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

Members Absent:  Mr. Steve Eberle  
Mr. Walter Gancarz

Others Present:  Mr. Dennis Dievert, Superintendent, WPCD  
Mr. Donald Chelton, AECOM  
Town Attorney Andrew Lord  
Mr. David Schrumm, Town Council Liaison (arrived at 7:40 p.m.)  
Attorney Anthony Fazzone of Fazzone & Ryan, LLC (departed at 8:50 p.m.)  
Mr. Stephen Dietzko, P.E. of Milone & MacBroom (depart at 8:00 p.m.)  
Mr. John Milone, President of Milone & MacBroom (depart at 8:00 p.m.)  
Mr. Mariusz Jedrychowski of Wright Pierce (departed at 8:15 p.m.)

Chairman Attwood called the meeting to order at 7:32 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.

REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

1. Public Communications

None

2. Applications

A. Richmond Glen (210 Wiese Road and Buckland Court) – Continuation Application for Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit and Application for Final Design Approval for Extension of Public Sanitary Sewer & Letter dated July 8, 2010 and Plans 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 as was Stephen Dietzko, P.E. of Milone & MacBroom. Attorney Fazzone stated
that at the last meeting there was some questions and suggestions with respect to the final design plans and Mr. Dietzko will go forward to address them.

Mr. Chelton stated that AECOM had submitted some review comments at the last meeting; Milone & MacBroom responded to those comments, AECOM responded to those comments today. AECOM has had discussions with Milone & MacBroom today, in addition, a copy of all the correspondents were distributed by Mr. Chelton.

Mr. Dietzko stated that he did have copies of everything already from Mr. Chelton so that they could close the loop on this tonight. After the last meeting, Milone & MacBroom addressed the comments that were received from AECOM and then submitted revised plans dated July 8, 2010 along with a response letter, which should be part of the package’s plans. The letter and plans addressed some issues relating to the location of the flushing manholes, which is now fully within the right of way, not in the snow shelf. Also addressed with the revisions was the question of maintenance; Mr. Dietzko has submitted a suggested and prescribed waste water system maintenance plan, which, again, should be part of the July 8, 2010 package. Mr. Dietzko also took a closer look at the wet well capacity, which Mr. Gancarz had brought up and is addressed in the July 8th response letter from Milone & MacBroom.

Since that time, AECOM took a second look at the plans and had minor comments that are articulated in the letter that Mr. Chelton has given the Authority today. Mr. Dietzko stated that he has reviewed that letter today also, he has spoken with Mr. Chelton and Mr. Pearson from AECOM about that and was able to address the minor comments, which relate mostly to the details for the flushing manholes; the air release and vacuum release valves; the specification of a control panel that does in fact accommodate an automatic transfer switch and generator receptacle. Just to make sure everything is neat and tidy for the Authority, Mr. Dietzko did prepare a response letter to AECOM’s letter dated July 28, 2010 as well as a bunch of plan, although not every sheet had a change, Mr. Dietzko thought it would be easier to give a full package of the plans, with 9 or 10 full copies. Mr. Dietzko stated that he would be happy to go further over any of the technical details or any other questions but he believes he has covered all of the comments from AECOM, both their letter of June 23rd and July 28th and the plans provided should also fully address those comments for a functional system.

Mr. Chelton stated that based on AECOM’s conversation today with Milone & MacBroom they are satisfied that the technical sides of the design have been addressed. Mr. Dievert stated that he had spoken with Mr. Chelton today.

Chairman Attwood stated that the one thing he has a concern with is that the Town has never had a development with this many grinder pumps. He stated that there is a high probability that there will be an event with a power outage that will last for 4, 5 or 6 days, at some period in time. He thinks that there has been some discussion that a generator could be the solution but Chairman Attwood is concerned that many years from now when none of us are around, when this event happens, how is it going to be addressed and dealt with. He is concerned that it won’t go, as we would like it to go. Chairman Attwood’s thoughts are that some sort of design or agreement needs to be developed. He asked if there is any reason why a central space could not be developed for the generator and then each unit could be hardwired? When this happens 15 or 20 years from now, where is the generator that will be brought around from unit to unit, does it exist, has it been maintained, who is going to take the responsibility of making sure it is connected, going to somebody’s house…..there not going to know how to connect the generator to their pump. Chairman Attwood is just wondering if there
is an iron clad way that we could make insure, however many years down that road when this happens, there are not 55 homeowners before the Town Council saying “you need to take over this because we had a disastrous event last week”.

Mr. Witek commented that he personally thinks that if a person doesn’t read the documents when they buy a house, they deserve to have it back up in their basement. There is no reason why the Town should be responsible for every homeowner in a private development. Chairman Attwood stated that he agreed and asked if there is a way to have an agreement, that it is iron clad, perhaps with Attorney Lord’s help with the language, that the Homeowners Association is very clear what their responsibilities are, how this is going to get taken care of…. otherwise…. there was the incident where there was a damn that was clear and the Town had to take care of that.

Attorney Fazzone stated that somewhat throughout these proceedings he has attempted to address that, he has prepared a summary and distributed to the membership. The entire system is private and the maintenance repair would be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. The Cheshire Zoning Regulations, in effect today, require that before any Certificate of Occupancies are issued a Homeowners Association has to be formed. Attorney Fazzone stated that this was not done in the instance of the damn. As a condominium or common ownership interest, each homeowner is required to be a member of the Homeowners Association. Attorney Fazzone stated that he believes that one of AECOM’s comments was to show a detail of the wiring to the pump for the generator, which Attorney Fazzone believes has been done. All of this can be made a condition of the approval; the developer will provide the Homeowners Association with that generator. In addition, each homeowner will be given the opportunity to purchase his own generator. The last item is that the Public Offering Statement, which by Statute, has to be provided to each prospective purchaser prior to the finalization of a contract, so when they sign a contract to buy a house the purchaser has 15 days to read, or have their lawyer review, the Public Offering Statement and they can get out of the contract. Attorney Fazzone stated that within that, we will provide that the Homeowners Association will be required to provide annual servicing of each homeowner’s grinder pump. The cost for this will be included in the Homeowners Association budget and will be part of the monthly common charge, which will be disclosed in the Public Offering Statement.

