

**Town of Beacon Falls
Water Pollution Control Authority
10 Maple Ave
Beacon Falls, CT 06403**



**WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 13, 2013**

Call to Order

Chairman Jeffrey Smith called the regular meeting to order at 7:46 p.m.

Present: Chairman Jeffrey Smith, Commissioners: Richard Komar, Charles Edwards, James Weed, Town Engineer James Galligan, Nicholas Champagne and David Prickett of Woodard and Curran, Walter Opuszynski, Treatment Plant Supervisor and Maryann Kempa, Clerk.

Absent: Commissioners: Robert Pruzinsky and David Finn.

Also Present: Richard Minnick, 147 Cedar Lane and Kurt Hummel, Patricia Lane

Minutes – July no meeting

Comments from the Public

Richard Minnick, 147 Cedar Lane came before the board to present his letter dated August 7, 2013 to Jeff Smith, WPCA Members, Jim Galligan, Town Engineer, Board of Selectmen and other concerned citizens stating: I was not able to attend the special meeting of July 9, 2013 regarding the upgrade to the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

After reading the minutes of that meeting, the newspaper and attending and voting to approve the current study, I have a few questions and concerns and hope to have them addressed at the public hearing to be held at some date this month before I could vote to spend additional tax dollars.

I know that there are certain items that must be addressed in order to meet federal and state environmental mandates. Thanks to the efforts of the current and previous plant managers and operators, the plant has been able to operate well past the normal life cycle expectancy. This equipment must be replaced and upgraded. This should lend itself to a more cost effective and efficient plant operation.

The Open Space Land Use Committee acting as a subcommittee of the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission, with representation from all of the land use commissions, the town engineer and a professional planner, spent two (2) plus years developing and

updating the town's Plan of Conservation and Development, POCD. At various states the plan was reviewed by the staff of Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (CNV COG). The Planning and Zoning Commission recently approved the plan and forwarded to the CNV COG, who in turn will forward it to the State with comments for OPM and DEEP approval.

Included in the Plan was an upgraded plan for providing wastewater treatment services which stated that the plant has more than sufficient capacity to service the town now and into the future. During the process, many hours were spent with representatives from Wastewater Treatment Control Authority, WPCA, P&Z and the town engineer to develop a comprehensive plan. During this process, it was discussed that infiltration was a major problem and that issue is being addressed.

It is my understanding that for any town to receive the maximum, if any funding, the proposed project must be in substantial agreement with the town, region and State Plan of Conservation and Development. It seems to be that the proposed project is substantially different than what was reviewed and submitted to the State for approval. I would like to think that Woodard and Curran have kept this mind. The Town of Cheshire is still suffering from professional advice that did not follow the appropriate state guidelines, (unfunded mandates).

If the plant is currently of sufficient size, why does the plant need to double in size? At the public information meeting, D. Prickett of Woodard and Curran noted the need to address the issue of "higher flows, essentially doubling the size of the current wastewater treatment plan." This is in conflict with POCD.

- If we have more than sufficient capacity that far exceeds the planned growth of the town, what is the source of this higher inflow?
- If it is the infiltration that is a major problem why no fix that?
- If it is the increase over the project estimate of the flow from the landfill, why not address that issue?
- If there is inflow, why isn't there an outflow of the wastewater into the ground? Shouldn't this be addressed?

In the minutes of the meeting, D. Prickett noted that "Woodard and Curran would design and oversee the project but will not bid on it". They intended to be the project managers for project. Typically the fee for project management is based on the cost of this project. It is to benefit Woodard and Curran to inflate the size of the project?

- Does the town need to hire yet another professional to keep track of the professional?

How is the upgrade going to be accomplished? With the high volume of infiltration, does some of the new equipment/pools need to be installed first? Is there sufficient space inside the building? After the plant is upgraded, how much space will be reclaimed?

It was mentioned the need for a 20 year maintenance plan. If the plan is developed, will it be implemented? In the past, long term maintenance programs were presented to the Board of Selectmen and Finance basically rejected. This is the main reason that the town is faced with the major expenditure today.

