the project; there is a future phase of the project which is outlined in the flow summary where on the west side of the river there would be planned a hotel, a fitness center and then residential units as well.

Chairman Pelton said he was assuming the timing of phase one is fairly current and that’s why you are before us tonight; do you have any sense of the timing on phase two – the residential and hotel.

Mr. Overton stated there’s no plan as far as timing for the later phases yet.

Chairman Pelton said looking at the plan – what point do you anticipate would be turned over to the town - from the pump station – the whole forced main – can you talk a little bit about that.

Mr. Overton said right now what we are considering is designing everything to the town standards and turning over the entire system to the town; there's certainly options to limit the amount that gets turned over; he said he would certainly expect that the main that comes through the site – that would be extended just to serve properties on the east side of Route 10; he said he assumed that the town would certainly want to own and control that main as it comes down through the site and connects into the pump station; other portions of the site – there could be possible future connections off of that; it's really a matter of preferences of this Commission and working out the details of it going forward; at this point they would be looking to turn the whole system over.

Chairman Pelton said in terms of a forced main going under the bridge – how do you engineer against freezing or different nuances that could occur during the winter because it's exposed to the elements.

Mr. Overton said we would expect that it would be installed and likely heat traced in order to prevent any freezing issues – heat traced provides heat in the line with an electrical connection to provide for heat along that line if necessary.

Chairman Pelton asked if they had any dialogue with DOT at this point either to suspend the force main from the bridge and or re-engineer on-ramps – off ramps of 691 or the Route 10 Interchange at West Johnson East Johnson.

Mr. Overton replied we have and the first phase of the OSTA permit process pending with the DOT; we have been working on that for several months now; it used to be what was referred to as the STC – the State Traffic Commission and they now refer to themselves as OSTA – Office of State Traffic Authority; so we have been working through the various widening lane arrangements in various improvements along Route 10 as well as the access ramps and the entrances to this project; so that has been ongoing for several months and we are working through that; we have had preliminary discussions with the DOT regarding various options for bringing water and sewer across 691 up to serve the site; so they are aware of our intention to bring those utilities up to this property – we haven't yet worked out the details of that with them.

Mr. Perrotti asked would the Authority here know how much open space is beyond this that could potentially be developed – looking at future use for this; on the east side not the west side.

Mr. Overton showed an aerial map used as part of the wetlands process and getting the local land use approvals from wetlands; he showed the location of 691 – the subject property – the Ten Mile River that runs through the site – Peck Lane is to the west – Saint Joseph Street – and at the most easterly edge of the Napoli Foods Warehouse; then there's Dickerman – the Rails to Trails right of way through here then Peck Lane so there's a little a bit of open undeveloped property between the railroad and Dickerman; on the eastside of Route 10 you can see the commuter parking lot; and then there's property that the State of Connecticut owns further to the east as well as there's a couple of residences also on the east side; Southington town line is the northern boundary of the project; the Rivercrest Development is on the other side in Southington.

Mr. Overton said there is some potential for development on either side of the property; in the feasibility analysis we did look at some of those overall properties and it was discussed at that point.

Mr. Bowman asked about soil types to the east of the property – what are they – are they the same soil types - sandy – good for drainage – good for septic systems.

Mr. Overton said he believed most of those soils are sandy type of soil.

Mr. Bowman asked if Mr. Overton had any idea of how many acres approximately that would be for future development.

Mr. Overton stated we looked at in the feasibility approval we looked at the sewer shed on the east side which he believed was in the interchange zone – we figured there was about possibly 33.8 acres that could potentially tie into this; he though the State owns a little bit more than that but some of that drops off pretty quickly in the back and it's not likely that would be able to tie in by gravity – it would probably need another pump station if they were to tie into the full property; we were kind of looking at more of the properties along the frontage of Route 10; and then over on the west side we estimated there's probably only about 16 acres and we estimated that the 600 gallons per day per acre which is what we were estimating for flows based on the facilities plan had used that number for estimating potential flows; so 33.8 acres east of Route 10 and then the potential for about 16 acres west of Dickerman.