Mr. Korman stated that this covers new purchases and asked what happens at the time of re-sale? Attorney Fazzone stated that part of the Statute is that in a re-sale, the purchaser is to be provided with a re-sale certificate that gives the current budget, the status of the then current owner’s account with the Homeowners Association. A copy of the Declaration and Public Offering Statement must also be included.

Attorney Fazzone stated that Mr. Dietzko has indicated to him that he doesn’t feel that one central generator will work. Attorney Fazzone stated that on Realty Drive there are 2 large generators there that have to be run frequently, he believes once a week when there is no one working at the time. When a second building was proposed on Realty Drive there was a lot of complaints from the neighbors about the generators running at 9 am on a Saturday or Sunday, when no one was working there. Attorney Fazzone stated that they do think this plan will work, they would expect that this could be incorporated as part of the project’s Declaration documents.

Chairman Attwood commented that this is great and is a great improvement, the only one thing he is questioning is that part of the fees collected goes towards servicing, will the language state that the Homeowners Association must actually service? Attorney Fazzone replied yes, in the forth line down, in the last paragraph it states “…that the Richmond Glen Homeowners’ Association will be
required to provide annual servicing of each homeowner’s grinder pump, the cost of which will be included in the association’s budget and proposed monthly common charge disclosed in the public offering statement.”

Attorney Fazzone stated that his final point is that there is currently the Award of Capacity in existence, that was extended, but there is also a pending Permit Connection that was filed. Mr. Pelton asked that in essence, isn’t this a new application and should the WPCA just…Attorney Fazzone stated that the Final Design application is new but there is also a Permit Connection application pending that was filed at the same time.

Mr. Scannell asked if Chairman Attwood was satisfied with the answers on the grinder pumps and Chairman Attwood replied yes and that he was sure Attorney Lord could help satisfy that everything is incorporated legally. Mr. Chelton reminded the Authority that there are other grinder pumps in the community. Chairman Attwood noted that they are not this big, though. Mr. Chelton stated that he is not sure how big Northridge is though. It was thought that Northridge is 20 or 21 units and Cheshire Crossing has 40 pumps. Mr. Chelton stated that the same issue applies to all grinder pumps. Chairman Attwood asked if there have been any issues on the already existing developments with grinder pumps that should be incorporated with this project? Mr. Dievert replied no. Chairman Attwood stated that he was satisfied.

**APPROVAL MOTION**

Moved by Mr. Pelton that the Cheshire WPCA has reviewed the application and submittals of Richmond Glen for Final Design Approval. Based upon that review and based upon the recommendations of the Director of Public Works, the WPCA has determined that the application and submittals detailing the sanitary sewerage system which can be constructed and used for sanitary sewerage purposes in accordance with requirements of the Cheshire Sewer Regulations and other applicable specifications, codes, and laws; therefore, the application is APPROVED.

This Final Design Approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. This Approval does not confer the right to connect to the sewer system which can only be gained by applying for, and obtaining approval of, an Award of Capacity and a Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit.

2. All costs connected with the proposed sewer system shall be borne by the developer.

3. All transfers of property in the subject development shall be encumbered in a written waiver by each grantee to any right to appeal any benefit assessment, which the Town of Cheshire may levy on such property; however, each grantee may reserve the right of appeal regarding supplemental assessments that the Town may levy.

4. [3.10] All construction shall conform to all relevant federal, state and local laws, rules, regulations, and specifications.

5. Official representatives and agents of the Town of Cheshire, including the Building Official and the Director of Public Works, are authorized to enter the property, at reasonable times, for the purposes of inspection, observation, measurement, sampling, and testing.
6. The proposed sanitary sewer system shall become a part of the public sanitary sewer system except for that part which is to be retained in private ownership, which is described on the application plans, as such; this will be a privately owned sewer system.

7. The application and submittals are incorporated and made a part of this Approval.

8. The approval is conditional upon the documents that will go as part of the property owner’s record on the original purchase and re-sale and transfer of any property. Also incorporated will be the recent plans and modifications based upon the prints submitted on July 28, 2010.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried unanimously, 5 - 0.

Attorney Fazzone noted that the Connection Permit is included on tonight’s agenda regarding this application.

Mr. Pelton reminded the applicant that the Final Design approval clock starts tonight; the Award of Capacity clock started at … Attorney Fazzone stated that he thought that approval was for one year starting this September. Mr. Pelton stated that the Award of Capacity clock runs through September 2011; the Feasibility approval clock is now mute because of the Final Design approval tonight. Mr. Pelton stated that he just wanted to be clear and make sure everything is covered, reminding the applicant that the 2 clocks are not quite in sync.

Attorney Fazzone stated that he had a copy of the Connection Permit for this application. The Authority noted that the Connection Permit is usually handled administratively. Mr. Witek commented that the form requires Mr. Michaelangelo’s signature after the other agencies have reviewed it. It was agreed that this permit is handled administratively and is not for the WPCA to act upon. It was noted that if this is error, it can be corrected at the next WPCA meeting.