A “use fee” was briefly discussed. This could be a fair and equitable way of addressing the cost to operate the wastewater treatment service. If the infiltration problems are not addressed, how can a fair and equitable fee be established without burdening non user taxpayers?

Depending on the answers to these concerns, I may have additional questions and concerns.

To the members of the WPCA, I know very well the effort and time it takes to work on a project of this magnitude and size. As a volunteer board it takes a lot of personal effort and time to review all of the data and many times some items may be missed. I want to let you know that your effort is appreciated.

Richard Minnick stated that the sewer plant has more than adequate capacity to sewer the whole town. David Prickett, Woodard and Curran stated that there is no expansion outside of the POCD undeveloped area. There are quite a few of existing undeveloped and unsewered lots that abut an existing pipe now. The sewer plant has capacity to accommodate Patricia Lane and Dolly Drive. The sewer plant does not meet the legal requirements. The studies done by the Town should be compared and reviewed. The I&I Study has been done. James Galligan, Town Engineer will review the studies. Avenue E and Felspar have the worst infiltration.

Kurt Hummel, Patricia Lane came to the board to express the need for sewers on Patricia Lane. It is a health issue.

David Prickett, Woodard and Curran forwarded to the board the Public Informational Meeting – Wastewater Facilities Plan- Town of Beacon Falls containing the following

This Meeting Will

- Present project background for Town Boards and residents
- Provide opportunity for questions and initial feedback
- Shape the recommended plan and completion of the study
- Lead to more detailed follow-up discussions and meetings

- Serve as initial step toward future Town meeting to consider capital improvements

What is a Facilities Plan?

- Planning study
- Consider current and future wastewater management needs
- Develop recommendations for 20-year planning period
- Funded through 55% grant from CT-DEEP
- Prerequisite for follow-up CWF funds from CT-DEEP for design and construction phases

Why Did Beacon Falls Need a Facilities Plan?

- Collection System
Parts of system has old pipes that leak and are subject to infiltration and inflow (negative impacts on plant)
Three remote pump stations in need of upgrades to ease maintenance needs
- Treatment Plant
40 years old (original equipment)
New permit requirements for phosphorus, nitrogen
Operational challenges during wet weather periods

Status of Facilities Plan

- Commenced in Summer 2012
- Treatment Plan evaluation nearly completed
- Collection System evaluation is on-going to be completed Summer 2013
- In the process of developing recommendations
- Finalize Report in Fall 2013

Collection System Overview

- Statistics
120,000 feet of gravity sewer
7,000 feet of force main
3 pump stations
1,700 existing connections/customers (50% of Town)
- Findings
600+ Manholes GPS located and mapped
Town now has comprehensive sewers system map
I/I Study in Spring 2013
Only performed detailed evaluation in parts of system

Treatment Plant Overview

- Statistics
Constructed in 1970
UV and septage handling added in 2006
Majority of equipment is original and “tired”
Extremely lean annual wastewater budget
- Findings
WPCF rated for 0.70 mgd, but was really only designed for 0.35 mgd
Challenges meeting permit during wet weather periods
Small undersized secondary clarifiers
UV disinfection challenges due to loss of solids from clarifiers and impacts from leachate (iron/manganese)
Major capital needs required

WPCF Upgrade Needs

- Site plan showing current plan and future expansion area
- Considering four upgrade alternatives
- Similar capital cost but varying O&M requirements
- Operators have toured other treatment plants to see new processes
- Recommendations to Balance
Life cycle costs
Site constraints
Solids handling requirements
Operator preferences and flexibility

Collection System Upgrade Needs

- Majority of needs are focused at WPCF
- Improvement controls and monitoring capabilities at pump stations
- Remove excessive I/I where it's cost effective (results still pending field work)
- Develop integrated capital plan to evaluate sewer and storm drain systems as part of paving capital plan

Overall Financial Impacts

- Capital Costs
Current proposed = \$16M
Interim phosphorus requirements (\$100K+/-)
Pump stations/SCADA (\$600K +/-)
Future collection system repairs and I/I removal TBD
- Annual Costs
Current annual wastewater budget = \$600K
Annual capital cost = \$978K
Also additional annual O&M cost (TBD)