Mr. Bowman said so 50 acres total and you were figuring how many gallons a day.

Mr. Overton said it was around 30,000 gallons per day potential additional flow that could come into this.

Mr. Bowman asked if it was for the entire project.

Mr. Overton stated that's additional flow beyond our project; the project is the 90,000 something gallons per day - in the area.

Mr. Overton stated so we're roughly maybe another third.

Mr. Bowman asked if you plan on making any type – he said he knew they were going to plan for the infrastructure that your putting in for your facilities to extend to Route 10 at a later date but you're not going to extend that – you are going to stop at your last piece of property but that main will be sized for an additional 30,000 gallons per day.

Mr. Overton stated the gravity mains would be sized to handle flow beyond the project itself.

Chairman Pelton said similar to DOT were there discussions with Algonquin Gas or Tennessee Transmission.

Mr. Overton said yes he did have conversations with both Yankee Gas and Algonquin to try to gather information on the transmission lines; unfortunately in his conversation with Algonquin even though they did have mapping that had information on the depth of the mains they were reluctant to release because they felt it would open up to liability in us designing this going across; he said he believed based on the elevation of the roadway that's there and based on the understanding that he's got from Yankee Gas – that their gas main runs over the top of the transmission lines; that there should be enough room for us to run the force main over the top without issue; Algonquin said the only the way they would verify elevations is for us to do test pits out there; at this point based on the condition of the pavement in Route 10 he didn't think DOT would want us going out there doing test pits now; we would likely show that on the plans prior to construction to verify the transmission elevation – to make sure there's enough clearance.

Mr. Carroll asked what's their experience with building similar centers and then handing over the sewer system to the municipality – is that common – what sort of issues are experienced to have in that regard.

Mr. Curley said they've done it both ways – we've built pump stations and infrastructure that we then turned over to the community and in many places we have privately owned pump stations that we own and maintain ourselves to we sort of done it both ways and its worked for us both ways.

Mr. Carroll said so if the municipality if it took over the facility would have to have more or less unencumbered access to those facilities at all times.

Mr. Curley stated correct.

Mr. Carroll asked if that would happen.

Mr. Curley stated yes.

Mr. Carroll said he would just want to make sure that staff not having that experience in this type of center that everybody was very comfortable with that situation.

Mr. Bowman said in what is being said – the only benefit to the town the way he sees it is the future development; and that's why he asked for the soil types – if the soil types are – which he thinks they are good for private systems what the benefit be to the town to take this whole system over for 50 acres of land.

Mr. Gancarz said the area shown east of Route 10 is shown in our growth area and he guessed the determination would be what would go in there – although septic systems would be good for straight residential; if there are some commercial industrial facilities that septic systems wouldn't be appropriate for – that would have to be a consideration.

Mr. Bowman asked what is the zone for that area.

Mr. Gancarz said it was an I-2 (he was pretty sure); it's an interchange zone as well that quadrant of the north east property.

Mr. Bowman said the issue they have too is the State owns for half of the property; he asked if Attorney Fazzone knew the minimum acreage required for that type of development.

Attorney Fazzone stated its 10 acres in the interchange zone.

Mr. Bowman said the way he's looking at it right now is there's approximately 50 acres of developable land – the State of Connecticut owns 33 of those acres so really the possibility exists for one similar type building or retail structure in that area.

Attorney Fazzone stated that aspect of the interchange zone that this project was approved under is a 30 acre minimum – the straight forward interchange zone is 10 acres; another similar size project would require

most of the land on that side; he said the other consideration he thought to provide for sewers over there is that the property is also over the aquifer – that side of the road is over the aquifer.

Mr. Perrotti said Dennis comments from you regarding maintenance of pump stations –problems – issues – potentially hotels other things like that.

Mr. Deivert said it's a lot of work for the town to cover another pump station – it's a high profile pump station – with shopping and restaurants; that's why we spoke about making sure the pump station is designed by town standards so that we'd be comfortable taking it over; another concern he had is the heat tracing on the line because that needs to be either a thermal coupled with an alarm system or such that if that should fail someone needs to know about especially in lieu of the winter we had this past winter; there's a lot more maintenance – a pump station is a pump station.

