

**Town of Cheshire Water Pollution Control Authority
(W.P.C.A.)
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, May 28, 2014 at 7:30 p.m.
Town Hall Council Chambers 84 South Main Street, Cheshire, CT**

Chairman Pelton called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Members present: Chairman Timothy Pelton, Mark Kasinskas and Thomas Scannell, Ken Cianci, John Perrotti and Steve Carroll (arriving at 8:13 p.m.)

Member absent: Matthew Bowman.

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

Guest: Don Chelton from AECOM.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited by all present.

EMERGENCY EVACUATION NOTICE READ

Chairman Pelton read the emergency evacuation notice.

1. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Chairman Pelton stated at the time the agenda went out there were no public communications.

2. APPLICATIONS

Chairman Pelton stated in the interest of time and getting to the rest of the agenda they've moved applications to the last agenda item.

3. PROJECTS

- a. AECOM Invoice 37440470 dated May 12, 2014 in the amount of \$165,188.73**

Walt Gancarz explained that month there was a request from the WPCA that when he deals with his report on this that he provide some back up.

Mr. Gancarz said he pulled together a summary sheet that he passed out; he said really what it does is that it takes a look at is each of the construction and administration items – what the time is, how we based our assumption mutually between us and AECOM on how long it would take to complete each of these; how many hours that would entail, what the fee would be, and then it compares how many have charged to that per date; and what's remaining.

Mr. Gancarz said the purpose of this is just to see if there are any outliers here that are going to perhaps increase the budget.

Mr. Gancarz reviewed the summary sheet details with Authority members and noted the items they want to continue to monitor; the first has to do with consultation, shop drawings and request for information.

Mr. Gancarz said the items are something that AECOM, Carlin and (the town) will take a look and see if they could be more efficient and keep that number down and try to stay within our contract amount; and keep within the original estimate.

Chairman Pelton asked if some of these are associated with startup costs – that the front end of the request for information and other things might be more time consuming then say at the front end of the project.

Mr. Chelton said there are startup things; he explained they usually see the biggest stuff up from – it takes more time and typically we see the lesser shop drawings as you go further in so for hours for shop drawing basis should get a little bit better; secondly the hours for reviewing shop drawings are accumulated but they might have not gone out yet; and the third thing is on a dollar per hour basis we are running a little bit better than we had estimated so that off sets some of that; and there are other items that we are running quite a bit under.

Chairman Pelton said he thinks it's an excellent report and asked for it to keep coming; it's a management by expectation report and it's easy to track the outliers then looking at the whole bottom line and say we are on or off track.

Mr. Gancarz recommended approval of the invoice.

Motion: That the WPCA approves the AECOM Invoice 37440470 dated May 12, 2014 in the amount of \$165,188.73.

Moved by Mr. Scannell. Seconded by Mr. Cianci. Motion approved unanimously by those voting and present.

b. AECOM Change Order No. 3, WPCA Upgrade Project

Mr. Gancarz stated this change order is for PCB remediation work for the digester building.

Mr. Gancarz said if you recall this is something that they went out – got several quotes on – AAIS was the low bidder; after further consultation when we met in special meeting we decided we want to do this on a time and materials basis so that's how its proceeding.

Mr. Gancarz said in the meantime we are getting quotations for the other two structures being the influent pump station and the operations building.

Motion: That the WPCA approved change order number 3 in the estimated amount of \$220,975.22 to Carlin Contracting, Company, Inc.

Moved by Mr. Scannell. Seconded by Mr. Perrotti.

Mr. Kasinskas asked if \$220,975.22 was the same number we had before provided for the estimate.

Mr. Chelton stated the (original estimated) \$210,452.00 but then you have to add the contractors profit on that.

Mr. Gancarz said the contractors provide is 5%.

Chairman Pelton stated that dovetails with the original estimate.

Mr. Chelton said and that gets you to the \$220,975.22; the subs estimated cost was \$210,452.00 with a 5% mark up on that – that's another \$10,522.00 bringing the total to \$220,975.22 but that's just an estimated amount; the amount is in line with the contract.

Mr. Chelton stated there isn't an option not to exceed in the contract – it's either the lump sum or a cost (work) which is the same as time and materials.

Motion carried unanimously by those voting and present.

- c. Carlin Company application #6: April 30, 2014 in the amount of \$1,413,070.85**

Mr. Gancarz said this is from the contractor Carlin Contracting for a \$1,413,070.85. He explained for those of you who haven't been down there – there has been a substantial amount of work done in the past month and the good news is we are pretty much almost out of the ground or very close to it. The generator building is actually has a rood on it and is bricked up; they are working on putting up the brick up on the outside of the administration building; and the largest building being the phosphorous and UV building has the foundation and walls almost completely in; they are working on some slabs but he thought in the very near future we should be out of the ground; they've done a lot of work with electrical duck banks from the new generator building over to the operations building so there's been a substantial work and not surprisingly there's been a fair amount of costs.

Mr. Gancarz said they've actually started some of the roofing and pretty much all of the roofing has been purchased and is on site so that's also reflected in this invoice.

Mr. Gancarz stated the actual digester cleaning and Dennis will actually update you on the status of that but there hasn't been a charge for that at this point in time so that's not in this invoice.

Mr. Gancarz stated he recommended approval of this invoice.

Motion: That the WPCA pay Carlin Contracting Co., Inc. invoice dated April 30, 2014 in the amount of \$1,413,070.85.

Moved by Mr. Scannell. Seconded by Mr. Perrotti. Motion carries unanimously by those voting and present.

4. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

a. Digester cleaning complete

Mr. Deivert informed the Authority that the digester cleaning is complete; it took approximately four and a half months.

Mr. Deivert said that he and the staff and would like to thank Walt and Tim for lunch based on giving them recognition for all the work done during the cleaning of the digester.

Mr. Deivert said what Walt was referring to (earlier) there are some cost that will be applying to the monies that the Town should be getting back for overtime and water usage and some other items which he is presently putting together now.

