Water Pollution Control Authority  
May 26, 2010  
Special Meeting  
Town Hall – Council Chambers

Members Present:  Mr. John Attwood (Chairman)  
Mr. Walter Gancarz  
Mr. Tim Pelton  
Mr. Thomas Scannell  
Mr. Mark Witek

Members Absent:  Mr. Steve Eberle  
Mr. Mark Korman

Others Present:  Mr. Dennis Dievert, Superintendent, WPCD  
Mr. Donald Chelton, AECOM  
Mr. David Schrumm, Town Council Liaison  
Town Attorney Andrew Lord

Chairman Attwood called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.  Roll was called and a quorum determined.  The assembled group recited the Pledge of Allegiance.  Mr. Attwood explained to the audience how to exit the chamber in the event of an emergency, in compliance with the Fire Marshal’s order.

Mr. Attwood explained that the purpose of the special meeting is to discuss items relating to the Facilities Plan upgrade.

Mr. Chelton distributed copies of three documents: the agreed to project elements of the Facilities Plan, a draft of responses relating to project elements requiring additional information and further action and a memo from Mr. Dievert explaining the necessity for upgrades to the laboratory at the plant.

Question #1 relates to the cost to replace the comminutors with channel grinders.  Mr. Chelton explained that the estimated cost is $550,000.  Based on updated information, the estimated cost to replace the influent screening has been revised to $1,850,000.  Mr. Chelton thought that this was previously approved by the Authority, but presented it as a precaution.  Mr. Dievert informed the Authority that this is a moving screen which is approved by the DEP.

Mr. Chelton explained that the channel grinders macerate materials into smaller pieces.  If the material is not screened, it ends up in process tankage and the digesters, which reduces process capacity, especially during periods of higher flow.  In response to a query from Mr. Pelton, it was noted that after the material is screened out, it is lifted into the dumpster.  It is not a labor saving endeavor.  It was the consensus of the Authority that his process is related to pumping reliability of the system as well as an employee safety device.  Staff overtime will be reduced because there will not be a necessity to monitor
for clogged pumps. It was also noted that mechanical screens are standard technology for removing material from incoming wastewater.

Mr. Chelton cautioned members that the numbers associated with these estimates are very preliminary. Actual numbers will not be known until after final design.

It was the consensus of the Authority to move forward with Influent Screening.

The next area for discussion is **Septage Receiving**. Mr. Dievert explained that the DEP does not require that municipalities accept septage, although most plants do. Mr. Dennis Greci of the DEP stated in a letter that if the costs for plant upgrade are paid for in part by general taxation, then all users are paying for a portion of the upgrade, including residents with septic systems. Thus, they should be entitled to dispose of their septage at the plant.

In response to a query about surrounding towns’ charges for septage disposal, Mr. Dievert presented the following:

- Southington: $138.24 - $207.36
- Wallingford: Currently: $60.00, but increasing to $90.00
- Meriden: Currently $90.00, but increasing to $117.00
- Waterbury: Currently $80.00
- Greenwich: Currently: $70.00

Mr. Dievert referred to correspondence from Mrs. Lorraine DeNicola from Chesprocott strongly urging the WPCA to continue to accept septage from licensed plumbers who service septic systems in Town. She noted that the lifetime of a septic system can be prolonged if it is emptied on a regular basis. If the cost of having the system pumped increases, property owners may not pump as frequently, which may result in more failing septic systems. Mr. Gancarz concurs with this approach.

Mr. Attwood inquired as to whether the Town should look into increasing the cost of accepting septage. He questioned whether Cheshire’s fees are so low as to encourage dumping from other towns.

Mr. Chelton commented that there are more septage systems moving forward as a result of the Conservation and Development Map

Cost of work recommended relating to septage receiving is approximately $400,000, versus the cost to upgrade of $100,000.

**Ancillary Facilities – Emergency Power**

The draft Facilities Plan recommends the removal of the existing generator and the installation of a new generator. The Authority requested that AECOM investigate augmenting the existing generator with another to meet emergency requirements.
Mr. Chelton reported that multiple generators are connected through the process of paralleling, which matches voltage frequency and phase. If the generators are not paralleled, undue wear and tear on the generator can occur. The estimated cost to provide a second generator and paralleling switchboard is approximately $750,000 in comparison to the $700,000 cost of a single new generator.

Mr. Pelton inquired as to whether the old generator could be recycled or reused. Mr. Chelton and Mr. Dievert agreed that it may be possible to use the old generator at another Town location.

It was the consensus of the Authority to approve the emergency power generator.

Ancillary Facilities – Fuel Oil Systems

Mr. Chelton reported that the Authority requested that AECOM re-examine the estimated costs for the fuel oil systems and provide a breakdown so the cost could be better understood. He further stated that as a result of the query of Mr. Gancarz, the fuel oil tank replacement cost has been revised as shown on a Table provided to the Authority.