Mr. Carroll asked if phase one is approved and WS Development builds the system – is it after at the conclusion of phase one that the system gets turned over and now is it municipal owned system; and does WS Development come back to this Authority for additional capacity for over 30,000 or whatever – do we have the change to or does WS are they grandfathered in for additions to that system – he said procedurally he wasn't sure – he would like to be clear on that – and he was not sure it could be answered.

Chairman Pelton said it was his understanding – the approximate 91,000 gallons per day in your attachment is for both phase one and phase two whenever that should occur; and that phase one in simple math is half of that number – it was 40% - 45% but somewhere in that ballpark; so as we're proceeding down both phase one and phase two represent in round numbers 91,000 gallons per day if the whole phase one and phase one and phase two were done and he assumed that probably be in your application should we get to that point and then we would look at codicils – we would build in as phase one as completed and however we arrange future maintenance of the system and then we would go through phase two as a second continued application recognizing there are timelines on applications.

Mr. Perrotti asked if there was a reason why you decided to take the force main right through the middle of your development as opposed to skirting around the edges in case there were potential future problems.

Mr. Overton explained the initial thought on that was really just to take the path of least resistance – the shortest run around and avoid any

high points – the grade where the buildings are is relatively flat – we come across the bridge and then it rises up through there so the intention was just to take the shortest route and avoid high points.

Mr. Deivert asked how long was the forced main in feet.

Mr. Overton said it was not sure; in looking at the plan he stated it starts at the pump station – around station 9+00 and ties in at almost 43 – he said it was about 33,000' to 34,000'.

Chairman Pelton asked about the future use – the future gravity extension.

Mr. Overton said if the Commission felt that that extension was appropriate we would design that in as part of this project so it would basically a dry sewer would go in so that the improvements wouldn't have to be dug up in the future – right now we're showing it as future because we're not sure whether the Commission desires to have that extension out there or not.

Chairman Pelton said if you have all the equipment there and you are doing all the excavations just make another loop up for future potential use.

Mr. Overton stated right – we'd run a dry sewer line under the roadway there and up to a manhole in Route 10; our improvements in Route 10 to extend beyond that northern intersection so it would be the logical time to put that in.

Chairman Pelton asked Walt as the town engineer asked if he'd had a chance to look at this and does it pass muster with good engineering practices.

Mr. Gancarz said yes – there are a few things he thought they should talk about though – he said he knew they included information in the package on the gravity alternative – but for the folks who aren't here tonight and would be interested into why we are not this by gravity – if you could kind of just give us a capsule summary as to why the pumped alternative is the choice instead of the gravity.

Mr. Overton explained that this plan doesn't fully show the gravity extension but there was an alternative submitted with the feasibility; essentially we had a similar collection system planned for onsite and then the gravity trunk line would run to the south out towards the 691 right of way – there's a bridge here over the Ten Mile River and the highway is elevated well above the Ten Mile River; some of you might

recall the Apple Valley Mall project years ago that was planned on a portion of this site and the Rivercrest site; that project had rights of access under 691 to build potentially utility connection; we researched early on in the project with DOT and they concurred that those rights still exist so there were rights on the east side of the Ten Mile River would allow us to put a gravity sewer underneath the highway – it would be relatively deep below the highway and then we looked at the elevation of the sewer main down by the West Johnson pump station and it was clear we could make that connection and serve the site by gravity; we would have needed to get additional rights from the DOT because there's actually a parcel south of 691 that they own that has a stormwater management basin associated with the highway on it; between that property and West Johnson Avenue is another privately owned property – 300' to 500' of property we would have to cross in order to make that connection.

Mr. Overton said back when we looked at this project four or five years ago there was a different owner then there was today - WS Development had made efforts and there's documentation with the narrative that we submitted with both property owners – there were efforts made to secure an easement across that private property – to date that has been unachievable to get that easement secured and basically with the project forward and schedule becoming an issue we've decided to move forward with the pump station because the gravity main no longer seems to be an option without those right.

