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.

PUBLIC HEARING @ 6:30 P.M. – Proposed Amendments to the Cheshire Sanitary Sewer Regulations Article 12.0 (Feasibility and Final Approvals of Sanitary Sewer Plans) Sections 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.10, D2)

The Chair read the public notice of this Public Hearing as follows:

Notice is hereby given that a Public Hearing will be held by the Water Pollution Control Authority of the Town of Cheshire in Council Chambers, Town Hall, 84 South Main Street, Cheshire, Connecticut, at 6:30 P.M. on Wednesday, June 23, 2010.

At said time and place, the Water Pollution Control Authority will consider and take action on following proposed amendments to the Town of Cheshire Sewer Regulations:
Amendment to Article 12.0 (Feasibility and Final Approvals of Sanitary Sewer Plans) Sections 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.10, D.2

A copy of the proposed amendments are on file with, and available for inspection in the Cheshire Town Clerk’s Office and the Department of Public Works, 84 South Main Street, Cheshire, CT.

Public Discussion:

Ron Dischinger of 144 Cook Hill Road who is President / CEO of Elim Park came forward to speak to the Authority, specifically about Section 12.6 of the Sewer Regulations. He stated that through the years with the expansions at Elim Park, he has been involved in a number of special permit applications with various commissions and authorities in Cheshire. Not being privy to the WPCA’s thoughts in making the proposed revisions to section 12.6, he would like to make the following observations.

First, he commended the Authority for proposing the initial 2-year approval. However, to the layman it appears that the Authority is attempting to vigorously control future approvals for extensions of a special permit. Mr. Dischinger is concerned inasmuch as it is difficult to bring a project to substantial completion within the initial 2-year approval timeframe. And that will leave an organization open to the possibility of being denied a one year extension of the special permit and potentially unable to complete the project.

In Mr. Dischinger’s personal experience with special permit applications, significant projects can easily eat up the initial 2-year approval period:

- Completing project architectural drawings (generally only schematic drawing phase are complete at the time of approval) could take 8 months following WPCA approval: the design development, construction document and bid document phases);
- Marketing of the project would likely start when approvals for the building are obtained (it can take 18 months to reach critical mass to begin construction) and
- Project financing can take 6 – 12 months to put in place (and that can only begin when construction documents are complete and a guaranteed maximum price (GMP) is obtained); and
- Actual construction can take 12 – 14 months before and the building department issues a substantial completion certificate.

All totaled, it could run 30 to 48 months from the initial granting of the special permit approval to the time of substantial completion. An organization such as Elim Park would be back at least once for an additional one-year approval to bring the project to substantial completion.

Mr. Dischinger’s suggestion would be for the Authority to consider changing the word “and” to “or” in the second sentence of the proposed revision so that it reads: “Extension of the WPCA final approval for additional one-year periods may be given by the WPCA, by resolution, upon good cause shown, or if, in its discretion, the WPCA finds that substantial…”

Mr. Dischinger stated that with that simple change, an organization would have the opportunity to show “good cause” as to why an extension should be considered. Further, if the Proposed Regulation Revisions are adopted, Mr. Dischinger would respectfully request that the Authority retroactively make
Attorney Anthony Fazzone of 500 Payne Drive came forward and stated that he would like to echo Mr. Dischinger’s comments. He stated that he has gone through lists of past minutes with some approvals that are out there, for example the Housing Authority application for the property on West Main Street, which is probably running out of their approval time on their final design. Attorney Fazzone stated that he agrees that the current approved applications should be retroactively giving the 2-year approval, if the WPCA decides to go a head with this Sewer Regulation revision.

He also commented on the number of projects with extensions granted by the WPCA without substantial work being completed on the project. Attorney Fazzone understands the intent of not wanting to tie up capacity allocations for projects that are not going to be built, adding that this type of limitation is already built into the capacity approval.

**MOTION**

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority close the Public Hearing regarding the Proposed Amendments to the Cheshire Sanitary Sewer Regulations Article 12.0 (Feasibility and Final Approvals of Sanitary Sewer Plans) Sections 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.10, D2). The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried unanimously, 5 -0.

**PUBLIC HEARING @ 7:00 P.M.– Presentation of the findings of Draft Phase 1, Wastewater Facilities Plan**

The Chair read the public notice of this Public Hearing as follows:

The Town of Cheshire Water Pollution Control Authority announces a Public Hearing on the Phase 1 Wastewater Facilities Plan on Wednesday, June 23, 2010 at 7:00 P.M. in the Town Council Chambers, Town Hall, 84 South Main Street, Cheshire.

The Agenda includes a brief presentation on the findings of the draft Phase 1 Wastewater Facilities Plan including the planned future extension of the sewer system. Copies of the draft report will be available for review at the Cheshire Library, 104 Main Street, Town Clerk and Public Works / Engineering Department, Town Hall, 84 South Main Street, by June 16th.

**Public Discussion:**

Mr. Chelton and Mr. Pearson were the consulting engineers from AECOM present to review the some of the history of the Cheshire Wastewater Facility as well as the guidelines and criteria for potential future sewering locations in Cheshire and review the results of AECOM’s efforts.
The first master sewerage plan for Cheshire was developed in 1965, which was the same as a facilities plan. The original 1.5 mgd Water Pollution Control Plant was built in 1971. An upgrade to the Plant was completed in 1993, allowing the Plant to treat an average of 3.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and a peak flow of 7.75 mgd.

As a result of an unusually wet fall of 2004 and spring of 2005, the 6-month rolling average exceeded 90% of the Plant’s permitted capacity in April 2005 which required the Town to prepare a plan to accommodate future increases in flow to the Plant. Also in 2005 the State of Connecticut published its Conservation and Development Policies Plan that restricts where sewers can be extended without State Funding to local governments being negatively effected. In 2006 the denitrification facility was constructed. In 2008 the Water Pollution Control Plant was re-rated by the DEP up to 4.0 mgd at the current plant and the Phase 1 Wastewater Facilities Plan was drafted to project future wastewater flows for 20 year planning. A Phase 2 Facilities Plan was recently developed and submitted as a draft. The Phase 1 Plan is really a needs plan to establish where sewers may be needed in the next 20 years. The Phase 2 Plan is targeting the Waste Water Treatment Plant and the upgrade that will be needed to meet the needs for those additional flows.

Mr. Chelton reviewed the existing sewer system in Cheshire. The system is made up of about 95 miles of main line sewers and 9 pump stations. Since 1987, when the last update to the Facilities Plan was prepared, there have been some significant expansions to the west Cheshire area, East Johnson Avenue, Glen Brook Drive and in addition there have been a number of sewers that have been constructed by developers, most notably Moss Farms and the Northridge developments. The main components of any waste water system are domestic flow (the normal discharge from our homes), commercial & industrial discharges from the businesses in Town and infiltration & inflow. Right now there are approximately 4,700 domestic users connected to the Town’s sewer system and about 415 commercial / industrial users. The average daily flow during the planning period was 2.8 mgd.

Mr. Chelton showed the Zoning map for the Town of Cheshire and stated that in developing where sewers may be extended in the future, there were some basic guidelines that were followed. First is that all R-80 zoned areas will not be sewered, this is consistent with what the Town had adopted back in 1978 and also consistent with the Connecticut DEP’s Sewer Avoidance program. This area is shown in orange on the Zoning map. Areas zoned R-20 and R-40 will be sewered on a need basis. This has been modified from the last Plan, as the last Plan said that all R-20 and smaller areas would be sewered. This current plan looked at this Plan and as opposed to “would be sewered”; they will now only be sewered on a need basis. For commercial and industrial zoned land, the guideline was that a certain percentage of undeveloped areas would be developed over the 20-year planning period.