- Beacon Falls current annual wastewater costs = \$353/EDU
- State-wide average of \$369/EDU
- Possible funding sources
 - CT-DEEP grants and low interest loans
 - USDA –Rural Development
- Ad valorem verses user fees

Future Schedule

- Complete Facilities Plan Fall 2013
- Interim phosphorus requirement in place prior to May 1, 2014
- Pump stations upgrades during FY 14
- Design for WPCA upgrades during FY 14
- Future construction during FY 15 and FY 16

Business Meeting

New Applications

Tiverton Subdivision (formerly Gobblers Ridge Subdivision)

Chairman Jeffrey Smith stated an application is needed.

Old Business

1. Industrial Park – Lancaster Drive – J. Martin

Chairman Jeffrey Smith stated that a lien should be put on the Industrial Park property owned by James Martin.

Motion was made by Commissioner Charles Edwards and seconded by Commissioner James Weed to authorize Atty. Steven Byrne to put a lien in the amount of \$12,000.00 on the Industrial Park property owned by James Martin.

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

Chairman Jeffrey Smith stated that the building inspector has been notified of the outstanding fees.

2. Sewer Service Area Map

There is nothing to report. This matter will be kept on the agenda.

**3. Nitrogen & Phosphorus Removal – Treatment Plant
I&I Study**

This matter was previous discussed above.

4. O&G Wash Plant

Chairman Jeffrey Smith stated that this matter can be taken off the agenda.

5. Burton Hill, 363 Burton Road – 2 Lot ReSubdivision

Chairman Jeffrey Smith stated that this matter can be taken off the agenda.

New Business

Treatment Plant Monthly Reports

1. Leachate flow summaries for second quarter of the year 2013.
2. June 2013 Data Report

Resolution – Various Improvements to the Town’s Wastewater Systems

The following Resolution was made by Chairman Jeffrey Smith and seconded by Commissioner James Weed:

RESOLVED, that the Water Pollution Control Authority recommends that the Town of Beacon Falls appropriate \$700,000 for costs in connection with various improvements to the Town’s wastewater systems, as to be determined by the Water Pollution Control Authority, contemplated to include supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) systems and integration, emergency, bypass and readiness provisions, and mechanical improvements for Railroad Avenue, Pine Bridge, and West Road pump stations; short-term measures to address interim phosphorus removal requirements at the Wastewater Treatment Plant, and for related bond and note issuance and other financial costs; and that the Town issue bonds or notes and temporary notes in an amount not to exceed \$700,000 to finance the appropriation.

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

Grinder Pumps

139 West Road & 37 Rimmon Hill Road

Payment of Bills

Water Resources – 139 West Road - \$300.00

Motion was made by Chairman Jeffrey Smith and seconded by Commissioner Charles Edwards to pay the bill.

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

Maryann Kempa - \$147.50

Motion was made by Commissioner Richard Komar and seconded by Commissioner Charles Edwards to pay the bill.

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

New England Septic – 37 Rimmon Hill Road - \$140.00

**Motion was made by Commissioner Richard Komar and seconded by
Commissioner Charles Edwards to pay the bill.**

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

Water Resources – 37 Rimmon Hill Road - \$500.00

**Motion was made by Commissioner Richard Komar and seconded by
Commissioner James Weed to pay the bill.**

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

Nafis & Young \$181.25

**Motion was made by Commissioner Charles Edwards and seconded by
Commissioner James Weed to pay the bill.**

Discussion: None Vote: 4 in favor Abstained: 0 Opposed: 0

Correspondence

Interoffice Memo dated August 8, 2013 from First Selectman Gerard Smith concerning Purchasing Policy and Procedures.

Resignation letter from Maryann Kempa, Clerk stating last meeting will be in October 2013.

Miscellaneous - nothing

Executive Session – none

Petitions from Commissioners – none

**Motion was made by Commissioner Charles Edwards and seconded by
Commissioner Richard Komar to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Maryann Kempa

Maryann Kempa, Clerk