Chairman Pelton asked in the early stage of development were any overtures made to the Town of Southington.

Mr. Overton said we did have discussions with the Town of Southington about service to that area; it was there understanding that this was in the facilities plan for Cheshire that we would always tie into Cheshire.

Mr. Gancarz said second thing is – he said he knew they had given some documentation on the expected flows and compared those to other similar facilities in Canton, CT, Augusta, ME and Millberry, MA and that was something we had asked for when we originally sat down – he said when you come in with a full application if you could just show those and explain those a little bit better because some of the unit flow rates your using are lesser than text book values – we did want you to take a look at other similar facilities so we just need that fleshed out more so so we can see that; two other things that have to do with the technical – since we are talking about two phases and roughly phase one is 60% and phase two is 40% - something we'll want to look for are variable speed pumps because the flows that you have initially are going to be significantly less than what it might be when its fully

developed so we want to make sure we have that accounted for; and for one final thing is where this comes into East Johnson where the forced main enters the gravity sewer that will also be the same sewer hat our large West Johnson pump station pumps into so we would want to make sure that sewer is adequate to handle both – worst case scenario of your pump going on full tilt and also the West Johnson pumping at peak.

Chairman Pelton stated there were no other comments from the Authority; he opened the meeting up to comments from staff.

Mr. Chelton said another item is you are going to have a peaking factor on those design flows – have they established that.

Mr. Overton stated we have not - at this point we were just looking at a peaking factor of four; but we would certainly be looking for guidance from the Authority would like us to use.

Mr. Chelton said he was going back through some documents that were submitted back in 2007 – in the flow allowance at that time – we had commented at that time – just to give a little history – we had prepared a letter in December 2007 that did a review of the preliminary plans at that time – the concept plans – he thought the Authority gave feasibility approval at that time – and we commented about the flows – its substantially different than text book flows – the other item also was an infiltration allowance; there was no allowance at that that time for some infiltration- he didn't think it was going to be a significant amount but it's something that probably should be considered.

Mr. Chelton said somebody made a comment about crossing over the bridge and the heat tracing – we did a project ten years ago in Southington across 84 – we hung the bridge from 84 – wrapped it with installation similar to what they are proposing – heat traced it; there a box on the side of the bridge by the road that has an alarm system on it that allows the operates to go by and look at it – he said he didn't remember if that goes back to the plant or not but at least they can see if the heat tracing is operating so that's been done before; he said the other thing that was mentioned was there was going to be a pipe hung from a bridge on the property as well crossing the Ten Mile River.

Mr. Overton stated yes.

Mr. Chelton asked if they planned on doing the same thing there was the installation and heat tracing.

Mr. Overton stated yes.

Chairman Pelton said seeing no more comments from the Authority or staff we thanked you for your attendance – we know this is a major project to come before us and this is the first chance we've had to review it in detail – we will work with our town engineer and prepare notes and give you our feedback in preparation for whatever feedback and recommendations we have and go forward from there.

Chairman Pelton asked if the meeting was going to be open to public comment; he explained that normally we don't have a public comment session but he was going to use the Chairman's prerogative to open it – we have guests here that were not part of regular attendees; the meeting was opened up for public comment.

Jeanette Bothroyd of 1988 Highland Ave, Cheshire, CT (where she lives and runs a landscaping business with her son at this address) addressed the Commission. She said in reading her following letter she also represented Connie Dice (1972 Highland Avenue, Cheshire, CT).

Ms. Bothroyd said 1988 and 1972 Highland Avenue are located on the east side of Route 10 at the corner of 691's exit 3 directly across from Route 10 at The Outlets at Cheshire; she said she's been at this location for nearly forty years; she said her letter expresses concerns for their ability to sell the combined 6.5 acres without having definitive sewer and water services and also the access into and out of their property; she said in her opinion when her property is sold it would be a valuable tax generating property.

Ms. Bothroyd read a letter dated April 23, 2014 addressed to Cheshire WPCA into the record; the letter was submitted by Jeanette Bothroyd, 1988 Highland Avenue and Constance Dice at 1972 Highland Avenue.

