

Cheshire WPCA Special Meeting

May 6, 2014 held at 7 AM

Room 210, Town Hall

Members Present: Chairman Tim Pelton, Matt Bowman, Steve Carroll, Mark Kasinskas, Tom Scannell. John Perrotti was on speaker phone.

Member Absent: Ken Cianci

Staff: Town Engineer Walt Gancarz and WPCP Superintendent Dennis Deivert

Public: Jeanette Bothroyd, 1988 Highland Avenue

Bill Morganson, 78 Jennie Road, Marlborough CT (A colleague of Mrs. Bothroyd arriving at 7:13 AM)

Chairman Pelton called the meeting to order at 7 AM and began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call was taken and it was determined that there was a quorum of WPCA members present

Chairman Pelton outlined the protocol should an emergency evacuation of the town hall be required.

Mrs. Bothroyd commented that she had a colleague in route and that he would be joining the meeting shortly.

In light of that Matt Bowman suggested that the agenda be modified to talk about construction at the wastewater treatment plant first, discussion followed.

Motion by Matt Bowman, seconded by Steve Carroll to move agenda item #4 *WPCP construction* as the first order of business. No discussion. The motion carried unanimously by WPCA members present and voting.

Tim Pelton provided the authority with an update on the PCB mitigation process that involves three facilities within the treatment plant. They are the digester building, the influent pump station and the operations building.

Three bids were requested from licensed and certified PCB removal companies and two quotations have been received. The Town of Cheshire WPCP PCB mitigation plan needs to be approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and that plan has been submitted for review by EPA. It is important to note that the EPA approval of the PCB mitigation plan focuses on the encapsulation process that needs to take place once PCBs are removed. The process to start removing PCBs can be commenced prior to final approval by the EPA.

The decision has been made to solicit PCB removal quotations for each of the three affected facilities at the plant. The basis for this decision is due to the current schedule of planned upgrade construction and the digester building is the first facility to have major renovations take place and the upgrade of the other two locations will take place later in the construction schedule. The decision to move ahead on getting a price quote for PCB removal for digester building is not to hold up the current construction schedule. The chairman opined that normally such changes to the plant upgrade construction contract are handled through the change order process. But given the unique discovery and significant costs of PCB mitigation, comprehensive discussions by the WPCA are warranted. Bid specifications for PCB removal from the other two plant locations are currently being developed.

The two quotations for the digester building PCB removal from certified PCB removal companies include AAIS for \$210,452.59 and Bestech for \$447,000. A lengthy discussion followed on the scope and deliverables required as part of this effort. Discussion then reviewed if the bid award should be lump-sum or based on time and materials. The advantage of a time and materials approach is that it might be potentially less expensive but that is not guaranteed. The consensus of the authority was to develop a bid award based on time and materials with a not-to-exceed financial cap.

Note: These fees do not include money required by EPA to encapsulate masonry that has been contaminated by PCBs. Typical encapsulation methods may included sealants and/or flashing material. That determination will be made by EPA. Further these fees do not include billing from AECOM for development and execution of the PCB mitigation plan. The town engineer will request AECOM to highlight those fees on future invoices.

Motion by Matt Bowman seconded by Steve Carroll to authorize the town engineer to award the PCB bid to AAIS based upon time and materials used with the proviso of having a not-to-exceed cap of \$210,452.59. Discussion:

Walter Gancarz commented that AAIA was already contracted to do asbestos removal as part of the plant upgrade and AAIA has worked for the town in the past performing specialized hazardous waste removal efforts without issue. Motion passed unanimously by all WPCA members present and voting.

WS Development Plans

As a starting point to review and comment on the presentation made by WS at the regularly scheduled April meeting of the WPCA, Tim Pelton had prepared a list of a number of talking points.

Tim Pelton asked the town engineer to review and comment on the maximum potential sewer shed coming from the north end of Cheshire north of I-691 to better quantify the maximum potential wastewater gallonage that would enter the sewer system at any point in the future. Walter Gancarz stated that, based upon topography and distance, the simple solution for most future sewer usage would be to negotiate for a gravity sewer line going to the town of Southington. This would include the area north of the commuter parking lot on Route 10, along Route 322, and including Birch Drive, Popular drive, etc.