Mr. Perrotti said he had some questions about the potential damage so some of the equipment that you don't know exists or could exist from running some of the materials back through our pumps which he (Mr. Deivert) had mentioned last time.

Mr. Perrotti asked if any of the equipment that that material is re-run through is it slated to be replaced during the upgrade or are we continuing to use some of this equipment in our process.

Mr. Deivert stated the influent pumps are not going to be replaced; they did go through new influent pumps – we had some issues with the bladder plugging with debris that cools the motor.

Mr. Perrotti said he was wondering if it was advantageous to have some predicted maintenance on these pumps – the motors to establish whether there's any damage long term down the road because these are assets we are going to continue to keep and use.

Mr. Deivert said we have already been in contact with Homewood Pumps to they better send a tech rep to look at number one pump which we've had some overheating problems.

b. Update on construction progress

Mr. Deivert said to date vehicle storage building which is our garage – the roof gutter and down spouts are completed. The sludge handling buildings are what we call the dewatering building – the lower roof has been replaced – the upper roof ballast is removed and the HVAC and heating system has been demolished.

Mr. Deivert said the digester building as he just mentioned – the sludge removal is complete; the interior demolition is 95% complete; the dooms are being prepped as we speak for removal and PCB remediation is to start next week tentatively.

Mr. Deivert provided the Authority an update on the progress of the various construction projects taking place at the Treatment Plant.

Chairman Pelton asked Mr. Chelton if they were on track time wise from where we should be chronologically.

Mr. Chelton stated it appears to be – he said the next 4, 5, 6 months are going to be very important.

5. TOWN ENGINEER'S REPORT

a. Status Cook Hill Pump Station – new pump installation

Mr. Gancarz provided a status report of the Cook Hill Pump Station. He explained Scott, the assistant superintendent is in charge of this; they have spent a good portion of the last month upgrading some of the electrical associated it with because the new pumps are larger in size so as far as upgrading wiring, relays, starters; and they have the new pumps and they hope to be putting them in next week.

b. Phosphorus Grant Update

Mr. Gancarz said this is to be continued. He said there is a bill that has been passed that does increase phosphorus funding from 30% to 50% and although he sent out a memo after we had contacted Mary Fritz in the governor's office that it appears that Cheshire will be a recipient of that – we haven't seen that in writing yet and it's still a little bit up in the air so we don't the full answer to that yet but there was a bill that was passed signed by the governor increasing the phosphorus funding for more than the original three and was the impression of most people that that would include Cheshire.

Mr. Gancarz said the impact would be about \$1.4 million dollars increase grant if we were to get that.

c. PBC Update

Mr. Gancarz said we kind of covered part of the this but as for the digester building that's going to be \$220,000 there about for the remediation of the building itself; also when we proceeds AECOM's bill the 301 hours towards the building update or the finical impacts to date.

Mr. Gancarz said we started with about a \$900,000 contingency – we are starting to chop into that as a result of that; the good news is for all the other modifications and we are pretty much out of the ground – the first \$3.5 million in construction there's only been \$19,000 in change orders so that's kind of a good sign because that's where you hit more of your unknowns so we're kind of hopeful we can keep that down because we know the PCB issue's going to continue to chop into that.

Mr. Gancarz noted that AECOM did provide details in a written narrative in direction to Carlin to get estimates for the remediation of the other two effected buildings that being the influent pump station and the operations building – Carlin is obtaining those quotes so certainly before next meeting we will have that information so we have a closer idea of the whole picture.

Mr. Gancarz said in the meantime the remediation went up to the State and Federal government; there was a review letter that came back from EPA asking for some additional information, clarification and so a response to that is being prepared by AECOM at this point in time; that should go in in the next week or so; we can still proceed with removal of bulk product in the digester building – really what we’re looking for is the main clarification on what we can do to either encapsulate it at the end whether it be a coating or a flashing; that’s something EPA hasn’t given us an answer on yet.

d. Sump Pump Committee

Mr. Gancarz stated the Sump Pump Committee hasn’t met as of yet.

e. I/I Program Update

Mr. Gancarz said if you recall we were fortunate enough to get pretty good data or we hoped to get pretty good data from the three and a half weeks that we had flow meters in which happened to be a very wet portion; Dennis had flows as high as 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 gallons so I think we’ll see some things.

Mr. Gancarz said unfortunately Highcamp was a bit slow in getting it but he was assured today that he will have the report next week so he’ll be able to share those results with you next month.

f. Creating sewer use fee based on metered water usage for non-potable purposes

Mr. Gancarz said he had expected to get a letter in from a nursery that had asked this question – we charge based on water usage and what they’re maintaining was that a large portion of their water actually gets diverted for irrigation and actually what they use for sanitary purposes that gets discharged to the sewers is much smaller so they were going to prepare a letter asking that Commission to take a look at that – he said he didn’t see that letter but when that comes in he’ll prepare a memo in reference to it.

g. Re-allocation of surplus influent pump station funds to WPCA upgrade project

Mr. Gancarz explained in reviewing capital projects that are still open; the influent pump station has a balance remaining in their fund of \$139,127.25; in reviewing the language of what went to referendum for that – it specifically did talk about work at the influent pump station at the treatment plant so he’s talk to Michael (Milone) about this and he’s in agreement that the funds could be specifically used for the work at the influent pump station at the plant; they can’t just be rolled into the water pollution control project but if we were to break out specific items at the influent pump station and there’s quite a bit of work that’s going to be done there well in excess of \$139,000 these funds could be used for that so it would help basically in a kind of a roundabout way of helping our contingency.

Mr. Gancarz said we are through the warranty period for the influent pump station – he said he would recommend that this commission ask him to write a memo to Michael Milone asking that those funds be kept active and be used for specific items that have to be upgraded at the influent pump station.

Chairman Pelton asked mechanically how would that work; for example we need to build a temporary switch station in the influent pump station during construction – can we apply those funds towards that.