The letter voiced the authors support for the WS proposal and asked for clarification on several items; what is the plan to extend sewers into this area with a pump station; how will their properties be provided service and where will the connection be made for their properties; the proposed road changes may limit access to turn right in and out of their properties – what provisions will be made or what is a reasonable solution; how will the water be supplied to their properties on the east side of Route 10 in the future – can the water line that will service The Outlets at Cheshire be extended.

The letter was entered into the record.

Chairman Pelton thanked Ms. Bothroyd for her input and stated they will not be taking any action tonight but he highly valued her letter and they

would mill that into all the discussion they were going to have; he said just to be clear your property is north of the west bound ramp coming off 691 to Route 10 between there and the commuter parking lot.

Ms. Bothroyd stated that was correct.

Bill Morgansen, 78 Jennie Road of Marlborough, CT a family friend of the Bothroyd's addressed the Authority by stating his background has been in development for 40 years – he was the developer in Glastonbury for Summerset Square; he said he did not have a financial interest in this – he was here advising Jeanette; he said the acreage on the east side of that area – 33 acres – its buildable – the State of Connecticut has 44 acres – Jeanette has 6.5 acres; 9,000 SF or 10,000 SF buildable per acre; so you have the ability to build about 300,000 SF in that quadrant if the State makes that land buildable for development.

Mr. Morgansen expressed his opinions about providing for the development of the land across the street from the proposed commercial project; he said a commercial development of that magnitude will attract other uses- it will complement that – it will be high quality and tax generators; he said it would be wise as far as Cheshire is concerned to provide the ability for that to be developed; he said right now Jeanette can't sell her property – it sits on an aquifer – any commercial development will not go into that location without sewer so she's waiting for sewers to have the opportunity to sell her property for other than a house; so she is looking for your help and WS's help to provide that.

Chairman Pelton said this was a major project to come before us – there are lots of nuances we need to digest stating he has the right to call a special meeting of the WPCA – it will be publicly noticed and we can begin to address the open items that we concur with and we will communicate all of our recommendations, findings and proposals through our town engineer to WS.

### 3. Projects

- a. AECOM Invoice 37432072 dated April 11, 2014 in the amount of \$134,512.31

Mr. Gancarz stated he has reviewed this invoice and recommends payment of as such.

Motion: To pay the AECOM invoice dated April 11, 2014 in the amount of \$134,512.31 for services on the W.P.C.A Upgrade Project from March 8, 2014 through April 4, 2014.

Moved by Mr. Perrotti. Seconded by Mr. Bowman. Motion carried unanimously of those members present.

- b. Carlin Contracting Company pay estimate 5 dated March 31, 2014 in the amount of \$563,746.15

Mr. Gancarz said regarding Carlin's request as to payment estimate number 5 for \$563,746.15 he recommends payment; a lot of this payment has to do with underground piping and electrical conduits plus the dewatering and concrete; and for the reinforcement concrete work for the slab and walls of the three main structures that are going in there especially the UV phosphorus building along with some selected demo.

Motion: To pay the Carlin Contracting Company invoiced dated March 31, 2014 in the amount of \$563,746.15 for Water Pollution Control Plant Upgrade Project; Contract Number 1231-06; Est. No. 5; work through March 31, 2014.

Moved by Mr. Carroll. Seconded by Mr. Perrotti.

Mr. Bowman stated he had a discussion with Walter prior to the meeting; Walter had reviewed all these and made recommendation to us to make a motion to pay it; he said he recommended that something be submitted in writing so we can move his wording because at the previous meeting there were problems with some of the numbers and things like that so he thought if Walter could do it and present something in writing it would be much easier for us.

Chairman Pelton stated we can make that happen.

Motion carried unanimously of those members present.

