# PUBLIC MEETING / SPECIAL MEETING
# AVON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
**July 23, 2015**
**Selectmen's Chambers, 7 pm**
**Town of Avon**

## I. CALL TO ORDER
The Avon Water Pollution Control Authority was called to order at 7:10 pm by Mr. Farrell.

**AWPCA**
Present: Michael Farrell
Tom Armstrong
Terry Ryan
Chris Roy

Absent: Eric Johansen

**Present:**
**Town of Avon**
Lawrence Baril, Town Engineer
Matt Brown, Assistant Town Engineer
Tim Foster, Superintendent of Sanitary Sewers

**Avon Water Company**
Robert Wesneski, President
Kevin Schwabe, Environmental Technician – Serviceman

## II. MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING – May 21, 2015

**MOTION**: Mr. Armstrong made a motion for approval of the May 21, 2015 minutes. The motion, seconded by Mr. Farrell received unanimous approval.

**III. COMMUNICATION FROM THE AUDIENCE** – Mr. Farrell welcomed audience members and invited members to ask questions should there be any questions outside of the upcoming agenda relating to the Paperchase Trail sewer project.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS** – None

## V. OLD BUSINESS -

**2014 – 10 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for the Paperchase Trail neighborhood** – Mr. Farrell welcomed audience members and introduced members from the AWPCA and Town Staff. Mr. Roy has formally recused himself from this part of the agenda. Mr. Farrell noted the AWPCA received a petition from multiple members of the Paperchase / Hurdle Fence neighborhood asking the AWPCA for the feasibility of sewering that neighborhood. Working with Engineering, ground testing was conducted and other preliminary figures and data have been returned which leads to the Public Meeting part of the process. Mr. Farrell noted it is not a voting process rather it is the obligation of the AWPCA to extend sewers into neighborhoods that have demonstrated a need or into areas that are feasible to extend them. From a study done in 2007, neighborhoods were qualified. The Paperchase neighborhood appeared on the top third of the list. Many of the top neighborhoods have already been

sewered so you are now considered a higher priority than most of the neighborhoods in the Town of Avon. Regardless of whether your petition came to us or not, it is highly probable that we would be at this point in the very new future. It just makes sense to move forward with looking at the feasibility with going forward in your neighborhood. Should this project come to fruition and the Town and the AWPCA decide to extend sewers into your neighborhood, you should understand a couple things about your financial obligation. First, there is no obligation or requirement for you to physically connect to the sewer system should it be run in front of your house. You will, however, be assessed for having that benefit in the road in front of your house. We have a process whereby that assessment can be paid out over several years. If you choose or have to connect, there are other fees involved such as a connection fee, an annual user fee and construction fees to have a contractor come in to make that physical connection. If you choose not to connect or you don't have to connect, there is no requirement for you to do that. However, there is a financial obligation where everyone will be charged the assessment.

Mr. Farrell entered into record three emails which Larry Baril received. One email from Mr. Paul Valente of 21 Paperchase who is in favor of the project. An email from Mr. Robert Bernaduci from 41 Paperchase Trail who is also in favor of the project. Mr. Farrell mentioned he also received an email from Mr. Evan Davis of 86 Paperchase who understands the need for the project but at this time is not expressing any interest in supporting the project. Mr. Farrell introduced Mr. Larry Baril to provide an overview of the project and encouraged audience members to state their name and address for the record.

Mr. Baril provided a presentation and noted it is not decisions – just information. Mr. Baril suggested members ask questions at the end of the presentation and also noted that Bob Wesneski and Kevin Schwabe are present from the Avon Water Company (AWC) as interest was noted from residents at the time the petition was received to also extend water and gas. Invitations were sent to AWC and Connecticut Natural Gas (CNG). However, CNG has been rather quiet on their interests while AWC has been very different and has an overview to present.