B. RLJ Properties, LLC - 680 South Main Street – Application for Award of Capacity submitted by Fazzone & Ryan, LLC.

Attorney Fazzone was present on behalf of the application of RLJ Properties, LLC for an Award of Capacity at 680 South Main Street. He noted that this property was formerly referred to as 660 and 678 South Main Street and is the location of the John Ricci office building, which houses the Midstate Medical Center facilities and Coldwell Banker offices, across from Alderson Funeral Home. At one point in time the applicant had an application approved for apartments on the upper level, the applicant is now going back to construct four 2-bedroom apartments on the upper level. Attorney Fazzone noted that the Planning & Zoning Commission is currently reviewing the apartment application for this property. This apartment project will entail the removal of 1,945 square feet of office space, which had a 200-gallon per day capacity award. Attorney Fazzone noted that his amount was not netted out of the new proposed Award of Capacity application, as he was not quite sure how that should work. The four residential units were taken at 227 gallons per day times the 4 units and came up with a total of 908 gallons of capacity per day for the project. The building is already built and it is connected to the sewer system.
Chairman Attwood questioned how the capacity fee will be calculated for this project since the property is increasing its capacity? Attorney Lord replied that the capacity fee will not be needed right now to determine if an Award of Capacity should be made. Mr. Korman asked if the water meter sized will need to be increased and Attorney Fazzone stated that he did not know. Mr. Korman questioned if that would be the trigger for the capacity fee. Chairman Attwood stated that it is for residential but he didn’t think it would be for commercial. Mr. Pelton commented that now they have a hybrid in this situation. In reviewing the capacity fee regulation, Attorney Lord stated that there looked like there would be a capacity fee applied to this application. Mr. Pelton commented that the approval could be dependent upon the capacity fee. Attorney Fazzone stated that he assumed that prior to the Certificate of Occupancy, the WPCA would get their capacity fee.

Chairman Attwood asked if Mr. Dievert had any questions or concerns on this project. Mr. Dievert replied that he wasn’t sure if the question could be answered right now, but how exactly are the 4 apartments going to be tied to … is there a chance that if one apartment has a problem, could it possibly manifest itself in the next apartment? How will the actual piping be….there will be 4 different units that are all to be occupied by separate people, going to one common line.

Attorney Fazzone stated that he believed a perspective drop pipe was put in the building, because originally it was set up for apartments. Each individual apartment goes to that standpipe, not through each other. There is a hallway down the middle; there will be 2 apartments on one side of the building and 2 apartments on the other. Mr. Dievert questioned if there was going to be 1 bathroom in each apartment and Attorney Fazzone replied yes.

Chairman Attwood noted that this application has not yet received approval from the Planning & Zoning Commission, as they are in the process of that right now. He questioned if this application for an Award of Capacity should be held until the Planning & Zoning Commission approves the project. Attorney Lord stated that the applicant will have to come back to the WPCA for Final Design approval. Attorney Fazzone questioned why the applicant would have to come back for Final Design because it is all connected? The design of the connection to the Town sewers will not be changed with the addition of apartments at 680 South Main Street. Chairman Attwood agreed and stated that the applicant will not have to come back to the Authority, if the project is approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission. Chairman Attwood did say that he did not want it to be stated to the Planning & Zoning Commission that the WPCA said we can do this, so we should be able to do this, it has nothing to do with the WPCA, it is a Planning & Zoning issue. If this project is approved, the WPCA will then have to determine how the capacity fee will be handled. Attorney Lord stated that the WPCA’s Award of Capacity has little bearing on Planning & Zoning’s decision. It doesn’t matter who issues the approval first, the WPCA or Planning & Zoning Commission.

Mr. Witek commented that his concern is what if the Planning & Zoning Commission turns this project down after the WPCA has given an Award of Capacity? The WPCA would need the ability to take it back, some how. Attorney Fazzone replied that if the application is denied by the Planning & Zoning Commission, he would notify the WPCA. Mr. Witek stated that the Award of Capacity could be awarded, pending the Planning & Zoning Commission approval; otherwise it would just go away.
APPROVAL MOTION

Mr. Scannell moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority has reviewed the application and submittals of RLJ Properties, LLC located at 680 South Main Street 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 908 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. If applicable, 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. [12.10.F] Use of the following language for awards of capacity issued for additions to existing uses or structures exceeding a sanitary sewage flow rate of two hundred twenty-seven (227) gallons per day or for extensions of sanitary sewers to permitted areas or wastewater treatment or disposal] 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.

7. This approval is subject to the approval of the Planning & Zoning Commission to convert this project to apartments.

8. Any additional fees identified by Staff for the capacity award fee will be borne by the developer.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 5 - 0.

Chairman Attwood questioned if there was any reason why the WPCA could not include the terms and conditions on the back of the application, with a statement on the bottom that any further amendments or conditions may be applied. When the WPCA comes to pass it, the applicant could sign, that way there are no questions, it could be agreed upon ahead of time. Chairman Attwood suggested that it could speed things up if all the conditions didn’t have to be read each time. Mr. Pelton stated that it is good practice to have the conditions read into the record. Members stated that they would think about it for future discussion.
3. Reports from Chairman/Staff

A. Mixville Pump Station - Project Progress Schedule

Mariusz Jedrychowski, Project Manager at Wright Pierce was present to give the WPCA an update on the Mixville Pump Station project. Mr. Jedrychowski stated that last month the contractor was working on bringing in the new power to the building from the existing pole, new electrical boxes were installed in the pump station, a new fuel tank was installed behind the building for the generator and the new generator was installed inside the building. The contractor started working around the existing wet well, cleaning it up and bringing in a new hatch so it’s easier to access the wet well. The pumps have been ordered and the contractor expects that they will be by the end of August, when they arrive the contractor will start working on installing the pumps inside the station. Some of the working coming up in August includes the new hatch installation for the wet well, installing a bypass pump to work on the wet well and installing building louvers. In addition he will be wire brushing and painting the existing can inside the building and when the pumps get there, he will be working on the pumps inside the can. Mr. Jedrychowski stated that the progress schedule is attached to the current invoice and it looks like the contractor is projecting the start up of the pump station for September.

Chairman Attwood asked what the difference is between schedule revision and re-scheduled? Mr. Jedrychowski stated that he would check with the contractor and get back to the Authority next month.

Approval of Wright Pierce invoice # 72233 dated July 9, 2010 in the amount of $4,637.80.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve and pay in full invoice #72233 from Wright Pierce in the amount of $4,637.80, for services relating to the Mixville Pump Station. The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried unanimously, 4-0 (Mr. Pelton was absent at this time).

Approval of Xenelis Construction Co. – application for payment # 5 dated 07/13/10 in the amount of $34,173.64.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve and pay in full, payment #5 to Xenelis Construction Co. in the amount of $34,173.64, for services relating to the Mixville Pump Station. The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell and carried unanimously, 4-0 (Mr. Pelton was absent at this time).