As mentioned earlier, in 2005 the State adopted the Conservation and Development Plan for a 5-year planning period. The Plan was developed by the Office of Policy and Management and was adopted by the Legislature in 2005. This Plan encourages growth around existing infrastructure and discourages the development of new infrastructure in outlying areas, which they refer to as Conservation Areas and are displayed in shades of green or white on their map. According to the State’s Conservation and Development Plan, these conservation or preservation areas should not be sewered and if they were sewered the Town would run the risk of potentially loosing funding on future projects. This type of document is currently called “Smart Growth”. Sewers can be extended into conservation areas if some of those areas are developed and there is an existing need for sanitation sewers to solve problems for on lot disposal systems. That was taken into consideration in this planning document.
Mr. Chelton reviewed some of the design parameters for this report, which is for planning of 2010 through 2030. For domestic flows, AECOM assumed 3 people per household, which is based on a 2000 census population of 28,543 people in the Town of Cheshire living in 9,588 housing units. The average per capita water use, based on their analysis, is 66 gallons per capita per day. AECOM has assumed that 90% of that will get returned to the sewer system per day or 60 gallons per capita per day of wastewater generation. For commercial and industrial areas, AECOM used 600 gallons per acre per day wastewater production. That is somewhat lower than some of the normal standard values; usually these areas assume a rate of 1,000 to 1,500 gallons per acre per day. In 1987 the Facilities Plan downgraded that number to 600 gallons per acre per day based upon an analysis of the water being used by the existing industries at that time. AECOM re-evaluated the water use for commercial / industrial areas as a result of this study and calculated that the average water use in those areas is about 229 gallons per acre per day. So 600 gallons per acre per day is somewhat of a conservative number now, but AECOM stayed with the same number that was established in the mid 1980’s. There is always going to be some extraneous flow in the sewer system, for infiltration AECOM assumed a rate of 200 gallons per acre per day in residential areas. In commercial areas a rate of 100 gallons per acre per day was assumed. With regards to inflow, we assumed there would be no additional inflow. The reason for that is because the Town right now is in the middle of a program to help reduce inflow, they just completed a program to seal a number of manhole covers in low-lying areas that were sources of inflow. The Town plans to continue in these efforts going forward.

In addition to the base flows, there are some special flows that need to be considered but don’t fall into any real categories. These special flows that need to be considered are Cheshire Academy, Elim Park and Cheshire Correctional Institute and also some special allowances for the Interchange Zone. Mr. Chelton noted that the zoning was changed for the Interchange Zone during the middle of this report’s preparation so a special allowance was added to account for this.

In developing future flows, AECOM looked at 2 main categories. The first was infilling, which are those areas where sewers exist but people are not necessarily connected to the sewer. AECOM estimated that there are approximately 700 properties that have been assessed for sewage but have not yet connected to the system. AECOM has assumed that all of these properties will connect over the next 20 years and that some of those properties that are larger than the current zoning where they exist, that they would be sub-divided to allow for that additional development. AECOM also looked at extending the sewer system in both the growth areas, as allowed by the Conservation and Development Plan, and in the conservation areas that right now have some existing development and may experience problems with their existing on lot systems over the next 20 years.

For residential zoned areas, AECOM established a number of criteria that they looked at in trying to make a determination as to whether a particular area should be recommended for sewer in the next 20 years or not. Not all of the locations had equal weight given to them, there was a lot of weight put on the Chesprocott consultation because they work with on lot systems on a daily basis. AECOM also looked at zoning, lot size, location and proximity to existing sewer system and soil suitability. AECOM also reviewed about 177 system failure reports at Chesprocott taken from over the years, classified as easy to repair, moderate to repair or difficult to repair. The Town of Cheshire also keeps record of all the septic pumping that takes place and in areas that they found septic systems need to be pumped on a more frequent basis, that is generally an indicator that there are soils in the area that may not necessarily be conducive to long term use of on lot systems.

AECOM also sent out a questionnaire to 2,354 residences of which they received 1,518 responses, which is about 64%. In the questionnaire AECOM asked such questions as providing the resident’s
system type and age, how often it is pumped out, are there any known problems with the system and in
the resident’s opinion, is there a need for sewers in their neighborhood.

Based on all the criteria and information AECOM analyzed the data, held several workshops as a group,
the WPCA and Chesprocott. A number of areas were looked at, various areas were subdivided the
unsewered areas and grouped them together and analyzed them based on the criteria. The following are
the results of this analysis, which determined whether or not AECOM would recommend or not
recommend sewering of these locations over the next 20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Growth Areas of the Connecticut Conservation & Development Plan
| A    | Westside Rd, Barnhill Rd, Percival Dr | No |
| B    | Moss Farms Rd, Stacy Ct, Moss Ln, Alpine Dr | No |
| C    | Peck Ln, Sloper Ln, Abbey Ct, Grandview Ct | No |
| D    | Deer Run Cir, Oakridge Dr, Vista Ter | No |
| E    | Wolf Hill Rd, Wolf Hill Ct, Braemar Dr | No |
| F    | Beacon Hill Dr, Nob Hill Rd, Payne Dr | Yes |
| G    | Knollwood Cir | No |
| H    | Stony Hill Rd, Country Club Rd, Woodland Dr, Brook Ln | No |
| I    | Chapman School, Highland Ave | Yes |
| J    | Applewood Dr, Fairwood Dr | Yes |
| K    | Country Club Rd | No |
| L    | Farm Meadow Ln | No |
| M    | Birch Dr, Poplar Dr, Aspen Dr | No |
| N    | North of 84, Marion Rd, Upson Pl | No |
| O    | East of Marion Rd, North of Huckins Rd, McKinley Rd | No |

Conservation Areas of the Connecticut Conservation & Development Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marion Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peck Ln, Devonwood Dr</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Birch Dr (lower)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Ridge Ct, Cheshire St (northern)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nicole Ct, Suffield Ct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cheshire St (southern near Allen Ave)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meriden Rd (northern near Norton Ln)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Meriden Rd (southern near Scenic Ct ext.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oregon Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Meriden Rd, Peach Tree Ct, Cortland Cir</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wiese Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sir Walter Dr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Talmadge Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Carriage Dr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Radmere Rd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Coleman Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jinny Hill Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Fenn Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>Fenn Rd, Sturbridge Ct, Deerfield Ct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address Details</td>
<td>Sewered Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c</td>
<td>Hidden Pl, Old Ln, Stonehenge Pl</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d</td>
<td>Fenn Rd, Orchard Hill Rd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18e</td>
<td>Bradford Dr, Mt. Sanford Rd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18f</td>
<td>Harrison Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18g</td>
<td>Romulus Rd, Remus Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>Towpath Ln, Golden Rod Ct, Iris Ct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>Ward Ln, Verbena Ct, Arrowleaf Ct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19c</td>
<td>Wintergreen Ln, Watch Hill Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>Cornwall Ave, Argle Dr, Rustic Ln</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>Oak Ave, Frances Ct, Foxwood Ct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>Cornwall Ave, Argle Dr, Rustic Ln</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20c</td>
<td>Timber Ln (northern)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20d</td>
<td>Mountain Rd, Timber Ln (southern)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20e</td>
<td>Ives Row</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20f</td>
<td>Mountain Rd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Chelton noted that it has been projected for the next 20 years that a 1.2 million gallons per day increase will be needed in Cheshire if the recommended areas are sewered, along with the current existing average base flow of 2.8 mgd would bring the Plant to 4.0 mgd for the average daily flow per day, which is the level that the Plant is currently rated at. Based on these projections and information, the Phase 2 Facilities Plan sized the Waste Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Chelton noted that it is very fortunate, and purely by coincidence, that this number matches the current capacity of the Plant and the Plant will not have to undergo a hydraulic upgrade but simply an equipment upgrade and a process upgrade to accommodate the new phosphorus limits that will be imposed on the Town in the very near future by the EPA and the State.

Mr. Chelton then asked for comments, questions or concerns from the public.

Earl Kurtz of 648 Wallingford Road came forward to address the Authority stating that the report calls for Charles Drive and Sir Walter Drive to be sewered but not Talmadge Road, what about his property at 648 Wallingford Road, which falls between these 2 locations? He noted that Copper Beach Drive is sewered. Mr. Kurtz also asked if this 20-year plan for Cheshire can be changed in 20 years? He also asked if the WPCA is working with the Planning & Zoning Commission and Planning Department to dovetail this Plan for the sewer system with the Town’s Plan of Development?

Mr. Chelton replied that he cannot answer the question right now, specifically related to 648 Wallingford Road but he will get back to the Authority. He added that regarding the 20-year plan, this is the plan with today’s data and analysis, and it may require revisions over the next 20 years. Mr. Chelton noted that the Town Planner has played an active role in the developing of this document and has given input for potential development areas in Cheshire. It was also noted that the Economic Development Commission has been invited and has attended the workshops that were held to discuss the commercial / industrial zoning predictions of 50% of the undeveloped areas will be sewered in the next 20 years.

Anthony Fazzone of 500 Payne Drive and the Attorney representing Brodach Builders for a development at 210 Wiese Road came forward to address the Authority. He stated that on map 5-2 there are areas that he believes are in a dotted yellow background that are labeled as “undeveloped” properties, would these not be recommended for sewers? Attorney Fazzone also mentioned that that the
Connecticut Conservation and Development map has been extended into 2012 without any revisions by the Legislature. He asked if there is a general statement in the Plan that would indicate that when they do come out in 2012 with a change to that map, that is initiated by the Town, is there flexibility in the Plan to then say that those parcels can be sewer? Specifically for property located at 210 Wiese Road that extends to Buckland Drive, it is located in area 11 on map 5-2; the owner is Serenity Ranch, LLC. As indicated before, Brodach Builders Inc. is the permit holder and has approvals from the Planning & Zoning Commission. The Planning & Zoning Commission has already changed the zoning on that parcel to an overlay zone, which that zone is now age restricted, age 55 housing. Brodach Builders has permits to build 41 units of age restricted housing on this parcel.