#### 4. Superintendent's Report

- a. Digester cleaning debris effecting plant process

Mr. Deivert explained they had a problem back this last storm March 30-31 when we received 4" of rain and what has been happening over the last three and a half months with the digester cleaning unbeknownst to us is that their belt press hasn't been running up to par and a lot of the debris and material that they had been removing from the digester has been inadvertently been dumped into our wet well; weren't not sure how much or how long but when we got the rain in March - the debris in the wet well got stirred up with the high flow and started plugging other cooling lines to our pumps so we had people there all day Sunday trying

to maintain the level in the interceptor and get the material back to through system; after flushing the lines a couple of times we noticed a black debris which was an unusual problem; not knowing that was the problem at that time we were able to get the pumps running – what was happening was all that material was blowing in the four primary clarifiers – so they had problems removing the debris from the primary clarifiers and at that time we were having pump issues ourselves and that's when it came to mind this debris came from the digester cleaner.

Mr. Deivert said they notified the contractor and Walter was down there and we tallied up what it cost and they have a credit coming to us for the overtime, the added disposal costs and the electricity and utilizes used to remove the process. Since then they've brought in a frac tank so what they are doing now is prior to the material getting to the belt press it's going to the frac tank where it's being mixed and being caught before it's getting back to the plant; so far we've been on top of them watching them a lot closer and we haven't had that problem again.

Mr. Deivert stated he did want the Authority to know we are getting a credit for that – somewhere around \$13,000 to \$14,000.

Chairman Pelton said he knew cleaning the digester has been problematic and he gave them a little slack due to weather but that opportunity has past – how close are we to having the digester completely evacuated.

Mr. Deivert said it's probably down about 3' to 4' now – more in the last couple of weeks – he said he was hoping by the second week in May they will be out of here – at the longest hopefully sooner.

Mr. Perrotti asked if there were any long term effects from the problems that they have.

Mr. Deivert said it's too early to tell if they did – there's a lot of grit material that went through the system.

**b. Update on construction progress**

Chairman Pelton said if you haven't had a chance to get to the plant it's a real construction site – there's piles of debris and equipment everywhere.

Mr. Deivert said they are working mainly on doing a lot of duck banks and trying to prepare to bring the new power line into the transformer then into the generator building so that's why there's been the upset with digging up the roads; their blocking the generator; they're blocking

the MCC building; they've got the steel roof up on the administration building; they've poured foundations for buildings and they are forming the walls; so there's a lot of new buildings being put up.

**5. Town Engineer's Report**

**a. Status of Cook Hill Pump Station – New Pump Installation**

Mr. Gancarz stated the pumps have been ordered; so when the pumps come in they will be installing them.

**b. CWF Applications for Cook Hill and West Johnson Pump Stations**

Mr. Gancarz said the Clean Water Fund has proposed to set aside this year - \$30,000,000 for pump station upgrades and this would be limited to \$4,000,000 per community; they held a hearing on it and they are in the process of finalizing the list – unless something drastic happens to change their plan that will probably be what happens. He said he made a call and talked with George Hicks regarding our (Cheshire's) particular status – we have two pump stations that are 90% designed – this may be something the Town of Cheshire is interested in applying for and what would be have to do; as with any Clean Water Fund application like for the one for the plant one of the key components of it is you have to have a bonding resolution – so there would need to be funding in place and the project would have to be bid – obviously we don't have either of those but it is something he wanted to bring to the Commission's attention - he's brought to Michael's attention and when we get to the summer that we'd want to bring to the Town Council's attention; he said he believed only Cook Hill was scheduled to go to referendum this year and West Johnson the year after but when you are talking about a total of \$4,000,000 and 20% of that being an \$800,000 grant it would certainly be up to the Council but it's something he thought they might want to be thinking about; the timing would be such that final list would come out DEEP in later May –June so we could take a look; since we have two projects with designs; this is something we should continue to track and this is something he provide a future update on.

**c. PCB Update**

Mr. Gancarz said as we mentioned last month there are three main buildings out there that PCB's have been identified that we are doing work – first being the digester building, the current operations building and the influent pump station; we have had a plan developed for that by AECOM – that plan has since gone into the State and Federal Government for review; it just got there a couple of weeks ago so we are not in a position to have any responses from them yet – it may take a

little while to get that; in the meantime AECOM developed a set of specifications for Carlin to bring to mediation contractors for the digester building because that's the first one – Carlin is bidding that and it's getting multiple quotations from contractors so once we have a full list well know a little bit there; it's fair to say it's going to be a significant financial impact when we get to this (project); and the influent building is a more difficult situation to work in because the complexity of pipes and electrical panels and piping, etc.