B. Facilities Plan Update and Project Progress Schedule from Donald Chelton – Letter dated July 15, 2010

Mr. Chelton stated that based on questions raised at last month’s Public Hearing, AECOM has prepared written responses to each in a letter that is dated July 15, 2010. Mr. Chelton reviewed each of the questions and their responses with the Authority.
With regards to Mr. Kurtz’s question regarding his property at 648 Wallingford Road, it was determined that this property and the property of 628 Wallingford Road were inadvertently omitted from a Needs area, which should be either area 12 or area 13. Upon reviewing these 2 properties it was determined that they more closely resemble the make up of properties in area 13. Consequently, AECOM is recommending that the boundary lines for Needs area 13 be revised to include these 2 parcels based on parcel size, pumping history criteria and soils. Mr. Chelton stated that Needs area 13 was not recommended for sewers. However, in order to extend sewers to Needs area 12 in the future, it may be necessary to install sewers in and / or around Needs area 13, as it is located between Needs area 12 and the existing sewer system. AECOM recommends that if sewers are extended to Needs area 12 that the need for providing sewering to area 13 be re-examined at that time. It was noted that there are no sewer issues at the Kurtz property at 648 Wallingford Road right now, Mr. Kurtz was just curious as to what area his property fell into and the sewering recommendation for that area.

Mr. Korman asked if a response has been sent to the property owners yet that raised these questions and he was told no.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority follow AECOM’s recommendation to revise the Facilities Plan Update to move 648 Wallingford Road and 628 Wallingford Road so that they are included in the Needs area 13 boundaries, noting that Needs area 13 is not recommended for sewers based on parcel size, soils and pumping history criteria. The motion was seconded by Mr. Witek and carried, 4-0-1 with Mr. Pelton abstaining, as he is a potential impacted property owner.

Mr. Chelton reviewed the response to question # 2 regarding changing the 20 year plan, in 20 years stating that it is anticipated that as new information becomes available, the plan may need to be changed and at the end of the 20 year planning period, an updated Facilities Plan will likely be prepared, which may modify the anticipated areas of sewer extensions.

Chairman Attwood asked Mr. Dievert to send individual response letters to those people that had inquiries during last month’s Public Hearing regarding the Facilities Plan Update, after this is finished. Authority members agreed it would be a good idea.

In regards to question # 3, it was stated that the Town Planner and members of the Economic Development Commission had participated in the development of the projected areas of anticipated sewer extensions.

In question # 4 Attorney Fazzone asked about the dotted yellow-backgrounded areas on map 5 that are labeled as “undeveloped” properties, if they would not be recommended for sewers. Mr. Chelton stated that if the “undeveloped” properties were in residential zones and included as part of a Needs area that, based on assessment criteria, were recommended for sewers, they would be included. If the “undeveloped” properties are in commercial / industrial zones, an allowance of 50% of un-sewered commercial / industrial land has been recommended, although not specifically identified.

Question # 5 was also from Attorney Fazzone when he asked if the State comes out with the Updated Conservation and Development map in 2012, with a change to the original map that was
initiated by the Town, is there flexibility in the Facilities Plan to say that those parcels can be sewered? AECOM’s response is that there is not such a statement in the report.

Since Attorney Fazzone was present at tonight’s meeting, Chairman Attwood asked if the response to question # 4 answered Attorney Fazzone’s question and he replied yes.

Question # 6 addressed Mr. Bowman’s concern of whether consideration was given to the Clean Water Act of 1992 regarding lower flows for toilets and showers? AECOM has stated that yes this act was taken into account and does reflect the impact of lower water usage of plumbing fixtures required by current standards.

Question # 7 was also from Mr. Bowman concerning the percentage of homes in Town are before / after 1992 and how the average of 600 gallons per day was calculated by AECOM? Mr. Chelton stated that AECOM does not have the age of the homes in Cheshire. He noted that it is not 600 gallons per day but rather 60 gallons per capita per day for the wastewater production rate. This rate is based on analysis of water use data and population for several residential areas in Cheshire for the period of June 2003 through May 2006.

Additional, question # 8 from Mr. Bowman asked about the concentration of effluent and its affect on the Water Treatment Plant or the ability to process the waste at the sewer treatment facility? Mr. Chelton stated that the projected future loadings to the Water Pollution Control Plant are based on the future projected flows and influent waste concentrations, adding that the Plant is sized for these parameters.

Question # 9 addressed Mr. White’s concern if Harrison Road near Rising Trail would be included in the 20 year Facilities Plan. Mr. Chelton noted that this area of Harrison Road was not recommended for sewers based on the criteria established for sewer needs. Chairman Attwood asked what specific criteria was not met for this area? Mr. Chelton stated that he did not have that information with him but could look it up. Mr. Dievert stated that he could look it up when he writes the response letters.

In question # 10 Mr. Jacuruso asked if 839 / 831 West Main Street, a commercial property, would be considered for sewers? AECOM noted that based on the consensus of those involved in preparing the Facilities Plan, an allowance of 50% was made for commercial / industrial parcels that would be sewered over the next 20 years, although no specific parcels were identified. It is anticipated that extensions of the sewer system to commercial and industrial zoned areas would be done on a need basis as established by the WPCA.

Other items brought up at the Public Hearing that were not specific questions on the Draft Facilities Plan are:

1. The reclassification of the Richmond Glen property from not recommended for sewers to recommended for sewers.

2. Adding a clarification to the report that the areas shown on the report maps as Growth areas include the neighborhood conservation areas.

3. Broadening the input on the draft Facilities Plan to include more input from the Inland Wetlands and the Planning and Zoning Commissions.
Mr. Chelton stated that the Facilities Plan was not approved last month at the WPCA meeting and asked where the Authority would like to go from here. Mr. Witek asked how the last 3 items would be addressed in the document? Mr. Chelton stated that they are policy issues. He stated that they will be adding a clarification to the report for item # 2 regarding the Growth areas included in the neighborhood conservation areas, to make that clear. Whether the Authority wants to broaden the input to the other Commissions…Mr. Witek noted that has been done in the past and they always try to do it better every time. Chairman Attwood added that each Commission was invited with their own individual letter to the workshops.