Attorney Fazzone is present this evening on behalf of the owners and Brodach Builders to request that the authority classify that property as recommended for sewer. Attorney Fazzone stated that he did submit a letter on May 17th to the Authority requesting that that change be made to the Plan. He also has a timeline of the approvals for the Richmond Glen project that dates back to 2004, when the applicant was first before the WPCA and received feasibility approval. As Mr. Chelton said, the Town became aware in 2005 of the State’s Conservation & Development Plan. In March 2006 Brodach Builders was denied final design approval, with the primary reason being that it was in a conservation area and the indication from the State was that it would jeopardize future funding. Attorney Fazzone stated that all the maps that he has looked at that are part of the Plan, map 5-2 and the other ones that talk about the sewer and non-sewer. They refer only to the C & D growth areas, but when you look at the Plan with the crosshatching on map 5-2 shows C & D growth area, clarifying that includes neighborhood conservation area. If you look at the center of the blue area, it corresponds pretty significantly to the pink area, which is designated on the map as neighborhood conservation and is an area that is allowed to be sewer under the Plan of Conservation & Development. This is just as a clarification; within these maps they have all kind of been lumped into C & D growth area but do include neighborhood conservation.

After Brodach Builders was denied final development because the parcel was in a conservation area, they went to the State Continuing Legislative Committee on Intern Change and they were successful in getting the parcel of land in question, which they would like to include and recommend for sewer, changed to neighborhood conservation. Neighborhood conservation is not shown anywhere on any of the maps and the fact that the Serenity Ranch 210 Wiese Road parcel is now designated by the State as a neighborhood conservation area that is not reflected on any of these maps by cross-hatching as the other potentially sewerable areas are.

As you are aware, after Brodach Builders received the change to neighborhood conservation, they came back to the WPCA and the Richmond Glen site, as reflected in your minutes, received full approval; design and capacity approval for 6,150 gallons per day, which approval based on last month is now good through September 2011. Attorney Fazzone would, just going through the criteria, which originally he thought were significant criteria, that this property as he has already indicated, meets the criteria for being recommended for sewer. This property has a zoning approval density of age restricted that is extremely and very comparable to the R-20A zone, it allows for 2 units to the acre in the Regulations. Attorney Fazzone has looked at Technical Memorandum # 4, page 18 gives a brief description, and he thought that this description did suggest that the R-20 land in the north-westerly quarter be recommended for sewer and that in the description of the soils, in all of area 11, on page 18 of that Technical Memorandum # 4 the Facility Plan document points out that in that whole area the soils have “mostly poor suitability”. Another criteria is location, with respect to R-40 lands it is recommended that those that are adjacent to existing sewer be recommended for sewer and those that are remote not be recommended for sewer. There are sewer in Buckland Drive. Attorney Fazzone
showed a map of the area around Buckland Drive as it currently exists and stated that there is a manhole on Buckland Drive. In the previous approval there was final design approval to connect to the manhole on Buckland Drive. When Buckland Drive was conveyed to the Town of Cheshire, originally Buckland Drive was intended to extend into the Serenity Ranch / Richmond Glen parcel. The deeds to the Town include Buckland Drive and a parcel that Attorney Fazzone highlighted in yellow, over which the Town has granted them an easement to get to the sewer in Buckland Drive. This cul-de-sac was never built, but is shown on here as what was originally intended and was before the Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Cheshire. Attorney Fazzone pointed out property lines on the map and stated that he believes the location is adjacent to existing sanitary sewers. The proposal that Brodach Builders has made to the Town is for everything that will be built as a private system. They will not be extending the public system to the manhole. This existing manhole… Chairman Attwood interrupted Attorney Fazzone and stated that he does think that the WPCA will talk about this area later and asked that Attorney Fazzone stick to the discussion of the Phase 1 Plan.

Attorney Fazzone stated that what he is getting at is that the location in question is adjacent to an existing sewer. Those three criteria at least, in their opinion, they meet. The zoning density, which they have, is 2 units per the acre, they are designated on the State map as neighborhood conservation, which is allowed to be sewered. The soil on this parcel, the WPCA has previously heard reports will not support the 2 units per acre. As far as location, this parcel in question is adjacent to existing sewers. Based on these criteria, Attorney Fazzone did have some exhibits. The timeline shows how this application has gone from 2004 to Feasibility, gotten their Planning & Zoning approvals, come up with the issue with the State Plan for Conservation & Development, been denied for final design, they have gone to the State Legislature, which is a system that is provided by State Statute, they have gotten a change to neighborhood conservation, they have come back to the Authority and in 2008 received final design and capacity approval. Here we are asking, and we think correctly, that this parcel be included as recommended for sewering within the new Facilities Plan. Attorney Fazzone distributed a summary of his points and a copy of the timeline to the members of the WPCA for their deliberations. There were also individual copies of the timeline, which Attorney Fazzone would like made as exhibits in the Public Hearing, if there are in fact exhibits in the Public Hearing. Attorney Fazzone also offered to answer any questions that the members of the Authority may have.

Matthew Bowman of 315 Oregon Road came forward to address the Authority noting that his property on Oregon Road will never need to be sewered as there is nothing but gravel in the area. He did ask if there has been any consideration given to the Clean Water Act of 1992, the lower flows on toilets, showers, etc.? Mr. Bowman noted that what used to use 5 gallons, and then 3.5 gallons of water per flush is now down to 1.6 gallons of water per flush; flows on kitchen faucets have also decreased as well as bathroom faucets. As a result, homes that were 600 gallons of wastewater per day will simply be much less going forward. Mr. Bowman asked what percentage of the homes are before 1992 and what percentage of the homes are after 1992 and how is AECOM getting the average of 600 gallons per day? He also asked how the concentration of effluent will affect the Water Treatment Plant or the ability to process the waste at the sewer treatment facility?

Mr. Bowman noted that AECOM put a lot of weight on Chesprocott, and Lorain is very good and has been on a lot of parcels of property, but she hasn’t been on all of them. It was stated previously that a lot of weight was given to what Chesprocott had said, but Mr. Bowman expressed some concern that there was no input from the Inland / Wetlands Commission or the Planning & Zoning Commission, only the Town Planner. He suggested that the WPCA should talk to some elected officials before making a decision for the next 20 years. It is kind of hard to believe sitting back there listening to this, but is the
Sewer Commission trying to control the development of Cheshire? He hopes not, that really is for an elected Board not an appointed Board. Mr. Bowman recommended that another Public Hearing be held in conjunction with the Planning & Zoning Commission, Inland / Wetlands Commission and the Water Pollution Control Authority. Mr. Bowman added that he believes this should be broadened a little further.

John Milone of 1400 Half Moon Road came forward to address the Authority stating that he wanted to echo what Mr. Bowman has said. Given the time that’s been put into this, several years, and the importance of this to the Community, not withstanding the fact that there may have been some administrative input from the Town Planner, it would be appropriate to hold this Public Hearing open for formal input from at least Planning and Zoning Commission, ideally the Inland /Wetlands Commissions as well, prior to adoption. Mr. Milone stated that he didn’t see any harm, given the time that’s been put into it so far to making sure that those bodies are on board as well.

Tim White of 29 Tanglewood Circle came forward to address the Authority, noting that he is also a member of the Town Council and apologizing for arriving late to this Hearing. He asked if Harrison Road, near Rising Trail, will it be included in the 20-year plan? Mr. White stated that there are relatively small lots near the end of a sewer line where their septic systems are in their back yards that are blocked by lots of trees, adding that he is hoping they will be included in the 20 year sewer plan for Cheshire. He also urged the Authority to keep the commercially zoned areas of Town are taken very seriously to maintain the option to sewer.

John Jacuruso of 21 Amherst Drive came forward to address the Authority also as the property owner of the commercial area located at 839 / 831 West Main Street. He said these West Main Street properties are currently not sewered but he wishes that they would be considered for sewers.

Matthew Bowman of 315 Oregon Road again approached the Authority and questioned when this initial Plan was put together back in 1971 and it was planned that basically most of the R-20 and R-40 area be included and R-80 would be excluded and this Plan was put before the Town. The Town understood and bought into a program of funding. Mr. Bowman questioned now that the Authority was cutting this back and not as much land is being allowed to be sewer, how is the funding going to be for the sewer? He added that he believes the Water Pollution Control Authority is kind of a quasi-public type situation that is supposed to be self-supporting. Mr. Bowman stated that he could be mistaken, but he is pretty sure that is the case, and the Authority does receive a large amount of money from the Town of Cheshire every year in its budget. If the Authority is going to condense the number of people that are going to have the availability for sewer, maybe we should really live within our means, like people are forcing the Pool to live within its means and to become completely self sufficient.