Mr. Baril reviewed the primary drivers for the project such as the evaluation within the Sewer Facilities Plan that the Paperchase Trail / Hurdle Fence neighborhood is noted as a high need area. Also, a petition from homeowners was received in 2014 which says there's an interest in the project. The age of the septic systems is also a factor. They are in the 50 to 55 year-old range. From experience no septic system lasts forever unless it's unused or if you are in an unbelievable groundwater or soil condition, which is not the case in this neighborhood. Your soils are tight, groundwater is high and there have been failed septic systems. Another driver is that the area abuts existing public sewer (Cambridge Crossing) which is relatively close to the neighborhood.

There are project goals of the neighborhood such as providing gravity sewer service to every resident/house in the neighborhood, minimize disturbance to the environment, particularly inland wetlands, which do exist in your neighborhood. We want to locate manholes to minimize driver impediments so manholes are not under the driver's wheels, determine interest and feasibility to bring other utilities to the neighborhood. The intent is to complete a road overlay. I've talked to the Public Works Director. Both Paperchase and Hurdle Fence are not considered among the worst ones in town, are not considered one of the better. This proposed project will kick up both roads a notch or two in the pavement management process. It wouldn't make sense to pave the road and then come back a year or two later and install sanitary sewers.

The Engineering Department was given directive from the AWPCA to proceed with a preliminary design to understand what the impacts there will be.

A field and office survey were performed along with soil borings which identifies presence of ledge rock, soil types and ground water depth. A preliminary design was then prepared. We met with the AWC and CNG to solicit interest. I don't have any more information to present from CNG as I am waiting to hear from them. We have identified and evaluated routes to connect. We met with property owners but would like to meet with all residents to determine location of your septic tank and look at your lot with you to determine best spot for the lateral. This would be done before final design is completed. Preliminary cost estimates have been done both internally and via a local contractor.

The preliminary design has yielded the following project considerations. There is an approximate length of 4,500 feet new sanitary main line, 26 manholes and 44 service laterals. The depth of the mainline sewer is between 8 feet (normal depth) and 21 feet (very deep). Our number one goal is to catch everyone by gravity. The current design does have two residents on Hurdle Fence who will need to pump. In order to keep construction viable, the road will be partially closed during construction. Everyone will still have access to their homes. There will be temporary pavement over the disturbed roadway. The complete road overlay will happen the following year as you want the whole temporary pavement to last one season.

Mr. Baril's next presentation slide included a design map where he discussed the proposed sewer route, including the exit point. A resident inquired about pumping which Mr. Baril replied he would address later in the presentation.

The factors that will drive the project include the depth of sewer, number of manholes, existence of ledge rock and groundwater. Ledge rock was not encountered during the soil boring testing although groundwater was discovered. Backfill material is a factor to be included due to groundwater saturation. Access to private property to connect to Cambridge Crossing will entail gaining an easement which will result in a monetary compensation and repairing the property.
The bidding contractor's workload and cost of materials impact the costs.

Mr. Baril reviewed the assessment estimates. The Town did an internal estimate of $605,000 and also reached out to Canton Village Construction estimate of $976,000. The soft costs of field survey, borings and legal/easements were discussed. The estimated range per resident is $14,553 to $22,985. Mr. Gordon Stead of 55 Hurdle Fence inquired about what is not included with the estimate cost. Mr. Baril replied that the cost is for the mainline sewer only – mainline sewer and lateral stubs to the lateral line. Mr. Farrell clarified the resident's question in that Mr. Stead may be asking what is borne by the homeowner. Mr. Baril mentioned he will discuss that in the next line. This estimate describes the construction of the mainline sewer and the restoration to temporary pavement patch. These are estimated costs as it is impossible to determine the true costs will be until the project is bid. Economic factors will affect the final construction costs.

Ms. Anne Marie McFadden of 33 Paperchase Trail inquired about what percentage level the estimated costs is. Mr. Baril required that he wouldn't give an estimate with a percentage. We take every unit, such as the number of manholes, length of pipe, backfill materials, processed stone, and place the cost next to each item, which are construction based estimates. I typically put a contingency on the final costs as most projects will run into an unanticipated situation. This is a preliminary estimate on a preliminary design. I want you to be aware of magnitude, not hard numbers.