With regards to the re-classification of the Richmond Glen property, Mr. Chelton stated that it depends on how the WPCA wants to handle it. The Authority just voted tonight to approve that, if they would like to vote to include that as part of the area to be sewered, AECOM could certainly revise the Facilities Plan to show that. The Plan can stay as is and the Authority could make a vote to amend the Plan after you have accepted the Plan to include this parcel. Chairman Attwood stated that the Authority could also leave the Plan as is. He stated that a lot of time has been spent on this Facilities Plan and there was a lot of rationale for each of the votes, Chairman Attwood’s opinion is that it should be left as is, with the comment that was made on question # 1 and the amendments made here.

Mr. Scannell commented that he thinks Richmond Glen should be included in the Plan. Chairman Attwood asked, why? Mr. Scannell replied it is done, finished, its part of the Facilities Plan. Chairman Attwood stated that is a component of it and when you start going…there was a lot of work and effort put into why each thing was done, when you go re-classifying an area, it goes up to much bigger areas being opened up. Richmond Glen has the Authority’s permission to go and develop that one section that they asked for. Beyond that there is no permission to go and develop.

Mr. Chelton added, just thinking out loud, again this is somewhat unique because during the period when the Facilities Plan was being prepared and reviewed, which covered quite an extensive period of time, the classification of that property changed into a classification that would allow it to be sewered. When the draft was originally prepared for the Facilities Plan, that was not the case, so it keeps you consistent or compliant, so to speak, with DEP’s guidelines about sewering only properties are allowed under the C & D map, so you are still in conformance with that program. It seems to Mr. Chelton that it might make good sense to just extend it since it has been changed between draft and final, things change and you usually alter your Plan to reflect that and in particular you just approved it to be sewered. If you don’t do that they you have a piece of property that you have approved to sewer that is outside your boundaries. From a precedent stand point that might work against the Authority further on down the road as opposed to having it within your boundaries. Mr. Chelton asked Attorney Lord if he had any thoughts on this?

Chairman Attwood stated that the rationale for not approving it was that one of the criteria was it didn’t fall on the map, number 2, it was zoned large enough and the soils were good enough, so as an R-20 or R-40 it didn’t need any sewers. The application was made while the Facilities Plan was still sitting up at the State. Had that already come back, this would not have gone through. But there was a quagmire of which regulations you should follow. In a few years from now, should this not occur, for whatever reason, there would be no reason to have that and we would not need to extend into that area. Mr. Chelton questioned, if this development does not occur? Chairman Attwood said yes, if this development does not occur, it may 5 years from now, fade away. It was noted that it would not change the State Plan…Chairman Attwood noted that the State Plan says you
may go there but it doesn’t say you have to go there. A lot of areas that the Town is not pursuing are eligible for it. Chairman Attwood stated that his concern is that the Authority is saying this one thing changed, now we have to go look at all the other criteria behind it so it’s a bigger issue than the Authority just sitting here making a decision on one piece of lot.

Mr. Chelton stated that he understands some of the validity or argument, just thinking it on the other side, if you have extended sewers into an area that your Facilities Plan does not recommend for sewer ing…Chairman Attwood stated that acceptance was done… you can’t play both sides of the wall, when the Authority voted against it before, 7 –1, his argument was that the Authority has put in a Facilities Plan and have to follow it. There was some debate whether or not that was the actual case. The Authority has subsequently discussed / come around and said, well no, we don’t, so we are following the Facilities Plan that is in place right now. As of this minute, that development is fully legitimate right now. When this updated Facilities Plan passes, following the old Facilities Plan goes away, what is grandfathered is grandfathered. There will be a lot of developments with sewers that are outside our Plan because they were all grandfathered.

Mr. Chelton commented that Richmond Glen has been approved under the 1985 Facilities Plan, to which Chairman Attwood agreed, the prior Facilities Plan. Chairman Attwood stated that he is not comfortable making a shot gun change on something that so much work and effort went into and very logical steps were made to. Mr. Chelton stated that it is up to the Authority and that these are good arguments.

Mr. Scannell asked how many other things are they missing if they do this, along the way should the Authority go back and look at other projects that are…Chairman Attwood stated that it is a bigger territory than just one little piece. Number 2, the logic behind why it was listed as non-sewered was more than just the State Plan so those reasons are still there. All those other properties, you would be creating a precedent…Right now the parcel is eligible under the Facilities Plan that is in place today, and they will still be able to once this new Facilities Plan is passed. Chairman Attwood’s view is that there was a lot of time and effort in designing this, lets not suddenly try to make one quick change because of something that we have just accepted under the old Facilities Plan.

Mr. Scannell stated that he hears what Chairman Attwood is saying, but it just seems cleaner that we have this accepted…he stated that he doesn’t specifically follow Chairman Attwood’s logic. Mr. Pelton commented that a luxury that most of the members have, that Mr. Scannell does not have, is the long and intenuous history of this most recent approval tonight. This has gone up, down and side ways. Part of Chairman Attwood’s dialogue here is 1) healthy but 2) we don’t want to go down that road again. Mr. Pelton stated that he thinks there is some merit in saying that there was a C & D map, a snap shot in time, and here it is. The Facilities Plan was developed based upon that map. Everything took so long that the world did a couple revolutions and changed. The developer was able to get the C & D map changed, for whatever reason, the DEP could not approve, in a timely matter, the Plan that Cheshire submitted ions ago. Those with a little more tenure here are saying, we built this Plan based on what we knew back then, lets approve this Plan based upon what we knew, albeit 2 or 3 years ago, and lets be careful if we tweak that knowledge base upon a recent approval with Richmond Glen. Is it a shame that it took so long to get it out of DEP, absolutely, but those are the cards for which we have been dealt and lets not rock the boat, change the game, just because DEP took forever to get it to us. Mr. Pelton stated that he supported Chairman Attwood’s position, were we to render an opinion in favor of the Facilities Plan, it would be based upon the base of knowledge that was created and developed 2 or 3 years over time, not a recent abolition.
Mr. Scannell asked what this does to the Richmond Glen development? Mr. Pelton replied nothing, he is approved. Chairman Attwood commented that there is a danger down the line, if they have to come back 5 years from now or whenever the time period is up, that someone might say and someone might have to review this….but their whole plan is that they want to start digging so there is not an issue. Mr. Scannell asked if they don’t start digging and have to come back to the Authority 5 years from now…Chairman Attwood stated that even if the Authority makes the change to this Facilities Plan, the landscape will have changed and they would have to go through the same set of processes. We can’t predict what will happen, but from Richmond Glen’s perspective they are free to go and do what they want.