Mr. Gancarz expressed concern that the contingency fees provided by AECOM in the Facilities Report are too high, and could jeopardize the whole program. He questioned whether the figures should be so conservative.

Mr. Chelton responded that there are two contingencies: a 40% engineering contingency, which may actually be in the 20-25% range. Thus, the construction phase contingency is actually approximately 15%. Mr. Chelton offered that because over 30% of this project is rehabilitation, there are more chances of changes to the plans. Mr. Chelton noted that his experience has shown that the recommended contingencies are correct.

Mr. Chelton stated that the numbers before the Authority at this time are purely estimates, and will not be firm costs until after final design.

Need for Additional Space

Mr. Chelton presented information related to the Authority’s concern regarding the need for more space and improved space and the need for a laboratory upgrade. Mr. Chelton presented a table which documented the need for additional space for:

Files and storage
SCADA/Operations Areas
Reception Area
Meeting/Conference Room
Separation of Operation and Administration Functions

The need for space for all of these issues was discussed in detail. Mr. Attwood questioned the location of a door, which Mr. Dievert stated would give direct access to
the lab. Mr. Chelton reminded members that at this time discussion must relate to
general design, not specific design, as that will be done as part of the final design
preparation.

Mr. Dievert detailed reasons why the extra space is needed, specifically for additional
security of the plant and storage space. Mr. Attwood questioned whether it would be
necessary to spend 1.4 million for that extra security and space. He also questioned
whether there is a need for a new building. He offered that the use of a key card system
could eliminate some of the security issues.

Need for Laboratory Upgrade

The report detailed the fact that the current laboratory is 25 years old, and industry
practice is to upgrade the labs every 20 years. Without the upgrade, the existing lab will
be required to provide service for 45 years, which is not realistic. There is also a need for
an office, which is necessary to separate samples from reporting areas.

Mr. Chelton offered that the lab will be a fully equipped lab when completed, and will
serve the Town for more than 20 years. Equipment in the current lab is outdated and is in
need of replacement. Some of the equipment is so old that replacement parts can no
longer be found.

Mr. Gancarz commented that the laboratory upgrade represents only 6% of the project
cost, and is where employees spend their time running the plant. He stated that it is
necessary to have an upgraded laboratory to run the plant efficiently. Mr. Scannell
concurred with Mr. Gancarz, especially in view of future demands on the facility which
may be coming forth from the DEP.

Cost of the new Administration Building and modifications to the Operations
Building

Mr. Chelton presented a breakdown of the costs of the new building and the renovations
to the Operations Building with two scenarios:

Option 1: Laboratory in the new Administrations Building (currently in the draft Phase 2
Facilities Plan Report);

Option 2: Laboratory in the Operations Building (question raised at the workshop).

Mr. Chelton stated that the costs presented are in addition to the $1.75 Million for
building architectural improvements for all of the buildings at the WPCP.
New Administration Building with a Lab: $1.5 million
Reconfiguration of the Operations Building $0.45 Million (reuse of space from existing
lab).
Total: $1.95M.
After discussion regarding the new Administration Building, Mr. Attwood stated that there is a consensus for a new building, but urged Mr. Chelton to break out how much of the cost is for equipment and how much is for the building. He said it may be difficult to convince others of the need for a $2 million building. Mr. Chelton responded that it is really $1.5 million building and a $.5 million renovation.

Mr. Pelton expressed the need for the Town to have current equipment and technology and to upgrade the laboratory. This will serve the Town for many years to come.

**Sewer Maintenance Truck**

Mr. Chelton informed the Authority that the new sewer maintenance truck is necessary because the other truck is 11 years old and is corroding. He stated that it is really an in kind replacement of the current truck.

Replacing the truck now will allow the purchase to be eligible for State reimbursement. He noted that construction of a garage is not necessary in order to purchase the new truck. The truck will allow for regular sewer maintenance to help eliminate blockages in the collection system.

An additional feature of the new truck is the camera attachment which can be used to visually inspect the collection system. This will identify areas which may have structural problems as well as identifying infiltration and inflow sources. This will help identify illegal sump pump connections.

It was the consensus of the Authority that the truck be purchased, but it must fit in the current garage so a new garage will not have to be built.

Mr. Schrumm entered the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

The current estimate for the plant upgrade is approximately $31M. The next step is final design and a referendum in November of 2011. Construction is expected in 2012. Mr. Chelton informed the Authority that final design costs will be available in 12 months.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority adjourn at 7:35 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gancarz and carried unanimously.
Respectfully submitted,

John Attwood, Chairman
Water Pollution Control Authority

Attest:

Susan F. Zwick
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