The chairman allowed for public comment and Mr. Mortensen observed that further development on the East side of Route 10 opposite the WS development has potential financial benefit to the town in the form of tax revenue. Matt Bowman commented that WS development, as part of their initial discussions, have agreed to install a 'dry' sewer main for future expansion to the edge of Route 10 along their property. Additionally should a developer want to develop the east side of Route 10, any extension of the sewer by that developer to tie into the existing infrastructure sewer proposed by WS development should be borne by the developer or property owner on the East side of Route 10. There was consensus among the Authority members on this point. Mrs. Bothroyd commented that she has had some preliminary discussions with WS regarding potential future use of her property and the Authority recommended that she continue that dialogue.

The town engineer agreed to review the plans again with the WS development engineer to affirm that the proposed location of the proposed dry sewer pipe by WS is in the optimal location for future usage by adjacent property owners, but that it is appropriate that the proposed dry pipe end at the WS property line.

Regarding potable water supply for any future development on the east side of Route 10, the WPCA felt it was beyond their authority and scope to discuss providing water for future development of the north end of Cheshire. Mrs.

Bothroyd stated that her current water supply for her property comes from the Southington Water Department. Matt Bowman inserted that since Southington is already providing water service to the area that it was highly likely they would provide water for any future development.

The Chairman noted that he would be moving on to other talking points regarding the proposed WS development sewer plan and that Mrs. Bothroyd and Mr. Morganson were welcome to stay. Mrs. Bothroyd thanked the authority for allowing them to attend the meeting today and to speak. They both departed at 7:52 AM.

Dennis Dievert stated that significant odor problems can occur as effluent sits in a force main for long periods of time before entering a gravity sewer line. This problem is usually particularly acute when low flows occur as new developments slowly come online with lower flows prior to full development. He suggests that an odor control chemical such as hydrogen peroxide be added at the proposed pump station to manage this concern.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding whether or not the proposed WS development pump station should be held privately by WS or become a public pump station constructed by WS and then turned over to the town. A number of pros and cons were considered and it was the consensus of the authority that the WS development pump station be constructed, paid for, and maintained by WS as a private pump station, having comprehensive monitoring and alarm systems, and a backup generator. The alarm system will communicate directly to both the Cheshire treatment plant operations building as well as to the firm assigned by WS to maintain their pump station. Discharges from the WS pump station will be metered and Cheshire wastewater treatment plant staff will have unfettered access to that meter.

Motion by Steve Carroll, seconded by Matt Bowman that the WS Development pump station be a private pump station built to: (1) Town of Cheshire specifications, (2) have monitors and alarms installed at the pump station and on the heat tracing at all bridge crossings, and (3) the pump station will have an alternate power supply from a well maintained emergency backup generator. Discussion: Mark Kasinskas commented that as part of their presentation to the authority at the April meeting, WS has built both private and public pump stations in other communities. Dennis Dievert reaffirmed the importance of easy access to the meter monitoring discharges from the pump station based upon our ongoing issues with the Department of Corrections. Walter Gancarz shared that any future sewer use entering that system in all

likelihood would only come from the properties directly opposite WS on Route 10. He does not envision a major influx of affluent entering the WS system from other entities in the future. Mark Kasinskas added that whether WS remains the property owner of their current development or changes hands, any future utilization of their sewer system remains a negotiation between property owners and not with the town. The motion carried unanimously by WPCA members present and voting.

Mr. Perrotti asked to be excused at 8:01 AM.

Tim Pelton inquired that since the phase 2 of the WS development appears to be at some point in the future and that the details of that development are still in discussion, should the WPCA require that WS break their application down into two parts for both phase 1 and phase 2? There was consensus among the authority members to leave it as one application to identify and reserve capacity at the plant for this development following the current rules and regulations within the WPCA application process. Further it is the expectation of the WPCA that when phase 2 of the WS development should commence that there be an amended application made to the WPCA regarding phase 2 sewer usage.

The WPCA will develop a sewer use fee for the WS development based upon direct meter readings of the meter installed at the WS constructed pump station. This model will accurately account for all effluent coming from the WS development and any inflow/infiltration issues that may occur in the WS sewer system.

Mr. Carroll and Mr. Kasinskas requested to depart at 8:20 AM.

Agenda topic-Infiltration/Inflow study. No discussion, no actions taken.

Agenda topic- Sump pump program. No discussion, no actions taken.

Chairman Pelton adjourned the meeting at 8:25 AM.

Submitted by: Tim Pelton