Anthony Fazzone of 500 Payne Drive again approached the Authority and commented that this Plan was a monumental task with a lot of effort put into it and a good amount of effort and thought. He noted that Mr. Jacuruso’s commercial property on West Main Street is a parcel of C-3 land and is one lot removed from Mountain Road where the golf driving range and garden center are, adding that Mr. Jacuruso is also a client of Attorney Fazzone’s. It is C-3 back several hundred feet; the area on Mountain Road that is recommended for sewer but the parcel right next to it is designated as an infill.
parcel. As a commercial piece of property, it would allow for example a restaurant use, it would allow for uses that would be most likely higher in need for sewer than anything else.

Mr. Chelton stated that the Plan recommends that the industrial and commercial zones in Cheshire should be sewered but nothing specific is addressed as to where those sewers would be installed in the next 20 years. For the purposes of establishing the flow allowance, it was the consensus of the Authority, the members representing the Economic Development Commission and the members that represented Planning & Zoning at the workshops that of the acreage that is currently undeveloped and unsewered, that 50% of that land over the next 20 years would be sewered and will contribute flow to the Waste Water Treatment Plant. There has been a flow allowance allowed for areas like 839 / 831 West Main Street, but again there is no specific plan that says it will definitely go to that area, as they believe it should be done on a need basis as established by the Water Pollution Control Authority.

Chairman Attwood stated that they would try to respond to everything they can. With regards to Mr. Bowman’s comments about inclusion of the other Town commissions and boards, they were all invited to be here for each of the workshops. Representatives from the Planning & Zoning Commission, Economic Development Commission were here; the Wetlands were invited. The exact statements that Mr. Bowman used were probably paraphrased to everyone, this is a large piece as were all the elected officials were requested and sometimes demanded to partake in this.

Chairman Attwood noted that with regards to the question about Harrison Road, the WPCA will try to find out the answer. It was also noted that lower flows were taken into consideration pre-1992, with regards to the data collected and calculated for this Plan.

MOTION

Mr. Korman moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority close the Public Hearing regarding the Presentation of the Findings of Draft Phase 1, Wastewater Facilities Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.

REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING was called to order at 8:10 P.M. by Chairman Attwood.

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority add to the Regular Meeting agenda of June 23, 2010 item 1a. “Executive Session Discussion re: WPCA lawsuit”. The motion was seconded by Mr. Korman and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.

1. Public Communications

Copy of Civil Summons from State of Connecticut Superior Court received on 06/11/10 (Plaintiff: Brodach Builders)

A. Executive Session Discussion re: WPCA lawsuit

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority go into Executive Session to discuss the lawsuit brought against the WPCA by Brodach Builders and that the Executive Session be
extended to include the WPCA Board Members, Attorney Lord and Town Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Korman and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority exit out of its Executive Session to discuss the lawsuit brought against the WPCA by Brodach Builders with no motions or actions taken. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gancarz and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.

2. Discussion and Possible Action regarding Sanitary Sewer Regulation Amendments

Mr. Pelton commented that he would be OK with using the word “or” instead of the word “and”, as Mr. Dischinger has suggested for Section 12.6 but would defer to Attorney Lord’s expertise. Attorney Lord stated that he did not have a strong feeling either way on the wording options, both wording options would require the applicant to show good cause or show construction. Mr. Gancarz questioned if the amendment should be changed to 3 years, if it actually takes that long for this process? Mr. Pelton commented that the 2-year amendment to the Sewer Regulations would help to synchronize the timelines the WPCA is trying to work with, to meet their goals. Chairman Attwood stated that he agreed. Mr. Witek added that it would not be good having applications sitting out there too long to delay or might void someone else’s project, if they are not serious about going forward.

APPROVAL MOTION

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority accept the amendments to the Proposed Sanitary Sewer Regulations for sections 12.5, 12.7, 12.8, 12.10, D2 as presented, with the exception of Section 12.6 which shall read:

12.6 Final approval issued in connection with a special permit application shall be valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of approval by the WPCA. Extensions of the WPCA final approval for additional one-year periods may be given by the WPCA, by resolution, upon good cause shown, or if, in its discretion, the WPCA finds that substantial compliance has been made with the approved special permit, that is, that work on the public improvements and sewer system has been completed or substantially completed.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell.

Discussion:
Attorney Lord commented that the standard should be the same whether it’s a site plan application, or special permit application or subdivision application. Mr. Pelton stated that he agreed.

Mr. Attwood amended his motion to include section 12.5 and 12.7, in addition to 12.6 where the wording shall read, “…by the WPCA, by resolution, upon good cause shown, or if, in its discretion, the WPCA finds substantial compliance has been made…” so that the wording would be changed to or in all three sections, instead of and. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.
3. Discussion and Possible Action regarding Draft Phase I Facilities Plan

Mr. Gancarz suggested that this item be deferred so that the action items brought forward during the Public Hearing tonight can be investigated. Mr. Pelton stated that he agreed. Action items to be reviewed include the question of whether Mr. Kurtz’s property at 648 Wallingford Road would or would not be recommended for sewers, based upon its location; there was a lengthy discussion with Attorney Fazzone related to the property at 210 Wiese Road and should be reviewed to see if there is a specific item to be addressed, specifically about the soils, the access to the Buckland Drive sewers and if the property is in a R-20 zone; Mr. Bowman questioned about new technologies and flow rates and the impact of improving technology over the next 20 years; the participation of Planning & Zoning and Inland / Wetlands as well as elected officers was questioned by Mr. Milone; the question from Mr. White regarding Harrison Road / Rising Trail; the property located at 831 / 839 West Main Street; and Commercial Zoning. It was agreed that Metcalf & Eddy should prepare as many responses to the questions as possible, based on the research they have already done and prepared for the Town, to be consistent.

MOTION

Mr. Gancarz moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority table any further discussion or possible action regarding Draft Phase I Facilities Plan until the July 2010 WPCA meeting, when more information can be gathered to answer the questions brought forward tonight at the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.

4. Applications

A. Richmond Glen (210 Wiese Road and Buckland Court) – Application for Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit and Application for Final Design Approval for Extension of Public Sanitary Sewer submitted by Fazzone & Ryan, LLC on behalf of Brodach Builders

Anthony Fazzone, of Fazzone & Ryan, LLC representing Brodach Builders was present on behalf of this application. He stated that the application is for final design and connection for the Richmond Glen project. The applicant is seeking a repeat on the final design approval. Attorney Fazzone brought forward Stephen Dietzko, P.E. of Milone & MacBroom to go through the design.

Stephen Dietzko, P.E. of Milone & MacBroom reviewed the sanitary sewer design for Richmond Glen. He reminded the Authority that this is the very same exact plan, no changes, to what the Commission approved in September 2008. For the benefit of the new members, Mr. Dietzko will review the plans.

The Richmond Glen site is on 31.5 acres located on Wiese Road, largely interior, with a potential connection to Buckland Drive through an access strip that is owned by the Town. Honey Pot Brook is on the east side of the property, flowing down on the south side. The property is moderate to fairly sloped. The proposal is for 41 units of Age Restricted, as a zone change on top of the underlying R-40 zone. The site is about 7.5 acres of wetlands and flood plan, leaving a net acreage of about 24 acres, upon which that development is to occur. The development is a loop road, private road, with no Town facilities within the site. It will be served by underground utilities with primary
access from Wiese Road and emergency access occasioned up through Buckland Drive. That will be chained off except for emergency access by fire and emergency personnel. The units are all detached condominiums, so to speak, except for one unit that comprises the location of the existing home, which will be split into two units kind of like a duplex. The homes are laid out in a cluster orientation to take advantage of the existing site conditions, views, respect for wetlands and significant vegetation. All the major trees located here will be worked around and preserved.

The waste water system proposed is a low-pressure sewer system also known as a grinder pump system. That system is proposed to connect to the municipal sewer system, again like everything else within the site, will be private; privately owned and maintained. The map shows Route 10, the yellow depicts the existing sewers, with the proposed common force main which will tie into an extension of the gravity sewer coming off of Buckland Drive and then all discharge flows down the existing public sewer system here. As part of the initial approval process here, the applicant had done a down stream capacity analysis looking at the ability of the sanitary sewers down stream to accommodate the inflows from the proposed development. The applicant anticipates 6,150 gallons per day to be generated by the proposed development. Approximately 30 days ago at this Authority’s last meeting, you extended the Capacity Allocation for the property to this exact same number of 6,150 gallons per day. That is an active Capacity Allocation, the applicant is here asking for re-approval of the Final Design of the waste water system for the site.