Mr. Michael Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence inquired where the lateral stub is going in. Mr. Baril responded that we are going in where the right of way line is, which roughly 12 feet from the edge of the road to your property is owned by the Town. We bring it to the right-of-way. Mr. Baril reiterated a comment made by Mr. Farrell earlier that it is not the Town's policy to force anyone to connect. If a resident should choose to connect, there are other costs incurred at the time of connection. These costs

include a connection charge of $2,500, connection cost to the contractor by the homeowner, estimated to be between $3,000 and $6,000. The final connection costs to the contractor varies depending up several factors. The annual sewer use fee is currently $335 per year per home. The sewer permit fee is $50.

Mr. Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence inquired what a resident is getting for the connection charge of $2,500. What is it? Mr. Baril responded that the connection charge is primarily to cover infrastructure management and maintenance. The sewer use fee primarily covers treating the Town's effluent. We send our effluent to Canton, Simsbury and Farmington where they in turn send the Town a bill. Mr. Gilmore followed up inquiring additional explanation and Mr. Foster noted that the connection charge is a one-time cost and is the lowest in the Farmington Valley as Simsbury charges $4,100 and Canton is approximately $7,000. The connection charge has not been raised in about twelve or fifteen years. Mr. Gilmore commented you're paying maintenance on a brand new item. Mr. Baril clarified that even though there is new sewer in your neighborhood, the flow will pass through a lot of infrastructure, ultimately ending in Simsbury. Mr. Farrell added that the flow travels through several different lines through aged infrastructure, which also needs to be maintained. The connection charge is front-loading the cost to maintain that infrastructure farther down the line outside your neighborhood. It's important to have the money in place should be there be a failure. Mr. Chris Roy of 50 Hurdle Fence suggested it might make sense to understand the route of the effluent from Hurdle Fence including the amount of mileage it takes and infrastructure and pump station it goes through to get to Simsbury. Mr. Baril noted it goes through many miles of pump and Mr. Foster described the route from Cambridge Crossing to Simsbury, which is a long route.

Mr. Baril discussed other possible design alternatives, given the initial high cost estimate. Together with the Assistant Town Engineer, Matt Brown, other alternatives were reviewed. There are two other options, in concept, to review with you and the AWPCA. We, the Engineering Department, will need direction from the AWPCA on how to proceed. They will listen to your comments and questions and direct where this goes. One option is to raise the sewer. There are pros which will reduce costs and cons to this option which will require more homes to pump up to the sewer. In addition, these pumps are owned, powered and maintained by homeowners and cost around $5,000 plus installation. These pumps are powered by electricity and generally has a storage capacity equal to a day.

Low pressure sewer is another possible design alternative. Pros include cost reduction per foot due to shallower sewer, construction time and material costs which results in reduction in project costs. Similar cons to owning a pump include pumps are owned, powered and maintained by homeowners. Mr. Baril mentioned he owned a house for 11 years which was on a pump system and I never once looked at my pump and it was fine the day I sold it. Mr. Foster lives in a neighborhood with low pressure sewers. Mr. Foster mentioned he's in a unique situation where his Town owns the pump and he has not experienced any problems. It's a unique alternative. The problem in the Town offering this now is that developers may come and inquire about installing low pressure sewers. Mr. Baril mentioned the AWPCA has not allowed low pressure sewers for developers. Mr. Foster added that this typical mainline would need to be flushed and the $2,500 would be used to offset the costs.
Mr. Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence asked why the mainline would need to be flushed if it's just one line in the street and everyone is on it. Mr. Baril replied stating that it needs to be constantly flowing. You don't want the effluent to dry up.

Mr. Baril reviewed the next slide which describes the potential project schedule. We are at a fork in the road. We need direction from the AWPCA on how to proceed. If we do proceed, this is the schedule with project design finalization in October, second public information meeting in November, out to bid in winter with construction and paving to follow with a levy assessment to begin in Winter 2016/2017.