Mr. Gancarz said he thought the easiest way without working our way through whole thing but if you look at Carlin’s estimate they break down by building all of the different components whether it be the new addition to the influent pump station – the roofing – the electrical – etc. so we could certainly just apply the funds to those specific items – he said he thought that would be the cleanest; in a way it certainly leaves us on very firm ground; he said literally it seamless and the only thing the contractor would see is probably a second check from a different account when he billed us for that amount.

Motion: That the town engineer be authorized to approach Michael Milone on the proper way to reallocate the surplus funds currently in the influent pump station fund account and apply those funds to our current construction activities.

Moved by Chairman Pelton. Seconded Mr. Scannell. Motion carried unanimously by all those voting and present.

6. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Pelton explained we currently don't have an agenda item there.

Motion: That we add agenda item 6a to set a date for our bi-weekly meeting that we are currently scheduling between our regularly scheduled monthly meetings to take care of WPCA business as warranted.

Moved by Chairman Pelton. Seconded by Mr. Scannell. Motion carried unanimously by all those voting and present.

The bi-weekly meeting was set for June 10, 2014 at 7:00 a.m. location to be determined.

Mr. Gancarz said he's notice the meeting; he asked he get sent a proposed agenda because that has to be posted.

Chairman Pelton said they'd use a fixed agenda for posting purposes and would get that to Mr. Gancarz tomorrow.

7. NEW BUSINESS

a. Letter from Chesprocott dated May 1, 2014

Authority members had a copy of the letter from Chesprocott dated May 1, 2014 regarding failures discovered and repairs inspections for the month of April 2014.

Chairman Pelton said they didn't have any Chesprocott activity last month and we made up for it this month.

Chairman Pelton said he was pleased to say that there was a reception for Maura Esposito who is the new director of Chesprocott and if that name is not familiar she's a WPCA alumni and is well versed in public health and we will be continue to foster and enhance our relationship with Chesprocott; he said it was great to see her appointed as director.

b. FOI Workshop

Chairman Pelton informed the Authority that he and Mr. Gancarz had an opportunity to participate in a town sponsored FOI workshop. He said he learned several things the highlights which are that it's accepted under FOI for us to send out information; it's unacceptable under FOI for us to discuss and comment on that information because we are conducting business outside a public meeting. He talked about has he has pumped out information to members to they'd be informed to

discuss things tonight – the thing we need to be sensitive to is we cannot comment on those or make suggestions or enhancements because then we are conducting WPCA business outside.

Chairman Pelton said the other pieces of the puzzle was when and how to call executive session; there are specific criteria for calling executive session but only one really pertains to us – the opening and reading of bids and awards; even if an executive session is not published on the agenda it is alright for the chairman to call an executive session if he feels it's appropriate.

Chairman Pelton said it was a good session and it was his understanding from Michael Milone and Arnett Talbot this was going to be a town wide activity and all chairman are going to participate; he said he found it very informative; he said it was videoed – he said he didn't know if it would be available on the website or available through local channel cable connections.

Mr. Gancarz said he thought there was a way on the town website to sign up for On Demand if you really wanted to see it.

c. Approval of Minutes

**Regular Meeting of April 23, 2014
Special Meeting of May 6, 2014**

Motion: To approve the regular meeting minutes of April 23, 2014.

The approval of the minutes was deferred due to not enough members being present for the minutes to pass.

Motion: To approve the special meeting minutes of May 6, 2014.

Moved by Chairman Pelton. Seconded by Mr. Scannell. Motion approved by Ken Cianci, John Perrotti, Timothy Pelton, Thomas Scannell, and Mark Kasinskas. No member was opposed. Ken Cianci abstained from the vote. The minutes were approved for the special meeting on May 6, 2014.

At 9:13 p.m.:

Regular Meeting of April 23, 2014

Motion: To approve the regular meeting minutes of April 23, 2014.

Moved by Chairman Pelton. Seconded by Steve Carroll. All those in favor were Ken Cianci, John Perrotti, Timothy Pelton, and Steve Carroll. No members were opposed. Abstentions by Mr. Scannell and Mr. Kasinskas. The minutes were approved for the regular meeting on April 23, 2014.

d. Applications

1. Core Development

Ryan McEvoy, a licensed professional engineer in the State of Connecticut with Milone and MacBroom was present on behalf of the applicant regarding the final design and water capacity for a planned residential development.

Mr. McEvoy stated this application obtained feasibility approval from this board in September of last year; subsequent to that it has been approved by special permit by the Cheshire Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. McEvoy said as you may recall in the original approval this development is a total of 13 purposed units; 12 of which would be newly constructed unit and one would be an existing house located on the property that is proposed to remain as a residential dwelling; this property is located on the west side of South Main Street on Route 10 and on the north side of Elwood Drive just to the south of the high school.

Mr. McEvoy said the project did go through some revision during the Planning and Zoning process namely the configuration of the proposed units – we still have 13 in total; he explained the location of the three buildings and number of units in each building as situated on the parcel; the primary access of the development will come out on South Main Street as opposed to Elwood Drive where the original primary access was to come from.

Mr. McEvoy said the sewer plan is still generally conforms with the feasibility plan; he shown on the plans the proposed sewer and the existing 8” pipe in Elmwood Drive; each proposed building connecting into the sewer itself.

Mr. McEvoy said they still have 13 proposed units in total and our goal as originally proposed is the feasibility application would remain the same gallons per day of 1,950; we grab that number based on an average of 2.5 persons per total unit at 60 gallons per

person per day with 13 units it comes to exactly 1,950 gallons; the existing building is connected to the sewer in South Main Street; the proposed units would be connected to the new line on Elwood Drive.

Mr. McEvoy said we did receive some comments from the town engineer regards to the application; mainly questions about how the ownership of this proposed multi-family development will be maintained and for purposed on the sewer connection and the overall parcel it would be run by a homeowners association or through a single entity that would rent out the unit - the exact ownership is yet to be determined however we feel that the usage fees if it were a entity like a homeowners association would be appropriate on this site; there were some questions about the metering of water – he said its their intent at this time (and he’s not confirmed with the owner yet) that we’d come into the site with a new line down Elmwood and individual connection for each building would likely be a metered connection from the master meter although that is still somewhat influx and we understanding what we are proposing is based on the nature of the meter for the proposed buildings.