Mr. Dietzko reviewed some of the technical drawings of the site. They depict the end of the cul-de-sac at Buckland Drive, its an existing gravity sewer manhole that is the terminus of the existing sewer for the homes that are on Buckland and drains to the north. He showed the existing access easement, which was highlighted in yellow on the map, the Town property, which across it will be constructed a box culvert and an access road way for emergency access and within that they will also have an extension of the gravity sewer. That extended gravity sewer manhole will terminate on Town property and the connection will be made of the common force main coming out of the Richmond Glen property in the low-pressure sewer.

Chairman Attwood asked who would own this part, the extension of the Town right of way that is approximately 50 feet wide, that is owned by the Town. Mr. Dietzko pointed out on the map the different locations of the property lines and identified who would own which section. The private sewer will be the common force main, 3 inch in diameter at the point of discharge. According to Mr. Dietzko, that will be privately owned and maintained by Richmond Glen. The section of the extended gravity sewer would be municipally owned and maintained.

Attorney Fazzone came forward and stated that that was not correct. He said that is being treated as a lateral going in to the manhole in Buckland Drive, so he doesn’t know what in terms of the connection at the existing manhole, he doesn’t believe that any of that is public, so this is entirely a privately owned system. The manhole and the gravity portion within that easement area are again to be owned and maintained by the homeowners association, it is not intended to be public.

Chairman Attwood asked to clarify; from the Buckland manhole onwards is private? Attorney Fazzone replied that was correct.

Mr. Dietzko stated that he stands corrected. That would be a private system all the way to the connection to the existing sewer manhole at Buckland Drive. The majority of it, 3,000 linear feet, is a common force main on the property of the development. The balance being a gravity sewer of 148 feet in length would be on the Town right of way within the easement.
The sewer shed, or the limit of the area that can drain to this sewer system is limited to the private development. There is no accommodation for any easements or connections to any adjoining properties. This is a system that specifically designed to accommodate the flow from the 41 units without accommodation for additional units. Being a pressure sewer system, there is quite limited to nil opportunities for infiltration into the system so future flows should be very consistent with what the design flows are obviously in that regard. The common force main is to be 2 inches in diameter, it will be HDPE force main SDR-11. This can be seen on the drawings entitled G1, G2 and G3, it is shown as a dash line. At the beginning there are lower limits of the project where there are fewer units tying in. There will be a 2-inch diameter sewer for 1,000 feet; it will transition to a 3-inch diameter sewer for the remainder of its journey until its connection to the gravity manhole. There will be flushing connections and air relief valves along the way, a number of those, which are depicted along the plan as well.

The way that the grinder pump system works is that the common force main is within the roadway leading up to Buckland Drive, due north. Each home has a lateral, very much like a lateral water service connection. The homes would all have basement service, as is the Town requirement. The units would be plumbed to a small diameter wet well, it will be 30 inches in diameter, and it is about 8 feet deep. Within the wet well will be a pre-fabricated assembly of a pump, floats, controls and valves which would be plumbed into the house connection and would lead out to a service lateral. The service lateral will connect to the common force main; there is essentially a curb stop, which is comprised of a shut off valve and check valve so that flow doesn’t come back. It has been specified that E1 pumps be used, which to Mr. Dietzko’s knowledge, municipal pump stations use centrifugal pump. This is a semi-positive displacement pump, which is kind of like a progressive cavity pump. It has a cutting mechanism and grinding mechanism; the beauty of the semi-positive displacement pump is that through the sequence of chambers that the effluent is carried up, you essentially end up with an operating curve that provides a very much a uniform rate of flow against variant head conditions. This is a pump performance curve that depicts discharge in gallons per minute compared to total dynamic head, which is your vertical lift plus the friction in the pipe. By specifying the E1 pump unit, DH071, which is a small pump, for each unit, every pump is the same. There will be a uniformity of installation here across all the units. It is a tried and true pump and has been around for about 30 years. The assembly comes from the manufacturer.

Maintenance for these will be carried by the homeowners association, the local pump manufacturer’s representative, Water and Waste Equipment. They have an annual maintenance program where they come out and inspect these; they are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for any issues that may arise with the pumps. As a result of the concern for potential power outages, Mr. Dietzko stated that he talked with CL & P in the area to understand the frequency of power outages and was told they are very, very infrequent in this area. There is about a 300 gallon capacity in the wet well, if in fact power is lost, which this provides a good amount of back up if you think about the flow from these units, this would be about a days worth of flow with the minimum number of occupants that they have. The applicant has also agreed to make arrangements for a back up generation and have pig tail connections on the control panels at the units such that a portable back up generator could be brought around in the event of an extended power outage to evacuate the wet wells. This has been reviewed by the Town Engineer and Mr. Dievert. Mr. Dietzko stated that he met with them along with the pump manufacturer about 2 years ago to answer some questions, which he believes at the time everyone was satisfied.
Nothing has changed in the last 2 years in the technical design of this project. Also on the plans are the details for the wet well assembly, details of the pressure lateral, the curb stop and the service connection. Mr. Dietzko stated that he and the applicant are comfortable that this is an appropriate application of technology for this site to service the property. Mr. Dietzko stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Attwood asked how many grinder pumps would there be for this project? Mr. Dietzko replied 41, there are 41 units and there will be 41 grinder pumps.

When asked if when different units come on, will it evacuate all the contents all the way up to the manhole? Mr. Dietzko replied that the force main would always be full of effluent; it heads up hill the whole way on a positive slope. As each unit evacuates its contents it just pushes that slug of water that is in the common force main further along. Based on years of operating data that the manufacturer has collected, Mr. Dietzko stated that he has done these systems with centrifugal pumps as well. Statistically we know that for a given population or given mass of units, how many of these units will operate at a given time, statistically speaking. When talking about the difference between the pump on switch and pump off switch, there is not a lot of volume that would get evacuated out of here. Multiple pumps can operate at the same time and discharge in common to this force main. If there happens to be a lot of units operating at the same time, for example at half time during the Super Bowl, supplemental units on the main will increase the head or pressure. The beauty of this system is that as the pressure is increased, the receiving pressure, the system is either working against a static and frictional encumbrance or its going to have to work against the pressure that is in the main from the other units being online. If additional units are online and you have additional pressure head, you still have the ability to discharge. Milone & MacBroom has designed other grinder pump systems in other developments in Cheshire, such as Northridge where there are 15 to 18 units with similar flushing connections, etc. Those common force mains are in the public right of way. With a centrifugal pump system you could have an occasion where a pump has to sit and essential spin and not be able to overcome the head if there are too many units online, until say unit # 7 is done and he shuts off, then the other unit can get in. You will not have that with a semi-positive displacement pump because you have essentially vertical system head curve.

Mr. Gancarz asked where in Cheshire similar systems are used and approximately how many units? Mr. Dietzko replied that Cheshire Crossing uses E1 pumps but Northridge uses different pumps. He also mentioned Chesterfield Court, which has approximately 20 units. None of the developments have any issues with their systems that Mr. Dietzko has been made aware of.

Mr. Dievert asked about the discharge odor that may be present at the manhole cover? He also asked if the manhole cover would be sealed? Mr. Dietzko stated that he didn’t recall if the manhole cover would be sealed. He also stated that when the meeting was held with the manufacturer they had turnover computations. Mr. Dietzko believes the maximum residents time in the line at average daily flow is about 2 hours. Obviously there is the overnight period, where that turnover period may be greater than 2 hours. That was one of the reasons a few years ago in discussions, the applicant added the supplemental manhole and pushed it 150 feet into the access, just in case, so it wouldn’t discharge odors into the circle near any residences. Mr. Dievert noted that the applicant would also have to be careful of corrosion at that manhole discharge point because they are going to get…Mr. Dietzko agreed.

Chairman Attwood asked how the brook that the sewer system is going through is being managed? Mr. Dietzko replied that on plan G4, what is proposed is a stream crossing using a 5 foot high by 20
foot span open bottom box culvert made out of reinforced concrete, H-20 loading. There will be fill placed around that, hemmed in by retaining walls, a head wall and end wall, to essentially create a road section. In the profile the gravity sewer is extended above the box culvert and then the connection with common force main occurs on the development side of that stream crossing. What crosses the watercourse; the watercourse is carried in the box culvert, the gravity sewer spans over that with a clearance of about 3 feet and about 5 to 6 feet of cover beneath that access way, that’s how they are handling the crossing. Chairman Attwood asked who would own that box culvert? Attorney Fazzone and Mr. Dietzko replied the homeowners association would; everything in the easement, including the sewer would be under the maintenance and ownership of the homeowners association.