Mr. Kevin Schwabe of the Avon Water Company presented an overview of the Avon Water Company including how the groundwater is treated and that it is pumped to five tanks. There are two pressure zones. There is a shared water main installation cost where everyone contributes to the main extension. Similar to the sewer, there is a cost to the contractor to dig from the water main to your house. The AWC is responsible for maintaining the water main and the shut-off and you are responsible for the shut-off to your house. This plan calls for putting in fire hydrants. AWC is in the shoulder. We have the flexibility to move around and stay to the shoulder and out of the road. Mr. Wesneski mentioned the project would come in after the sewer. We would either put in a service to those houses that don't hook up so they can connect in the future. Once the road is paved, we don't want to go back into the road. We put in sleeves in under the road and take ties to them so we can open up both ends of the sleeve and put a pipe through should you decide to hook up later. This is our proposal and it's the same cost per person. We need to get at least 50% of the people to move forward with the project. I know you have wells now. You can maintain your well for irrigation but it has to be separate plumbing. The household usage has to be separate. It would be $9,600 per person. It won't go up – it won't go down. The annual water usage for 18,000 gallons is about $120 for a three month period. Mr. Wesneski offered water quality reports and rate schedules. We are a privately owned company. Mr. Farrell invited audience members to comment and reminded audience to give their name and address.

Mr. Richard Getz of 18 Paperchase Trail inquired whether sewers are inevitable. Mr. Farrell replied that one of the ethical and statutory requirements and obligation for the water pollution control authority is to control water pollution and we do that by extending sanitary sewers through areas that demonstrate a need. We have substantive data that suggest areas in Avon are on the short list. One of the biggest factors that this list considered were failures/age of systems. Is in evitable? At some point, I say yes. Given the standing of your neighborhood on this list, it is highly probable you would be on the radar screen.

Mr. Baril responded to a question inquiring about the typical timeframe a septic system lasts stating he is hesitant to give a timeframe for all septic systems. However, longevity factors include existing environmental conditions, soil types the septic tank is built in, groundwater conditions, how is it used (5 bedroom house with 5 children, pour bacon fat down drain). Septic systems clog. There are other system tank failures such as replacing a septic tank baffle. Those hardware repairs are not generally as expensive. If your leaching field system dies today, you are talking usually in the neighborhood of $20,000 to $30,000 to fix it. Most of you are living on systems from the original installed system. If it's just one or two people and you don't do laundry twice a day, you pump your tank every two or three years, don't flush bacon fat down, your system will last longer. No septic system is designed or expected to last forever unless you are in a unique condition where your soil conditions are so pervious that no matter what you put in, it goes away. Mr. Foster commented there are lengthy old systems in this neighborhood. What also is on your property is your water source. That's why we reached out to the Avon Water Company. You have your own individual water source on your property. You are also dumping raw sewage in your property. They don't mix.

Mr. Farrell invited the audience to look at the master plan list which is on the Town's web site and access the list which gives lots of criteria to explain how they were qualified.
Mr. Gilmore commented that septic systems don't last forever. The methane that is produced destroys concrete. Your baffles will go. We have been on ours since day one. We are original owners. No problems with it. Never had it pumped to date. We never had a leach field overflow. My parents only put down the right stuff. That's the most critical thing a homeowner can do. There are three ways a system can fail. One, is user irresponsibility, act of God and the system was designed and installed improperly. I don't know of any other way to fail a septic system. I never pumped. I can speak of 44 Hurdle Fence. I went down about twelve feet. There is beautiful groundwater underneath our property.