Mr. McEvoy said also the town engineer had some comments that the work shall be subject to entering into an acceptable developers agreement which they take no acceptations to; all sanitary sewer improvements will remain privately owned which again they take no acceptation to; and lastly there was a question about providing a detail for how they are going to connect to the existing manhole on Elmwood Drive which they provided details in an email on coring into that manhole.

Mr. McEvoy provided copies of that email for Authority members.

Chairman Pelton asked that the minutes reflect that the minutes reflect that Steve Carroll joined the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

Mr. McEvoy said one thing he wanted to make clear is that they do have some exterior garage spaces as shown on the plans.

Mr. McEvoy said that’s a brief summary of where they stand – if there were any questions he’d be happy to answer them.

Mr. Gancarz said from the preliminary originally they had the sewer coming in at more of a sked to the main on Elmwood and we asked that it come in at 90%; also at that time I think they were proposing a doghouse manhole which we were not in favor of so that’s when we

asked for they be cored and properly sealed to prevent infiltration so the details they proposed meets our criteria; so other than that it's pretty straight forward application and he was just addressing the issue on the capacity fee just for their information – we do base our capacity fee on the size of the water meters and so depending on whether they have three water meters or a larger one water meter or twelve individual meters that's how the capacity fee will be assessed and the same for the annual sewer assessment will be based if they become individually owned or if they remain under one ownership then it will be based on a commercial which is based on water usage; as far as the actual plans themselves he recommended approval.

Chairman Pelton asked wouldn't a master meter be easier to administer.

Mr. Gancarz said it didn't make that much of a difference – he said they get in the order of 2000 water records from Regional Water Authority.

Mr. Kasinskas asked if they had walkout basements.

Mr. McEvoy said at this time they are not proposed but if they do they will be used entirely for storage and there were be no intent to ever have a finished basements or any plumbing service or anything of that nature – the basements would just be for storage.

Chairman Pelton said so there wouldn't be any basement service for wastewater.

Mr. McEvoy stated no. He said as part of the design for this property we are infiltrating stormwater; he explained the process for infiltrating stormwater.

Chairman Pelton said in the scenario if basements are done and sump pumps are required where would you discharge those sump pumps to.

Mr. McEvoy said likely to the down slope areas of the system; he explained how this process would take place and where the current stormwater flows to.

Motion: To approve final design and award of capacity to Core Development, LLC for the proposed 13 unit townhouse development on the corner of Elmwood Drive and South Main Street with a proposed sewer discharge of 1,950 gallons per day.

Based upon that review and based upon the recommendation of the Director of Public Works, the WPCA has determined that the application and submittals detail a sanitary sewerage system which is generally capable of constructed and is capable of being connected to the Town of Cheshire public sanitary sewer system and therefor the application is approved with the following conditions.

The right to connect to the sewer system can only be granted by applying for and being approved for final award of capacity and the conditions are as follows:

- 1. The applications and submittals are incorporated as part of this approval.**
- 2. All costs connected with the proposed sanitary sewer system shall be borne by the developer.**
- 3. The proposed sanitary sewer system will become part of the public except for that part that is retained as private ownership as defined in the feasibility application form.**
- 4. Any additional conditions required by the WPCA as outlined below are part of this approval.**
 - a. As an additional condition the WPCA required that should sump pumps be required and installed and operated that the proper discharge is into an approved on sight wastewater disposal facility.**

Moved by Chairman Pelton. Seconded by Mr. Cianci. Motion carried unanimously by all those voting and present.

2. WS Development

Andrew Manning was present on behalf of Cheshire Outlets, LLC and from WS Development. He said we are here for our formal final application.

Mr. Manning provided the Authority with a recap of their appearance on April 23 seeking feedback and input from the Authority; he noted a special meeting in May was held to discuss and information and feedback was proved through the town engineer.

Mr. Manning explained they took that information, evaluated all the input for the project – the requests and information and developed our final application which you (the Authority) had before them.

Mr. Manning said while the plan says final they do not believe they are at that final approval stage so they are going into this meeting understanding there are components they still have to work through; they will address the comments of both the WPCA and the town engineer and all those who are reviewing this project.

Mr. Manning said Milone and MacBroom was here to outline the formal application, how we've addressed some of the town engineer's comments in the process of the April meeting and since then

Steve Ditsko, PE of Milone and MacBroom addressed the Authority.

Mr. Ditsko explained he was going to give another overview; he reviewed the plans outlining the gravity sewer as shown throughout the site as depicted on the plans leading to a proposed pump station located on the north end of the property adjacent to the Southington town line.

Mr. Ditsko described how the sewer system would operate; he said explained that there was a proposed stub out for future connections of other properties that may be developed in a portion of the sewer shed that could eventually drain to the pump station.

Mr. Ditsko talked about the force main and how it would drain leading south down Route 10 across the 691 bridge going underneath that connecting to a proposed gravity sewer – connecting to the gravity line leading easterly on East Johnson Avenue which receives the discharge from the West Johnson pump station.

Mr. Ditsko said the details of the pump station have not been worked out – they made this submittal with the application to get some feedback; they had the benefit of a meeting with Dennis and Walt.

Mr. Ditsko said what's proposed is a duplex submersible pump station with two pumps each capable of discharging the peak development flow rate for the onsite flows as well as the offsite flows of 365 gallons per minutes- that's about a 25 horse power pump; the pumps are submersible- they are located in an 8' diameter wet well;

the diameter of the wet well can be adjusted; that discharges through a separate valve wall leading to the force main off site;

Mr. Ditsko said shown on the plans the location property lines, town line, the gravity sewer collecting the proposed outlets as well as the future residential; the wet well was shown on the plan; the valve fault; after that they have a proposed meter; the proposed flow meter will be owned by the Town of Cheshire; designed and specified to their criteria – to your criteria – that will be located outside the fenced enclosure so the town can always have access to that and take readings on a regular basis however you like; within the fenced enclosure is the wet well and the valve fault and what they anticipate to be a precast concrete building and that would have the standby generator to be determined if its natural gas or diesels well as the control panel.