Attorney Lord stated that one other possibility if you spin it out over time is that there is at least talk that the State Plan of Conservation & Development is going to have a bottom up concept, to some degree, so to the extent that you can make recommendations to the municipality and to the Office of Policy and Management to change the State Plan of Conservation & Development to be consistent with the local Plan of Conservation & Development, you may want to change some or make recommendations to the State Plan based on your own plans for your sewer system. The thing is really a long term planning tool and not necessarily…Mr. Chelton added that it is not going to be a static condition going forward.

Attorney came forward and asked if he was allowed to make a comment. Chairman Attwood replied no, he is not because that would be a dangerous precedent in this case because there is a motion on the table. If there hadn’t been a motion, Chairman Attwood stated that he is the first one to allow things but there is a motion and it would be an issue.

Mr. Korman asked if the Facilities Plan were to be changed, would it have to be re-submitted to DEP for them to approve the changes. Mr. Chelton replied that he believes just a letter notifying them of the change, first of all the Authority still has not gotten formal approval of the entire document, an approval of the Technical Memorandum of the sewered area has been received. Mr. Chelton stated that he has given up trying to predict when the final approval is going to come from DEP, it’s a little disappointing in the speeds that things are going through DEP. Chairman Attwood commented that DEP has said to move forward, have the Public Hearings, do not hold the Facility Plan up for DEP approval. Mr. Chelton noted that as a courtesy it is not unusual, during a Public Hearing, to get input that requires you to make changes, that is the purpose of a Public Hearing.

Mr. Pelton suggested that the Authority’s changes are not significant; we are simply polishing the document.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve the Facilities Plan as proposed with the amendment noted under question #1 above, referencing Needs area 13 and the 2 parcels to be added to this area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried, 4-1 with Mr. Scannell opposing the approval.

Mr. Chelton stated that he would have revisions to Phase 2 of the Facilities Plan for next month’s meeting.
C. WPCD Upgrade – Possible action on RFQ

Mr. Pelton stated that Mr. Michelangelo prepared an RFQ, which was included in the meeting packet for all members to review, dated July 14, 2010. Mr. Pelton stated that the RFQ has been reviewed by the Subcommittee and was then sent to Dennis Grecci, at the DEP, who provided some additional input and recommendations. All of the revisions have been incorporated in the draft presented here tonight. Chairman Attwood stated that he was very excited to have all the input into this document, so in theory, it should meet everyone’s requirements.

Mr. Pelton stated that he had asked Mr. Michelangelo for a list of potential vendors that this RFQ should be sent to, which Mr. Pelton has not seen yet. The goal being that, if this document is approved tonight it could then go out tomorrow. Mr. Dievert stated that he believes that Mr. Michelangelo has the list of vendors, as it was done for the Mixville Pump Station and there were 7 or 8 firms that the bids were sent to. He also noted that the Public Notice will be printed in a few of the local newspapers. Mr. Witek stated that in the Subcommittee meeting it was stated that the Notice would be in the newspapers so that any vendor that is not on the mailing list would also be aware of it and could submit. Mr. Witek also asked about the walk thru for questions and answers, how does someone that does not attend the walk thru get questions and answers that are presented at the walk thru. Mr. Pelton noted that on page 7 it states that all inquires can be directed to Mr. Michelangelo, so his sense is that if they miss the walk thru they can queue up on that.

Chairman Attwood stated that he thought the team did a great job doing this, working this through, he hopes that it meets all the criteria. He then asked Attorney Lord if it was his understanding that this document would meet all the criteria? Attorney Lord stated that he would like to make only some minor tweaks to the document, just minor wording. Mr. Pelton noted that one of the Subcommittee’s concerns was how much time was going to be lost on this particular effort? Here it is July and we already have a document, we have an August deadline and we have met the spirit and intent of the Town Manger and Town Council to due diligence to evaluate as well as the DEP.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority accept as written, with Legal’s final review, the Request for Statements of Qualifications for Engineering Services regarding the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Upgrade, dated July 14, 2010. Mr. Dievert will be sure that there is a proper list of vendors that can be made available to anyone that would like to see it and that the Public Notice of this Request for Statements of Qualifications will also appear in area newspaper(s). The motion was seconded by Mr. Pelton and carried unanimously, 5-0.

Chairman Attwood asked Councilman Schrumm to make sure the Town Council is aware that the Request for Statements of Qualification (RFQ) for Engineering Services regarding the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Upgrade has been drafted and distributed to potential vendors. Councilman Schrumm stated that he believed it was mentioned at the last Town Council meeting that the WPCA would be going out for RFQ’s on the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Upgrade.
D.  **WPCD Influent Pump Station** – Project Progress Schedule.

Mr. Chelton reported that he continues to receive shop drawings from C.H. Nickerson Corporation; the pumps were just approved, which is a major step. AECOM is trying to get from them a more definitive schedule as to when some physical work is going to actually take place; Mr. Chelton stated that he hopes to have that next month. He added that there is an estimate in front of the Authority for $35,625; Mr. Chelton stated he did have the original from Nickerson with the signature on it.

Approval of C.H. Nickerson Co. – Application for payment # 1 dated 06/30/10 in the amount of $35,625.00.