Mr. Witek stated that he noticed that the detail shows a drop from the pressure sewer into the gravity line manhole where the connection is made and yet the profile shows pretty much a straight entry and not a drop. Mr. Dietzko replied that it is a little out of scale as to how they would do it, it could be done either way, and there could be a nominal drop. He has the pipe showing discharging into the invert of the pipe to eliminate the potential for aeration or if there is any issue with hydrogen sulfide aerating up. That would be their intent; it would be their preference to work with Mr. Michelangelo or Metcalf & Eddy, which Mr. Dietzko stated he knows they inspect all the sewer installations, to determine whether they want to come in with the elbow and strap arrangement or if they would like to come straight in at the bottom. Mr. Dietzko stated that it doesn’t matter in terms of capacity or the computations.

Mr. Witek asked about access points throughout the pressure sewer line throughout the development? Mr. Dietzko replied that in the plans on sheets G1, G2 and G3, there is a flushing connection that is specified for every 500 feet and where the transition from the 2-inch to the 3-inch pipe occurs. It is essentially a lateral coming off the main of the… Mr. Witek interrupted saying that is his point, there is no access to the force main on the main itself? Mr. Dietzko replied yes there is. In the middle there is a valve box and ball valve and the access for the flushing apparatus is off on the curb line. If looking at the plan view, the ball valve is in the middle of the road. Mr. Witek stated that there is no manhole access anywhere on the line, not even where it splits up around the circle at the top, end of the next sheet, there is actually no access at all within the paved portion of the road if you needed to get to the force main, is that correct? Mr. Dietzko replied, think of it like a water main, you would not have anywhere to get your hands of a pipe of a water main, the best you are going to have is a valve box coming up with a ball valve, a gate valve or butterfly valve. That is essentially what the function of this is; think of this as a water main, it is always under pressure. You don’t have to get your hands on a pipe; we don’t want it to go through a manhole to daylight. The manholes that were specified over at Northridge, there is a terminal flushing connection at the end of the line, and possibly some homes coming in to the side with the flusher connection coming up in the manhole. That happens to be more proximate to the main but it’s not right on line on the mid main. Mr. Witek stated that the concern would be that in wintertime, with the snow plowed up on the side of road, you wouldn’t have access to the flushing connections and if they were in the street and the street were plowed and they were in manholes then you would. Even a water main air release valve is typically in a manhole. Mr. Dietzko stated that those could be moved into the road, it was probably just a matter of design preference. A full load rated manhole could be put in the road and those valves put right next to the manhole, next to the main or right over it online. Mr. Witek asked if there was any way to determine on the plans, the depth going through here? Mr. Dietzko said it would be buried at frost depth, which in this part of New England would be 5 feet.
Mr. Pelton asked if there is any prohibition against the use of garbage disposals or things that would introduce significant solids into the system? Mr. Dietzko replied no, in fact a garbage disposal may be a good thing to pre-chop everything before it gets to the pump.

Mr. Pelton asked about the emergency generator back up supply. He stated that there was a significant outage in that area of Town a few months ago and public health is a big part of what we do and what we look at, given a one day outage, what would be the action plan to keep things moving. Mr. Dietzko replied that the first thing is common sense. If people loose power, how much of the high water generation uses will they be doing? Will they be showering? It would depend on the type of hot water heater they have. If you don’t have electricity, even your oil fired hot water heater will not fire; you will not run your dishwasher. We have to accept that water consumption would be less during a power outage, number 1. Number 2, while an outage persists you have flow that will go into the wet well, which has about a 300 gallon capacity or about a day’s worth of flow. Number 3, the fact that these control panels would be specified to accept a plug in generator. The applicant, the developer, has agreed to provide that back up generation such that it could be moved around from unit to unit to evacuate the wet wells if it were a multi day power outage.

Mr. Pelton asked about the annual maintenance program that would be funded by the home owners association, what is involved in the annual maintenance, is it the force main, is it the grinder pumps themselves? What is the scope of that maintenance? Mr. Dietzko replied he believes it would primarily focus on the mechanical elements of the plan, those things that have moving parts, electrical and mechanical. They would come through and do an annual inspection of the units, Mr. Dietzko believes they would pull them up out of the unit and do a visual inspection, test the seals and take a look at wear indicators. They would then put them back in and that’s an annual event. Mr. Dietzko stated that he would be happy to get the actual annual maintenance contract from them to understand exactly what’s done but its pretty comprehensive. Mr. Pelton replied, that would be great and he thought it would be something the WPCA would be interested in reviewing. He also asked how that would be communicated to each homeowner as properties transfer from person A to person B, Mr. Pelton doesn’t want the annual maintenance to be overlooked. Attorney Fazzone replied that it would be included as part of the monthly maintenance fee that would be paid to the homeowners association but the homeowners association would make the arrangements each year for the actual maintenance. He also noted that whenever a property changes hands that is part of a homeowners association, within 15 days of signing the real estate contract the condominium bylaws are disbursed to the new homebuyer. Attorney Fazzone also noted that Brodach Builders will offer each homeowner the option to have an individual generator installed in their home.

Mr. Witek asked if there would be reserve capacity, if the main were almost full when a power outage occurred? Mr. Dietzko replied that there would be extra space. It was also noted that when the system is running in normal mode, the maximum retention time in the main would be 2 hours.

Chairman Attwood asked how dependent are the lower pump grinders, the homes at the bottom, to the pump grinders higher up working well? If they start failing up above, does that affect the people below them? Mr. Dietzko replied, no they are all completely independent. If the upper most grinder pump didn’t work, then it wouldn’t be pumping but the common force main, essentially, if there is only one pump on, it will have the force main all to itself. It’s almost acting like its very own pressure lateral. Like it was talked about, with multiple units on line what happens is you share the capacity of the line. So under a perfect scenario one unit might discharge, it will have very nominal head to work against so all it has is the static lift, some friction ahead there is no pressure head to
work against and will have the maximum output of the unit. There is some slight reduction of capacity as the head increases. The unit at the top of the hill that only has to fight against a little force main has less static and friction head vs. the unit at the bottom. The big game changer would be multiple units online are going to pressurize the main and add more head to overcome. That’s what could make them sway a little on the capacity curve but still at 80 feet of TDH, it is at 8 gallons per minute. Chairman Attwood stated so the first one; on his own, can still pump all its material up the line. Mr. Dietzko replied yes, all on his own, he doesn’t need anyone else to help get the effluent out of his wet well.

Mr. Dievert asked that the maintenance contract be submitted for review. He is concerned about the air relief valves and the gate valves have to be, at least on a semi-annually or annual basis, checked. If one of those air relief valves stick, you can blow a lot of stuff out of it. Mr. Dievert asked that Mr. Dietzko make sure that the maintenance program they have is extensive enough and they are not just looking at the individual grinder pumps and not the whole complete system. Mr. Dietzko replied that he would look into it.

Chairman Attwood added that as part of that maintenance, the Authority wants to understand how they will insure that box culvert is maintained. It probably won’t be an issue for the first 10 years, but one day down the road if money is not put away there will be a situation, where if that has not been maintained and there is no money around and it starts collapsing, you will have a public health issue. And as this is a completely private entity, we don’t want to be the ones here having to come up with moneys to fix this, this should be looked at and included some how. Chairman Attwood asked if this made sense and Mr. Dietzko replied yes, in fact in the full plan set that went to Inland / Wetlands and the Planning & Zoning Commissions there is a comprehensive storm water management and operation & maintenance plan that includes those types of things. That would certainly be done under the umbrella or under the auspices of the other two agencies that have approved this and that would benefit the infrastructure there as well. Chairman Attwood stated that he is most concerned that if that collapses, it becomes a public health issue for everyone below it and then the other Commissions would probably step to the side real quickly and it will be “all right WPCA figure out what we are going to do on this one.” That the Authority would definitely want to do and make sure there are moneys in reserve to cover anything catastrophic that could happen. Mr. Dietzko replied OK.

Mr. Chelton commented that he was asked to take a look and provide some written comments earlier this evening. Chairman Attwood asked that Mr. Chelton share and go over his comments with the applicant, or Mr. Michelangelo or who ever. Mr. Chelton gave the applicant a copy of the written comments to Mr. Dietzko and submitted a copy for the written record as well.