Mr. Ditsko said they had some comments from Dennis and Walt about making provisions for future order controls so we'll leave some floor space for that; again those details will be developed before we come back for the next meeting – the architectural, mechanical and electrical components of that.

Mr. Ditsko said at this point he'd hand it off to Tom who's going to go through the more discrete flow rates that they've developed now.

Tom Knowlton, professional civil engineer with Milone and MacBroom addressed the Authority.

Mr. Knowlton said he would go over the flows briefly for the development and also our estimate of flows for future off site users.

Mr. Knowlton stated the total estimated wastewater flow for the entire development when it is fully built out is approximately 104,000 gallons per day; the initial phase – phase one of the development will be approximately 48,000 gallons per day and the total future offsite users are estimated at approximately 25,000 gallons per day; so with all those totaled up together the grand total is 128,000 gallons per day that could potentially be served on the north side of interstate 691.

Mr. Knowlton said they did meet with Dennis Deivert and the town engineer Walt Gancarz yesterday to go over the comments that were provided by Mr. Gancarz in a letter dated May 22, 2014.

Mr. Knowlton said he wanted to briefly go over the comments and their response to those.

The comments from the May 22, 2014 letter from Mr. Gancarz were as follows:

“We have reviewed the FINAL plans for the project and have the following review comments:

1. For the proposed Pump Station, additional detail will need to be provided for us to evaluate its acceptability. Although it is currently anticipated this will remain a private station, at some point in the future the Town may choose or be forced to become the Owner/Operator of it, and wants to be certain it would meet our needs with respect to reliability and long term operation.

This would include:

a. Greater detail on the proposed Pump Station Building and appurtenances, including architectural and structural/ mechanical/ electrical plans.

b. The capability to add hydrogen peroxide treatment if needed.

c. Provide sonic pump controls instead of float switches. As a precaution, floats should be included for low level and high level alarms.

d. Submersible pumps that are compatible with existing town equipment, these would include HOMA, Flygt, and Flowserve.

e. The Town wishes to own the flow meter, please provide a name/model number.

f. Provide make/model/size of emergency generator.

g. Provide a maintenance schedule for servicing all equipment, including the air release valves.

2. For the force main:

a. For the electric wrap on the force main associated with the bridge crossings, please provide a local visual alarm.

3. For the sanitary sewer:

- a. **The use of a doghouse style manhole is not acceptable. Although we understand you do not want to use the existing manhole at the junction of East Johnson and Route 10 to avoid additional paving, you will need to coordinate your installation of a new manhole with the operation of the existing sewer West Johnson Pump Station at that location. This may require night time work.**
- b. **As requested earlier, please provide evidence that the operation of this station and the West Johnson Pump Station concurrently can be handled in the downstream 21" interceptor.**
- c. **The Town currently envisions taking ownership of the gravity portion of the system starting at the location where the force main enters the first gravity manhole.**
4. **You will need to prepare a DRAFT copy of the Town's Developers Agreement for review by this office and the WPCA and WPCD. This should also outline the recoverable costs proposed for any off site users that may eventually tie into this system.**
5. **Capacity fees will need to be paid for this project; please note that these are based on the number and size of the potable water meters servicing the site, as listed in the attached schedule."**

Mr. Knowlton said for comment number one: there are seven subparts to it a-g; he said basically what its asking for is more detail in the design and as Andrew pointed out we understand that; on the pump station itself we submitted what we knew was more conceptual at this stage and it will certainly be detailed out for civil, structural, electrical, and mechanical on the next submittal so we will be providing additional information plans and specifications and also pointing out the various manufactures of pumps and things like that that will be allowed to meet these requirements as spelled out by Mr. Gancarz.

Mr. Knowlton said one of the things discussed as item c – the request was for sonic pumps controls instead of float switches; and what Mr. Deivert requested was that we consider having floats as a backup for high water – low water level alarms and provide either ultrasonic or preferable hydrostatic level removable devise that can be removed for servicing or cleaning as need to we intend to provide that; we talked about the flow meter item e that that would be owned, operated and maintained by the town so we do not have a repeat of another larger user in town; and then the generator and the those sort of items will also be specified in detailed out with options for

various manufactures; item g a maintenance schedule – that will be also be outlined for all of the equipment including the air release valves on the force main so that town and the WPCA can review all of those requirements that we foresee for this project.

Mr. Knowlton said comment number two is in regard to the electric wrap or heat tracing on the sewer force main on the bridge crossings and providing a local visual alarm; contained within our design basis that we submitted with this application we have a section that details the freeze protection requirements that we foresee on both bridge crossings; we have a bridge onsite and then we also have also have the I-691 bridge crossing on Route 10; and what we did is we analyzed the freeze protection needs for this pipe and one of the things that we found was if we don't insulate the pipe – the pipe will freeze if we have an average of zero degrees Fahrenheit for three hours the 6" force main will freeze; so we recognize that there is freeze protection required but with 2" of poly urethane insulation we can then increase that time to freeze if we had twelve straight of zero Fahrenheit weather and absolutely flow in the sewer force main – that's how long it would take to freeze that pipe; so recognizing that the force main will be in continuance operation as long as the development is operational we would never come close to twelve days without any flow; the pump station itself will take about an hour and a half by our calculations to completely move all of the liquid – all of the volume of the forced main – the 34,000 linear feet of force main so we will not have a time where the force main is stagnate long enough to freeze.

Mr. Perrotti asked the force main installation that you have put here in the package is this something you've developed or something that a supplier of the installation has provided to you.