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve and pay in full, payment #1 dated 06/30/10 to C.H. Nickerson Co. in the amount of $35,625.00, for services relating to the WPCD Influent Pump Station. The motion was seconded by Mr. Korman and carried unanimously, 5-0.

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

Mr. Chelton reported that there were some manholes that had the sealant peeled back, which is covered under the Interceptor Manhole Rehabilitation project’s Warranty Period. AECOM, Town Staff and the contractor have met to go through all the manholes and to discuss the corrections that were needed. Mr. Dievert commented that approximately 33% of the manhole had some type of defect, with only about 10% of those being fairly significant. It appears that all of the affected manholes were located in the 1st sections that were done, it was a little damp and wet when it was done and the contractor was new with the application. Also there was an overlap of 6 inches, and it was recommended that 12 inches should be done. Mr. Dievert reported that all of the corrective work was completed Monday and he is happy with the corrections. He also stated that the Inland / Wetlands Commission was notified of the corrective work that was being done, the permit is good until October 2013.

Chairman Attwood asked if the warranty period will be extended to 1 year from this past Monday’s date, when the corrections were made? Mr. Chelton replied no, the warranty period started from the date of substantial completion not this new work. If the sealant peels back again after the warranty period expires, it will be the Town’s responsibility to fix. Mr. Dievert noted that the sealant was peeling back on some of the manholes but there was no leaking yet, the actual integrity of the manhole seal was OK, it was just an oversized cap around it.

F.  **Superintendent Report**

Mr. Dievert did not give a Superintendent’s report tonight.

G.  **WPCA Capital Budget** – Discussion and possible action
Members of the Authority reviewed the items related to the WPCA that were submitted by Mr. Michelangelo for this year’s Capital Budget. The Capital Budget includes rehabilitation work for the West Johnson Avenue pump station ($1,880,000); Cook Hill Road pump station ($1,320,000); I & I evaluations and remediation ($750,000) as well as the WPCD Plant Upgrade ($30,000,000).

As presented to the Town Council right now the West Johnson Avenue pump station design work would start in 2010-2011 and construction would be pushed off until 2012-2013. The Cook Hill Road pump station design work would start in 2012-2013 and construction would start in 2013-2014. I & I evaluations and remediation would not be funded until 2012-2013.

Mr. Dievert stated that there will be a Capital Budget workshop on August 17th when he will meet with the Budget Committee to discuss this section of the Capital Budget. Mr. Dievert asked any available WPCA member to attend the workshop, for their support.

Chairman Attwood stated that he believes the West Johnson Avenue pump station, which is about 30 years old, has been pushed out due to the possible North End project, which could possible supplement the upgrades and improvements that are needed there. Mr. Dievert commented that the Cook Hill Road pump station, although it is about only 25 years old, has more problems. Chairman Attwood also expressed some concern with pushing the I & I project out a few years. Mr. Chelton commented that he thought there still is some I & I money available under a previous appropriation, that hasn’t been spent yet.

Councilman David Schrumm of 369 Sir Walter Drive came forward to address the Authority. He stated that he believes there is some funding available, depending on the structure of what the Authority may want to do. Looking at the Capital Budget list….Councilman Schrumm stated he wanted to review the Capital Budget timeline with the workshop for the WPCA items which will be held on August 17th and a Public Hearing on the Capital Budget will be held on August 18th, which members of the WPCA should be present to answer any questions. The Town Council will likely adopt the Capital Budget on August 24th. Councilman Schrumm noted that there is still some I & I money left over, depending on what the WPCA wants to do. He suggested that the money could be used to do some investigating into illegal sump pumps that are dumping out into the sewers, which the Authority has talked a lot about.

There was also some discussion about the State reimbursement rate for the WPCD Plant upgrade project, based on the State’s borrowing capacity and concerns that municipal bonding rates could go up to 5 – 6%. There are other concerns about the Clean Water Fund’s stability.

Chairman Attwood questioned if the WPCA should recommend that the pump station projects be moved up in the Capital Budget years. Councilman Schrumm stated that he doesn’t think the North End project is eminent. He encouraged Mr. Dievert to disclose the conditions of the pump stations at the workshop. He also suggested that he bring an updated graph showing the I & I gallon flow with the rainfall numbers by month to show the differences. It was noted that showing the lower number of days for recovery after a heavy rain storm will help to show positive I & I progress.

Chairman Attwood suggested that the Cook Hill Road pump station and West Johnson Avenue pump station design work be moved forward in the Capital Budget years. Mr. Dievert stated that he agreed, adding that he is not comfortable waiting on the North End project for the West Johnson Avenue pump station. Mr. Korman suggested adding the age of the pump stations and the ability to get replacement parts to the Capital Budget item descriptions. Mr. Dievert stated that there has
already been some modifications done at the Cook Hill Road pump station to keep it running, electrically and mechanically. Chairman Attwood suggested that contingency plans be prepared for both pump stations, just in case something happens before the Town is ready to act. Chairman Attwood questioned how long after design plans are completed will a new pump station be in place? What if the pump station projects are not funded, what will it cost the Town?

Councilman Schrumm stated that if the pump stations are in danger of collapsing it is good to have the design plans ready. He asked what the shelf life of the pump station design plans would be, if construction is pushed off? Mr. Chelton replied that it depends on how long construction would be put off for. It is not uncommon for there to be a couple year gap but by 10 years after the design plans are completed some updates would be needed. Mr. Pelton stated that he thought it would be about a 3 year shelf life on the design plans.

Chairman Attwood asked if the Town could get the same State funding for the WPCD Plant Upgrade and the pump stations? Mr. Chelton replied that he didn’t think the State would allow the projects to be packaged together.

Chairman Attwood questioned how much of the projects the Prison would be paying for? Councilman Schrumm commented that the number of prisoners has been going down. Mr. Dievert added that the flows at the Prison have been going up, noting that May numbers were the highest ever, and they are not sure why. The Facility Manager at the Prison is trying to look into why the flow rates are so high; Mr. Dievert has suggested to him that the meter be looked at.