Chairman Attwood asked if there were any questions on the comments from Mr. Chelton. Mr. Chelton noted that a lot of these were covered in the Q & A earlier this evening. He noted that probably the most significant comment was the changing of the pipe from HDPE to PVC. Mr. Chelton noted that his comments also addressed the same concerns about odors, in comment # 12. Mr. Dietzko replied that he thought these comments would be easily handled by his technical staff. He would have no problem what so ever as the comments are not significantly material to the design, if the Commission pleased to incorporate them in a condition for approval. Mr. Chelton stated that he wanted to draw attention to comment # 10, which has been touched upon in different ways but the fact that the pipe is going to be built on fill, obviously it will have a higher chance for settlement and ultimately breakage of the pipe so it needs to be spec’d out. Mr. Dietzko replied that he has a spec and it is 95% modified proctor condot spec. All the fill sections would be constructed
to that specification before the trenching was done. So again, no significant issues from their end with regards to these comments, per Mr. Dietzko. Mr. Chelton asked if it was the Authority’s wishes to have these comments responded to in writing? Chairman Attwood replied yes, that is the standard way they have always done it so the Authority will maintain what they have normally done. He asked Mr. Chelton if there are any other questions Mr. Chelton would like to give to the applicant so they are prepared to have them all for the next discussion?

Chairman Attwood commented that this has been a good presentation and asked if Mr. Michelangelo or Mr. Dievert had anything further, both replied no.

Attorney Fazzone asked, notwithstanding the fact that it is a totally private system, would there not be an inspection done of the installation, either by Metcalf & Eddy or the Town to inspect that it is being built in accordance with the plans? Chairman Attwood stated that he was glad that he brought that up because that was something he was going to talk to Staff about what is the Town’s oversight with regards to maintenance and with regards to structured building and the future. Chairman Attwood would like these questions answered for the next meeting for the applicant and the Authority. Chairman Attwood stated that his oversight includes inspection during and post; does the Town generally have any oversight? Mr. Michelangelo stated that there would be inspection during construction by both the Building Department, inside the building, and the actual grinder pump units and by the Engineering / WPCD staff in the road way system. There is no follow up maintenance inspection afterwards. Chairman Attwood asked how do we keep track of that culvert afterwards, based on everything he has heard, that is the biggest potential health issue down the road? How do we make sure and bring to somebody’s attention that there could be an issue developing?

Mr. Dievert commented that that could be something we could put into our preventative maintenance program, that every 6 months or yearly basis, it could be checked out or have a report generated. John Milone of Milone & MacBroom came forward on behalf of the applicant and stated that there is no reason to believe that a reinforced concrete box culvert would be under issue relative to deterioration or demise. They are standard installation in public facilities throughout the country. Mr. Milone stated that he thinks a year inspection would be more than adequate and if there are any signs of deterioration, it can be dealt with. It would be very unusual to have a facility like that fail.

Mr. Gancarz stated that he concurs, having overseen a quite a few of those installations. He put a whole bunch in after the 1982 flood and they are still doing well. Chairman Attwood agreed but said that he thinks some sort of regular report generated would suffice, its just want happens 10 or 20 years from now. Lets avoid…

Attorney Fazzone stated that another example in Cheshire, which may have been pointed out previously, and it’s probably about a 20 year old installation, is Highland Industrial Center. It is totally on grinder pumps, all condominiums, each individually owned unit with their own grinder pumps. Attorney Fazzone stated that he would bet that the Public Works Department has never heard from them. It is maintained by the condominium association, all the pumps are maintained, they have contracts and inspections. They work. Attorney Fazzone stated that he would guarantee that Public Works has had no complaints, no comments, no questions and no complaints about odors. He asked Staff if they have ever heard of it or if they were even aware that it was there? Mr. Michelangelo stated that he is aware that it is there, and yes there have been no complaints on that. In addition to that private one, there are 4 Town systems, which are pressure systems. They are located at Northridge, Rising Trail, there was even one that WPCA sponsored as a 2002 project on Higgins and Blueberry. The technology is pretty good, they are pretty fail safe. There are
communities out west where they have entire towns that are serviced by grinder pump, low pressure systems; the technology is pretty good.

**MOTION**

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority continue this application to next month to give the applicant time to reply to our inquiries, provide warranty maintenance data, etc. The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell and carried unanimously, 6-0.

B. Birchwood Condominiums Phases II and III 482 Oak Avenue Unit 60 – Application for Award of Capacity submitted by Harkin Engineering on behalf of Birchwood Condominiums.

Mr. Michelangelo distributed copies of the plans for this project and explained that this applicant, Birchwood Condominiums, was before the WPCA approximately a year ago with the same plans they have brought forward tonight; this is just the next phase of the project. He added that the plans were received, reviewed and responded to by Staff last year.

Mr. Pelton asked why the plans were not distributed earlier? Chairman Attwood asked that Staff make sure to distribute the submitted plans for a project with the meeting packets, even if it was seen by the Authority in the past as the membership changes over time and all members should be given the opportunity to review an application in its entirety.

Michael Harkin, P.E. from Harkin Engineering located at 78 Wolf Hollow Lane, Killingworth, CT was present on behalf of Birchwood Condominiums’ application for an Award of Capacity for Phase II and Phase III of their project. He noted that some of the members of the association were present tonight, as well as their council. Mr. Harkin reminded the members of the Authority that in June 2009 a three-phase project was presented, with Phase I being an emergency situation. At the June 2009 WPCA meeting, Phase I was given all of Feasibility, Final Design and Award of Capacity approvals but Phase II and Phase III were only granted Feasibility Approval and Final Design Approval; it was agreed at that point by the WPCA that the Award of Capacity should be done when the work is ready to begin. Mr. Harkin noted that Phase I was finished in November 2009.

Mr. Harkin explained that Phase II and Phase III make up the remaining 40 units at Birchwood Condominiums and based on the necessary calculations, they would like to request approval for an Award of Capacity of 9,080 gallons per day.

Mr. Pelton asked if this project is still an emergency hook up? Mr. Harkin replied last year, Phase I was an emergency but right now it is not entirely clear if Phase II and Phase III are approaching an emergency level. Mr. Harkin explained that they are starting to see some signs of failure, which may come up fairly soon.

Chairman Attwood asked if all 40 units would be connecting now or in phases? Mr. Harkin replied that the applicant is getting bids now for the project, it will likely be all 40 units connecting now because it is considered a small project if it were to be divided up. Chairman Attwood asked what zone this property is located in. Mr. Michelangelo replied that he did not know, but it was pointed
out that the application notes the parcel is located in a R-40 zone. It was also noted that the property is located in a conservation area on the State Conservation & Development map.

Mr. Michelangelo commented that there is a letter in this previous file that he drafted on June 16, 2009 giving the opinion that the approval based on comment # 3, would be consistent. This property is located in the conservation area, which is the light green shading on the Conservation & Development map from 2005, however this property is already serviced by sanitary sewers and is not being expanded into a new area. Mr. Michelangelo stated that he believes this is consistent with everything regarding the DEP Policy and previous guidance on these type issues. He asked them to recall that the DEP has not reviewed or commented in the past on individual applications. So when you look at properties with individual sewers in front of them, how are they sewered, Mr. Michelangelo believes this is consistent with everything they have heard from day one until now. It has sewers on it. Chairman Attwood stated that he agrees, his question is when the first one came, they were having a health issue, a collapse or failing problem. The question is, if he recalls, Phase II and III were not, so now he is asking if they are having that same issue and have you confirmed that and if so? Mr. Michelangelo replied that if it is an infill lot, it does not have to have septic issues.

Mr. Korman asked if there is any independent studies or inspection reports showing that Phase II and / or Phase III are in experiencing failure? Mr. Harkin stated that Chesprocott has not been out to the property recently. He also noted that there were 3 units that had septic failure as part of the Phase I connections but prior to that a previous unit at Birchwood had a failed septic system and was connected to the sewers approximately 5 years ago. Mr. Harkin added that the residents are starting to get the sewer stench again now and are concerned about any delay in connecting the last two phases.

Mr. Michelangelo noted that the letter dated June 15, 2009 from Chesprocott identified units 470 - 510 at Birchwood Condominium was having septic failure. Mr. Harkin noted that those units cover the entire complex of Birchwood Condominium. Chairman Attwood commented that if Chesprocott has identified the whole complex in its June 2009 letter regarding the septic failures at Birchwood Condominiums, he was satisfied.

**APPROVAL MOTION**

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority has reviewed the application and submittals of Birchwood Condominium Association located on Oak Avenue for an Award of Capacity. Based upon that review and based upon the recommendation of the Director of Public Works, the WPCA has determined that the application and submittals propose an award of capacity which meets the requirements of the Cheshire Sewer Regulations and other applicable specifications, codes, and laws; therefore, the application is APPROVED for 9,080 gallons per day.

This Approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. This Approval does not confer the right to connect to the sewer system. The right to connect to the sewer system can only be gained by applying for, and obtaining approval of, Feasibility Approval, Final Design Approval, and a Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit.

2. All costs connected with the proposed sewer system shall be borne by the developer.
3. The application and submittals are incorporated and made a part of this Approval.

4. The WPCA has approved, upon separate application, the phasing of the occupancy of this project.

5. The executed Developer’s Agreement, required by Section 12.4 of the Cheshire Sewer Regulations, shall be on file with the Director of Public Works.

6. This Approval shall expire two (2) years from the date of approval by the WPCA, unless an application for renewal is applied for not less than thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date, pursuant to Section 12.10.F of the Cheshire Sewer Regulations.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried unanimously, 6 - 0.

Mr. Michelangelo asked if there will be a capacity charge fee on this project? The first phase was approved before the capacity fee was implemented and point of discussion as to whether this applies to this project or not. Attorney Lord replied that there would not be a charge until the applicant seeks to make the actual connection, then at that point it can be determined if this fee would be applicable to these phases of the project, which was started last year.

5. Reports from Chairman/Staff

A. Mixville Pump Station - Project Progress Schedule

Mr. Michelangelo reported that a job meeting for the Mixville Pump Station was held on June 16th. The contractor has been doing a lot of the outside type work; shop drawings still need some approvals before they get into the heavy mechanicals on the inside of the building. There are no problems foreseen at this time. The contractor is working on schedule.

Approval of Wright Pierce invoice # 70747 dated 06/15/10 in the amount of $3,750.54.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve and pay in full invoice #70747 from Wright Pierce in the amount of $3,750.54, for services relating to the Mixville Pump Station. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6-0.

Approval of Xenelis Construction Co. – application for payment # 4 dated 05/31/10 in the amount of $4,474.50.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve and pay in full, payment #4 to Xenelis Construction Co. in the amount of $4,474.50, for services relating to the Mixville Pump Station. The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried unanimously, 6-0.
B. Facilities Plan Update and Project Progress Schedule from Donald Chelton

Mr. Chelton stated that based on decisions made at last month’s meeting AECOM is going to update the Phase 2 Facilities Plan. One thing that they are talking about changing is the way they presented the costs, it seemed to cause a lot of confusion with the overall project cost contained in the construction cost, i.e. the 30% design allowance contingency and the 40% engineering contingency. When we looked at the numbers we got the sense that it was a much bigger construction number and it doesn’t represent the actual construction costs, but the total project cost for that item. When AECOM prepares the final Plan they are going to show the construction cost and then a line item entry for the 30% design allowance contingency, which will be called “Final Design Allowance” and will give a subtotal for construction costs. A 20% allowance will be shown for engineering and a 20% allowance for construction during contingencies. This will end up with the same bottom line but the individual cost items on a construction costs will decrease. Mr. Chelton feels this will be a little bit more representative and be a little better to understand.

As far as the Public Hearing tonight, after the official record is completed and transmitted, Mr. Chelton stated that he would respond to all of the questions that he can.

Chairman Attwood stated that the Authority has made a point of inviting the public, including other Town Commissions, to give their input and there has been very little. Mr. Pelton asked if it was worth reaching out again to the other Town Commissions and Chairman Attwood replied that they have all been invited, many times, in writing. He added that the elected officials have also been invited many times.

Mr. Gancarz asked if the flow reduction techniques really don’t impact the size of the plant? Mr. Chelton replied that in the 1970’s and early 1980’s, it was factored in for the projection for future years.

Chairman Attwood asked to have an RFQ put together in the next 2 weeks by Staff sending out for qualifications of some firms as required by for the Clean Water funds. A Subcommittee made up of Mr. Pelton, Mr. Witek and Mr. Gancarz will review the RFQ and the submissions received. Chairman Attwood noted that the RFQ is a Department of Environmental Protection requirement for the design and planning work on the Facility Plan Update.

Mr. Michelangelo stated that he could get a RFQ template that could be used to create one for Cheshire. He will have Subcommittee review it, along with Town Manager Milone and the D.E.P. Chairman Attwood noted that Mr. Michelangelo and Mr. Dievert will have to work together to write up the general description of the work for this project, as the information cannot come from Mr. Chelton for this.

C. WPCD Plant Upgrade

Chairman Attwood stated that the Authority has requested that AECOM put this project on hold.
D. **WPCD Influent Pump Station** – Project Progress Schedule.

Mr. Chelton reported that the shop drawings on the WPCD Influent Pump Station are currently in progress.

E. **I & I Program** – Interceptor Manhole Rehabilitation – Warranty Period

Mr. Chelton reported that the Interceptor Manhole Rehabilitation project is in the Warranty Period and there has been no activity.

F. **Superintendent Report**

Mr. Dievert reported that the EPA’s FOG (Fats, Oils and Grease) Management & Control Program is one year away from going into effect for all local restaurants / food service facilities that fall into Class III and Class IV categories. The requirement for Class III and Class IV food service facilities or any other facility discharging Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG) into the sewer system to install and maintain grease trap/interceptors was designed to protect the public collection system from blockages and bypass events that can damage the collection system or endanger public health. Mr. Dievert would like to send a reminder letter to the effected establishments in Cheshire reminding them of the upcoming time frame. Chairman Attwood agreed it would be a good idea.

Mr. Dievert also reported that Cheshire Correctional Institute has just marked their highest flows ever for their sewer system, .614 mgd for May 2010. He has already contacted the CCI Facilities Manager and was told they would look into it; perhaps the meter is faulty because they could not identify a specific event that would cause the increased flow.

6. **Approval of Invoices**

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE and pay in full AECOM Invoice No. 7080527 dated 06/14/10 for work relating to Phase 2 WPCP Facility Plan in the amount of $512.97 The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6-0.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE and pay in full AECOM Invoice No. 7080528 dated 06/14/10 for work relating to the Interceptor Manhole Rehabilitation Project in the amount of $1,927.64 The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell and carried unanimously, 6-0.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE and pay in full AECOM Invoice No. 7080525 dated 06/14/10 for work relating to the Lilac Drive Pump Station in the amount of $293.01 The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6-0.
7. **New Business**

Mr. Michelangelo stated that the Engineering Department has done an in-house design of some sewer areas (Applewood Drive, Country Club Road, Riverside Drive and Oxford Court) and the project has gone out to bid. The bid responses will be reviewed at the next WPCA meeting.

The Capital Budget process has begun with Staff submitting their requests to the Town Manager for his review, before the submission to the Town Council. Mr. Michelangelo has already submitted items to Mr. Milone and will e-mail the WPCA members with the information he has submitted for the Capital Budget.

Mr. Schrumm questioned if the Capital Budget items submitted to Town Manager Milone by Mr. Michelangelo were shared with the WPCA before they were submitted? Mr. Michelangelo replied, no. Mr. Schrumm stated that they should be review and Mr. Michelangelo stated that he would send them to the Commissioners. Mr. Schrumm noted that Town Councilors are assuming that requests made by Staff for the Capital Budget, on behalf of a Town Board or Commission, have been reviewed by the said Board or Commission before they are submitted to the Town Manager and Town Council.

8. **Old Business**

Chairman Attwood asked if the schools are using low flow toilets in their buildings? Mr. Michelangelo stated that Dan Marseglia with the Education Department could be contacted to find out.

A. **Approval of Minutes of Regular meeting of May 26, 2010**

Mr. Korman moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority accept the May 26, 2010 minutes as corrected:

- Page 1, under Public Communications, last sentence, it should read, “Attorney Lord and Mr. Dievert will attend”;
- Page 4, under Facilities Plan Update, there was a motion made by Chairman Attwood, which was seconded by Mr. Pelton, that called for the setting of two separate Public Hearings on June 23rd regarding a Proposed Amendments to the Cheshire Sanitary Sewer Regulations Article 12.0 (Feasibility and Final Approvals of Sanitary Sewer Plans) Sections 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.10, D2) and a Presentation of the findings of Draft Phase 1, Wastewater Facilities Plan. This motion had passed unanimously.;
- Page 4, under Facilities Plan Update, sixth paragraph, last sentence should read, “Cheshire will be apply for funding under the 2012 list.”

The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried unanimously, 6-0.

B. **Septic System Summary from Chesprocott dated June 2, 2010**

Mr. Dievert reviewed the June 2nd letter from Chesprocott noting that in the previous month there have been 2 failures and 2 repairs to local septic systems, all in adequate soil.
9. Adjournment

Mr. Korman moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority adjourn their June 23, 2010 Regular Monthly meeting at 10:10 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

John Attwood, Chairman
Water Pollution Control Authority
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Tracey Kozlowski, Recording Secretary
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