Mr. Knowlton said there's various suppliers of pipe installation; the installation that we reference in the appendix the time to freeze table came from one specific supplier called EuroCon and they provide tables for zero degrees Fahrenheit, time to freeze in zero degrees in Fahrenheit and time to freeze for minus thirty degrees Fahrenheit; they provide this type of preinstalled pipe all over North America – United States – Canada and we have used it on a number of projects ourselves.

Mr. Perrotti asked if Mr. Knowlton would be able to provide us with two or three other applications going across state highways – other types of similar applications as a reference for the board to take a

look at and analyze because this is uncharted territory for us here in Cheshire.

Mr. Knowlton stated yes – they could provide that.

Mr. Knowlton said for comparison purposed we mention in the report that at minus thirty degrees Fahrenheit which is actually less than the all-time single day recorded low temperature here in Cheshire which was minus twenty five degrees on February 16, 1943 but at minus thirty degrees Fahrenheit with the two inches of installation it would still take six and a half days to freeze; so that is why we recommend that heat tracing is not required for the bridge crossings but we will provide other similar projects from the State of Connecticut that we insulated.

Mr. Deivert asked if the DOT had any information on that as far as any lines going under any highways that are insulated or non-insulated – were there any issues that you might be able to get from them.

Mr. Knowlton said as far as installation goes pretty much any water line or sewer line that you hang off a bridge in CT will require insulation at a minimum; we have been attempting to contact the DOT to talk specifically with them about the heat tracing since that does require an electrical source – it would require an electrical meter in the DOT right of way and potentially if something were to go wrong with that heat tracing could potentially have stray current on the steel bridge which as you know straight current is what causes corrosion so we think the DOT would have a little bit of concern about having heat tracing hanging off of one of their steel bridges.

Mr. Knowlton said item number three – as you told Mr. McEvoy – you do not like doghouse style manholes and we understand that so what we propose to modify for the connection point in East Johnson Avenue is rather than adding a new manhole we would change the location of the gravity line to actually connect into the existing manhole that's in the middle of the intersection at Route 10 and Johnson Avenue; item three b is requesting a capacity analysis of the 21" sewer interceptor that we are tying into which is a valid concern; you have the existing flows in there – the West Johnson pump station pumps into that line so we will analyze the flow capacity of the 21" line to the east of our tie in point and provide that information to the town engineer and WPCA for review; item three c regarding the ownership of the gravity portion that the town envisions ownership of that portion of the line – there's nothing to

comment on there; item four – points out we need to prepare a draft copy of the developers agreement and we understand that – there's a copy of that available online – we agree to that; and then the capacity fees – we have a copy of the table for those capacity fees and again at this time it is not defined and to how many water meters there will need to be for the development but we understand the capacity fees are tied to the water meter, the quantity of water meters and the size of the water meters.

Chairman Pelton asked about item one b was not addressed – the capability to add hydrogen peroxide treatment.

Mr. Knowlton explained the capability to add hydrogen peroxide – that would be for order control at the pump station and what we discussed yesterday was basically to provide sleeves either through the concrete wall of the wet well and the foundation of the building – as Steve pointed out providing some open space inside the building to house that equipment in the future if needed; one of the things we are proposing to provide for the wet well for order control initially is a carbon filter on the vent pipe or the wet well so that the hydrogen sulfate and other orders are not just coming out the vent pipe in the vicinity of the neighborhood to the north.

Chairman Pelton asked Dennis or Walter if it was an issue as the affluent discharges into the public sanitary sewer.

Mr. Deivert said yes it is and that's one of the reasons we mentioned peroxide.

Chairman Pelton said so it's not just an issue of the order potential at the pump station but also as it works through the system and goes into the public sanitary sewer and then dumps through the manhole; we are pretty much going to be a strong proponent of the ability to add a deodorant.

Mr. Manning said one of the things they did was calculated the volume of the force main – the 6" diameter force main is approximately 4400 gallons and based on the pumping rate at full capacity and for the initial phase we looked at the time that it would take to completely pump that and in the initial phase it would take about two and a half hours to actually pump that full volume through and in order to get the septic conditions that you are referring to – it would take somewhere in the order of eight to ten hours is what we found so we are going to be about a quarter of that amount and then

once we have everything fully built out it's about an hour and fifteen minutes to pump out that volume over a force main.

Chairman Pelton said he thought his concern was more at the initial phase than the wrap up part of the project; would you have the flows to purge the entire system.

Mr. Manning said with the opening of this project dissimilar to other types of retail the majority of the retail component in the first phase would open at the same time so there would be an initial startup of we turn this project on - we anticipate a high occupancy load right out of the gate so those initial loads while not being complete would be very close to that level on the day of opening.

Mr. Deivert said one issue is the fact from ten or eleven to seven or eight in the morning that sewage is sitting in that wet well with really low flows so it's going to build up that condition that you mentioned and that first morning pump is going to send down the line and that's we are concerned about.

Chairman Pelton said he wanted to make a reference to the sanitary sewer design basis report from Milone and MacBroom; he said third paragraph page nine they look about 34,000 LF of 6" ductile iron force main and at the top of page eleven you talk about the waste water force main of 6" in diameter is the effect length of 3,000 LF – he said he lost 400' somewhere.

Mr. Manning explained basically the full length of the force main is 34,000 LF from the pump station to the new gravity manhole on Route 10 where the force main terminates; the bridge on 691 is a high point in the force main so once the force main crosses the 691 bridge on the south side it starts flowing down hill to that manhole; he explained when the pumps turn off that last 400' that flows downhill into the manhole will completely drain out because we do have a combination air valve at the high point at the bridge so that's why we call it an effective length of 3000 LF.

Chairman Pelton said he had a couple of legal questions that we've shared with Attorney Lord and where in your vision does the private sewer established by WS become the public sewer maintained by the town it would be our thought that that would be in the manhole at the junction of Route 10 and West Main Street.

Mr. Gancarz said he thought it would be slightly up line from that because the force main comes into a new gravity section – so we would propose taking it at the first point it becomes gravity.