Chairman Attwood thanked Councilman Schrumm for bringing the Capital Budget up at the last meeting. He added that the WPCA needed to be involved in this process sooner and get the information well in advance of this stage, in the future.

H. Sanitary Sewer Extension Project - Applewood Dr. & Riverside Dr. area – Award of Contractor and set of plans

Mr. Dievert informed the Authority that Baltazar Construction out of Lowell, MA was the low bid contractor for the Applewood Drive, Bridgets Lane, Country Club Road, Oxford Court and Riverside Drive sanitary sewer expansion project. He stated that the company has had their references checked and all gave above average or excellent ratings of Baltazar.

Chairman Attwood asked if others have reviewed the contractor for this project. Mr. Witek commented that Baltazar Construction is a descent contractor; he has done work with them in the past, in other towns. He noted that Baltazar Construction worked on a project previously in Town on Wolf Hill Road that still has some issues.

Mr. Witek commented that in reviewing these plans, he does have some concerns with the plans regarding a 6% grade going into a .3% grade, coverage depth and insulation materials to be used for the project. When asked if AECOM has reviewed the plans, Mr. Chelton has reviewed the plans but a review has not been done. Chairman Attwood asked what the fee would be to review the plans and Mr. Chelton replied there would be no cost. Mr. Chelton noted that any changes that AECOM would recommend would result in change orders to the project because it has already been bid. Mr. Chelton added the recommendation that the shallow pipes should be insulated, where there
is only about 2 feet of coverage on a section of Riverside Drive and would recommend a different type of pipe in that area.

Mr. Dievert stated that Joe Michelangelo, the Town Engineer, and his staff designed the plans for this project. Mr. Dievert stated that he has not reviewed the plans for this project, as he has just received a copy of them. Mr. Witek commented that another set of eyes should be reviewing any in-house design plans, just to make sure everything is covered and that nothing is overlooked. Mr. Korman questioned if it is worth going forward without the specifications, as the Authority or Mr. Dievert have not seen them, it can’t be assumed that they exist.

Chairman Attwood questioned when this bid needed to be signed by. Councilman Schrumm brought up the concern about the timeline for the bid contract holding period and when it needs to be signed by. It was noted that it is common practice to ask the low bid contractor to extend their bid acceptance date by 30 days, when asked.

Chairman Attwood expressed concern about the missing details that should be included in all the documents for this project and questioned if the Authority should be taking action without all of the information. Mr. Pelton noted that it is important to have the timeline for the bid response so that the Authority knows when a response is needed. Councilman Schrumm commented that the contractor could be asked verbally for the 30-day extension to act on his bid. If the answer is no, then the WPCA will likely have to gather a quorum, under a special meeting, to accept the low bid from Baltazar Construction.

Mr. Dievert contacted Mr. Michelangelo via telephone to ask him about the questions that the Authority has regarding when the bid contract needs to be signed by and grading, material and coverage depth as well as. Mr. Michelangelo told Mr. Dievert that he did not know the timeline for the bid contract to be accepted, adding that he didn’t think that the signing of the contract could wait until the next WPCA meeting. Mr. Pelton stated that he wasn’t comfortable rushing into this agreement to this contract without due diligence. Chairman Attwood stated that in the future, the Authority should have a due date on these types of contracts. Mr. Dievert suggested that the plans for this project should be presented to the WPCA before a project like this goes out to bid, if the design plans are done in-house. Chairman Attwood stated that Mr. Dievert should at the very least be reviewing the design plans, too. Mr. Pelton noted that there is a great cost savings when the design plans are done in-house, but another set of eyes from the WPCA could help with a review before a project goes out to bid. He stated that it is not a matter of skill set, it’s a matter of process.

Mr. Chelton commented that he is slightly uncomfortable reviewing the Town’s work, it is not a money thing, it is just a delicate, uncomfortable situation for AECOM. Mr. Witek stated that if changes are needed to the design plans now, it would have to be done as change orders, because it has already been bid.

Chairman Attwood stated that the Authority would like Staff to ask Baltazar Construction for a 30-day extension to their bid contract so that a more thorough review of the design plans and specifications could be done and provided to the Authority.
4. Approval of Invoices

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE and pay in full AECOM Invoice No. 7082624 dated 07/14/10 for work relating to Phase 1 WPCP Facility Plan in the amount of $7,267.35; AECOM Invoice No. 7082625 dated 07/14/10 for work relating to the Interceptor Manhole Rehabilitation Project in the amount of $1,486.69; AECOM Invoice No. 7082626 dated 07/14/10 for work relating to the Phase 2 WPCP Facility Plan in the amount of $2,111.75; AECOM Invoice No. 7082627 dated 07/14/10 for work relating to the Influent Pump Upgrade at the WPCP in the amount of $3,678.65. The motion was seconded by Mr. Korman and carried unanimously, 5-0.

5. New Business

None

6. Old Business

Chairman Attwood stated that he would like to get the status of low flow toilets at the schools added to the next WPCA meeting agenda.

A. Approval of Minutes of Public Hearing (Amendment to Regulations) and Public Hearing (Draft Phase 1, Wastewater Facilities Plan) and Regular meeting of June 23, 2010

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority accept the June 23, 2010 public hearings and regular meeting minutes as corrected:

- Page 12, item 2, last sentence should read, “…sitting out there “too long” it could delay or might void someone else’s project…”;
- Page 17, third paragraph, third sentence should read, “…Mr. Witek interrupted saying that his point is, there is no access to the force main…”

The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell and carried unanimously, 5-0.

B. Septic System Summary from Chesprocott dated June 30, 2010

Mr. Dievert reported that all of the issues referenced in the letter from Chesprocott were code complaint issues and have been repaired.

7. Adjournment

Mr. Attwood moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority adjourn their July 28, 2010 Regular Monthly meeting at 9:45 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Korman and carried unanimously, 5-0.
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John Attwood, Chairman
Water Pollution Control Authority
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