Mr. Gancarz said as they said last month it would probably be three months before they had a good number to put in front of us – its probably a month or two months away before we would have that final financial impact.

Mr. Gancarz said just to kind of re-reminder the Commission of how we intended on dealing with any contingencies whether they be PCB – when we started this project we had about \$945,000 for contingency and we had about \$600,000 worth of work – mainly in regard to the felt filter presses we would defer to the end of the project to give us about a \$1,500,000 project contingency; so we are still operating under that scenario; there have only been a few minor change orders so we have preserved in large part the contingency so that's still the game plan until we see where we're at as far as the financial impacts to the PCB remediation.

Mr. Perrotti asked when he thought they would get some feedback on the plan.

Mr. Gancarz said he thought it was going to be at least a couple of months – the initial feedback from EPA was that they were snowed with other projects; in particular because they principally had to do with schools and will all school systems they're pushing to get their answers so they can be doing their work in the summer period; we are probably at a little bit of a disadvantage there since we have a longer construction period so we probably get a little less priority then a school system does.

Mr. Perrotti said say we get two to three months turnaround time – how does that impact the whole project.

Mr. Chelton said we don't have to wait for final approval to begin work – the remediation – the removal of material can begin prior to the regulatory approval; we really need the regulatory approval for what's going to be the final product left in place; so the plan is as Walter mentioned for the digester once there is some pricing that's gotten on that we're all agreed to that we can immediately go in and start to do the

demo – the removal work so then the contractor can proceed with the work their doing there.

d. Sump Pump Committee

Mr. Gancarz said the Sump Pump Committee hasn't met yet. He said although it's very important he thought a few other items like the plant upgrade has caused this item to take a back burner for a couple of months but he expected they would be meeting again soon.

e. I/I Program Update

Mr. Gancarz said we did have flow meters installed for a three week period – we had lots of heavy rain fall – some pretty large flows down at the plant of 7.7 million to 8 million gallons – we expect we'll get very good data – all this is electronically stored in the units so once they pull them they'll download all the data and get us a report probably before the next meeting; he said we did have a two week period where the flows were up so we figured we'd put the flow meters where we had them last year because last year was very dry when we had them in so we wanted to compare apples to apples but then we did take three meters out and we relocated them to areas that were tributary to the Elmwood Pump Station – we did that area because that's the area of the highest sump pumps and the pump station that shows the largest increase in flows during wet weather.

Mr. Gancarz said so he thought they'd have some very good data maybe as early as next meeting but certainly by the meeting after to share.

6. Old Business

a. Scheduling bi-weekly construction update meetings (time, location, format)

Chairman Pelton commented about the plan to move forward to schedule the bi-weekly construction meetings once a time and location was determined.

Mr. Gancarz said he'd just need enough time to notice the meetings.

There was a consensus of the Authority that 7:00 a.m. at the town hall would work.

Chairman Pelton said he would work on putting the special meetings together and taking care of the notification process – they will be at the

town hall at 7:00 a.m. and there will be a prepared agenda and we'll call it a mini-WPCA meeting.

**7. New Business**

**a. Letter from Chesprocott dated April 1, 2014**

**Chairman Pelton said there were no failures to report for March 2014.**

**It was noted that Lorraine DeNicola is the new Chesprocott Health District director.**

**b. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 26, 2014**

**Chairman Pelton called for a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of March 26, 2014.**

**Moved by Mr. Bowman. Seconded by Mr. Cianci.**

**Mr. Perrotti and Mr. Carroll abstained from the vote to approve the minutes.**

**No action further action was taken on the motion.**

**Chairman Pelton stated since there was not a majority present to vote on the minutes they would carry the approval of the minutes to the next meeting.**

**Adjournment**

**Motion: To adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m.**

**Moved by Mr. Bowman. Seconded by Mr. Carroll. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Respectfully submitted:**

**Carla Mills  
Recording Secretary**