Mr. Manning as it goes up Route 10 north bound the force main would terminate – we would take the force main across the gas transmission lines then go to gravity; so that being the premise of being the cutoff point – would we'd like to the Authority about is an issue of working through and it was mentioned that we've got phone calls into DOT that we have a private force main within a state highway crossing a straight bridge which would be fairly problematic; one of the points we'd like to consider – is making that cut off point within the valve pit such that the public infrastructure would be starting with the force main owning the flow meter which is been very clearly pointed out that would like to be maintained by the town as public infrastructure carried out; with that being said we would propose as a separate agreement to maintain that on behalf of the town as part of the rest of the system so that way the force main is publicly owned by maintained as part of this center until such time that whether public ownership becomes a question or a process but for the proposal that's what we would like to consider at this time.

Chairman Pelton said not he wanted to discuss a little bit the public private entity – there was a lot of discussion last month about development on the east side of Route 10 and how some point in the future they might hook into your existing stub and how would that work from a public-private sewer system – who bills who for what – who's responsible for what and what is your vision for future developments should it ever occur from folks on the east side of Route 10.

Mr. Manning explained so the proposal here that you've seen in your packages proposes to extend a line; we would show a sanitary sewer line – a dry line until connection is needed down on the southern portion of our property which would end up more or less across from the private properties on the other side; the line from approximately here north is the state owned land; one thing to keep in mind this center is well below the road grade so the sewers over here are well below grade we would carry that under our parking lot using normal engineering practices – and when we get to this point we would have a terminal manhole that we would propose on the outset not to have any core that would be deep that would go down to our elevation and allow any property over here the means to get over there and at the depth required provide a core and then a drop to get into the system so that it provides the flexibility without creating a leak point or a

plug or something else that we'd have to worry about in the dry line; as these properties come up for development.

Mr. Manning explained there's two ways to do this – one is the conversation of does this become a public system – how big is the development that might be coming forward - if it's a small development and it's a slow flow maybe it's something we can handle in a private agreement that we accept that with the WPCA's approval and an agreement is worked out such that your party to it – we're party – that that gets accepted and works through the system in a manner and cost that's fair and equitable to all parties or the other conversation is if it becomes bigger and all of a sudden the WPCA or the town has concern over the quantity or flow and how its routed we could open up that dialog that is there a section that needs to become publicly owned and maintained and we would put into the agreement provisions to provide the necessary easements for access through the private property – to determine those pieces so we would put in the frame work of the developer agreement those provisions for a future option but we go into this knowing at the initial phase we will own it – we will build it – we will maintain it in the manners described above.

Mr. Manning said the capacity provided based on the calculations of the facilities plan which he believed was 600 gallons per day per acre and it's not in our purview to go above and beyond that.

Chairman Pelton said he could understand Algonquin and Yankee Gas's hesitance to here's our pipe – here's how deep it is but surely if you guys are going to develop this and work around and above their pipes you will have access to their engineering plans to know we're not going to create a significant problem.

Mr. Manning stated in a confidential manner yes; they will have onsite inspection while any work is being down – that's very common.

Chairman Pelton said candidly he's always been concerned about taking a force main over a bridge and exposing it to elements and he was pleased last month when there was testimony that it would probably be a heat treated line – now tonight we are learning that the alternative might be an installed line – he said he's a doubting Thomas; so John Perrotti asked for some data on insulated lines – he said you're going to have to sell me; not that you think it's a good idea – data analysis – places we can go – references we can make – people we can see because we're going to get the calls even though

it's your line and all of a sudden CT State Police are going to say there's a fuge coming out from under the bridge and it's you pipe please come fix it; so please appreciate that he is looking for some concrete analysis and data as why an insulated pipe versus a heat treated pipe will work.

Mr. Gancarz said the flavor of the comments basically outline the strategy where this is a private pump station but that at some point if it were ever to be become like a facility that we basically are having to built to the standards that we'd be interested in and that's why for the ultrasonic pump controls – by specifying types of pumps that already exist at Dennis's plant that are similar and have similar parts – flow meter and ways of getting a signal of getting that back to that plant – all of those things for the make, model, size of the generator- all that's kind of important to us because you don't know at some point that it may become a public station at some future point for whatever reason; he said his own personal concern is when we get offsite flows be now has another private party going into a private system that becomes a public system I thinks it gets a little bit dicey – at least my initial thinking perhaps is this is something that remains private until the time we get off site flows into it and then the Authority may wish to make it public but that's just his own way of thinking and he actually is going to throw this question over to legal counsel as to whether there's any precedence one way or the other on this type of thing; he said the second thing I'd like to point out is item four on the draft developers agreement and just kind of again for the Authority's purpose – when a developer puts in a sewer at their own cost when they do have off site users that connect to that there's basically a ten year look back period where they can assess the portion of it that helped for the offsite properties so this is something that's been in place with the town forever so I would want that outlined in the developers agreement and just kind of in a big picture what he as thinking of there's a stub being put over here that really doesn't serve this development at all but he didn't know how many hundred feet of that stub that gets that so that certainly would be something that he was sure would have a look back.

Mr. Gancarz said along with any incremental improvements – for instance if the pumps had to be upsized to take that additional 25,000 gallons flow incremental for that; he said he thought the Authority would want to have that kind of number in front of them so that they see that see that it's a reasonable number; we don't want to be in a position where and he's not saying you folks would do it but the first offsite user shows up and it's a million dollars to connect into the system.

Mr. Gancarz said with any good agreement he thinks they would want to see how that would be assessed for this so just so there's transparency there but they do want a shorter offsite users – if you look at other developments in town – Don you've certainly seen in over the number of years – that's the way they are assessed; if said if he put in a sewer down the street to get his three houses connected and then there's five infill properties that connect to that in the next ten years then actually able to get some of my funding back.

Mr. Gancarz said he thinks that's kind of the biggest thing that he had and certainly he knew Dennis spent a fair amount of time looking over the plans also.

Mr. Chelton said he had a few points – he said he seemed to recall that on these arrangements that the town would actually have an assessment – an assessment value for that section of sewer that can be used by the public; it's a hook in-charge – you establish that if he recalled by public hearing and then if anybody hooks up then they pay for their share.

Mr. Chelton said a couple things on the heat tracing – he knows that we did a crossing of Route 84 on the Judd Brook pump station in Southington – it's got to be ten maybe fifteen years ago now and we insulated in and be heat traced it – he said he can't remember of we heat traced in because our calculations said we should – if it was an owner's request or if we were just being conservative but he did know that forced main was heat traced; he said you made a comment Tim that even though you don't own that but he thought he heard him say that you want the town to take ownership of that force main because of the crossing over of the public highway its makes it easier if they are the owner of that portion.

Mr. Manning said as a private force main in the state highway there's concerns over ownership so we would propose for it to be a public owned infrastructure under an agreement for private maintenance.

Mr. Chelton said so you would have ownership of that even though they would maintain it you would have the ownership.

Chairman Pelton said the doubting Thomas just got a little more.

Mr. Chelton said the 104,000 gallons per day – was there any allowance for infiltration – he said ever sewer system has some

allowance for infiltration – it's going to leak at some point in time; he said we mentioned that at the last meeting.

Mr. Chelton said the release valve – is that going to be an automatic air release valve; he explained that we don't recommend automatics on sewage flow mains– there great on water flow mains – we stopped using automatics thirty five – forty years ago – maybe longer when he first started; the reason is and he didn't know if they've changed because he hasn't used them in that many years but when there's sewer you have solid material and it has the tendency to get hung up in that air release valve and actually hold it open and instead of serving the purpose of letting the air out it lets air into the force main so we have always recommended – we don't use and we recommend against the use of automatic air release valves on a forced main because of that reason – generally our designs we have a manual air release valve at the high point that discharge into some sort of a chamber and historically once you get the air out of that line in the initial startup you probably never have to operate that valve again because air doesn't get into the system – it's a closed system.

Mr. Chelton stated our recommendation is always been against automatic release valves.

Mr. Chelton said back on the potential for odors – you had mentioned that it would take two and a half hours to vacate that forced main at the pumped rate – he said if the pump pumps at 360 gallons a minutes at two and a half hours the pump would pump 54,000 gallons – you said in your initial comments that at opening you are going have about 48,000 gallons per day is the projected flow.

Mr. Manning explained that time frame to evacuate that 4400 gallon does not have the 365 gallon per minute pump pumping continuously for two and a half hours – what that's doing is you have cycling and that calculation is based on average day inflow into the wet well so that's not a peaked flow either – if you have peak flow during the day – everybody's there shopping using the facilities your pumps are going to cycling more frequently but that calculation is based on approximately four pump starts per hour and then the pump is only running for two to three minutes at a time to evacuate that portion of the wet well that's the operating range.

Mr. Chelton said so it's not a two and a half hour pump period.

Mr. Manning stated no – not at all – its two and a half hours of time under average daily flow coming into the station would equal that approximately 4400 gallons.

Mr. Chelton said he think Dennis mentioned in the wee hours of the morning those pump probably aren't going to kick on so that last pump of the day that's going to be sitting in the forced main and then you'll get that first pump in the morning – it's going to have several hours of sitting there and getting pretty ripe so order control odors are certainly a potential in this force main line.

Mr. Perrotti said just regarding the legality – he asked Attorney Lord if he'd get back to us with the information needed.

Attorney Lord said he thinks if he has a conversation with the applicant to more fully understand the wrinkles with the DOT and the restrictions that they've got on public versus private would be probably be the best thing to pin point at this point.

Mr. Perrotti said from his perspective on the design of this you're force main's gone directly through the heart of the property and obviously it's because it's the straightest point – less costs. He said from a maintenance perspective – should the town assume the rights to this they'd have to maintain it – is there any benefit to moving that to that to the perimeters – moving that the other areas on the site there so if there were any repairs – any maintenance – anything that was required to be dug up it would be less disruptive but you guys going into that would know that.

Mr. Manning said we can take a look at but he didn't know that adding the length in anticipated bends and everything else that goes into it whether its adding more potential issue or removing them from the system; he said he understood but he has seen a lot of force main issues – he's seen a lot of sections that might need to be evaluated and maybe replaced but he's not very familiar with force main issues over a life a project but he would defer to the experts in clarifying that point.

Chairman Pelton said what he'd like to suggest moving forward and this has been a healthy dialog and we continue to tighten up each of our perspectives; we identified a biweekly meeting early in June – what I'd like to suggest that will be on the agenda – we'll take all this information distill it back; he said it was his understanding the interim letter from the town engineer says there are more things to look at to address and give us time to quantify those so that in mid-

June you'll have the next step of the analysis of the tightening up process that we'd like to present to be able to give you enough time to come back at the June meeting to continue to fine tune the application.

Mr. Manning said he agrees with that approach, he appreciates the time and input that we've received; he thinks there's the two tracks that we see – the technical track with actual details that have been discussed here and then a frame work of a legal agreement in place and he thinks over the next week or two before the June meeting possible we have a frame work you can consider and then we can draft that into some form that come the end of June we are wrapping up the details or the frame work and we are at a point with a few tweaks we might be there; so I believe we are on the same page to the same end.

Mr. Perrotti said the technical aspect is going to be the easy part – it's going to be the political – legal aspects that we really need to go through carefully.

Chairman Pelton said he thinks they recognize from our perspective insulated pipe is new ground, working with DOT – should be go under state roads not over them so we are all learning a bit as we go along and let's continue the dialog.

Mr. Manning said excellent – we are looking forward to the end.

At this point in the meeting the Authority revisited the approval of the regular meeting minutes of May 28, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: To adjourn the meeting at 9:14 p.m. Moved by Chairman Pelton. Seconded by Mr. Scannell. The meeting was adjourned unanimously by those members voting and present.

Respectfully submitted:

**Carla Mills
Recording Secretary**