I would like to address the water table. When were the measurements made? What month? Mr. Baril responded they were done in June. Mr. Gilmore mentioned we had a long, wet winter which meant the melt came late which means the water table lasted a lot longer. There is another factor in this. We have three drains on Hurdle Fence. The drain from Stage Coach to the house to the left of me is one line. I know it dumps into my neighbor's property which means it then flows overland down to the people behind. I know this when I tried to find my cat. Where do the other drains flow into? There's a lot of water coming out of this pump. Mr. Baril noted that in addition to this project, there's an Infiltration and Inflow study being done. The stage of the I/I study that was in place in springtime and early summer, the groundwater elevation was critical to the success of that part of the project – the dilution testing. The consultants told us the groundwater was too low to make it feasible to continue dilution testing. Therefore, we feel the borings conducted were quite adequate for estimating groundwater conditions as not being high groundwater.

Ms. Jackie Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence inquired whether someone could identify those properties on the petition who are having problems. Mr. Baril offered to give Ms. Gilmore a copy of the petition but it's not necessarily people who are having problems. It's not a list of all the people on the petition are people who are having problems. Mr. Farrell added that there are other motivators of signing the petition such as resale value and not indicative of someone having a problem. Mr. Gilmore said the problem with the project is that there are no definitive numbers. It's a consensus. It's from petitioners. Put a number on it. Mr. Farrell responded that we will provide you with the names on the petition. This is preliminary, in terms of numbers. Don't get confused with numbers. Regardless of receiving a petition, it's not just about numbers. There are other factors in the mix. Mr. Farrell noted there are nineteen signatures on the petition.

Mr. Gary Palmer of 20 Hurdle Fence is curious whether the neighborhood has been canvassed to determine how many septic systems have failed already or how many are close to failing as a percentage of 44 neighbors that we have. We are generally in favor of the project and our system is fine. Mr. Baril responded that the Town does not canvass the neighborhood. Septic systems are not governed by the Town of Avon. The Farmington Valley Health District is the contact for system tank owners. They will identify whether a system is failed or not failed. They don't do that ad hoc. They do that only when they receive a request. Mr. Farrell noted the Authority requested approximately five years ago quarterly reports. We were looking at that for proactive purposes. Mr. Baril noted that recently we have been receiving reports from the FVHD. We have entered this data in our database. A resident inquired to the audience to see who has had a failure. One resident said she knows of four. Mr. Farrell noted the neighborhood is mature. Mr. Matt Brown noted he received septic information from the FVHD web site. He noted Mr. Hirsch's entire lot in the back yard is taken up by a septic system. He has no chance of putting in a new system unless he digs up the whole system and puts in new sand. Talk to FVHD and ask how much that will cost. Many of the systems are repairs. When the Haynes Road sewer project happened, many of the residents said they were not going to hook up. It was a transitional neighborhood. The developer offered an incentive to hook up early. Those who didn't sign up, paid extra. That came off the sale of the house. It definitely adds value to the house. Mr. Foster added if you choose not to hook up and experience a failure, FVHD will be on the doorstep and say you have public sewer here, you are going to hook up. There will be mandate. Failures can affect wells.

Mr. Neil Dibiccari of 35 Hurdle Fence mentioned he just replaced his septic tank because it was old but the leach fields were fine. My question is about the alternative of bringing pumps in. What are the chances of that getting approved if we move forward with the project? Mr. Farrell said it would receive equal consideration at this point. Mr. Dibiccari followed up with asking if it's been denied in the past. Mr. Farrell said that was an isolated proposal. That was part of a multi-faceted development. That particular denial did not serve the greater good of a larger sub development. Mr. Baril noted that

development was already designed to do gravity sewers. The developer caught wind that the Town was considering doing low pressure sewers. The sewer facility plan identifies areas where it is logical to use low pressure sewers where existing gravity sewers are very far away or just impossible because they are uphill. For example, the Cider Brook Road area is distinctly away from an existing sewer. This area is a logical candidate for low pressure sewers. This area is high on the list. Mr. Farrell noted that if we were going to entertain a low pressure system, I foresee another public meeting because the Authority will want to hear more from the vested neighbors. At this point, it would receive equal consideration but I really want to hear more from you. The resident asked why this option was the first option to go to considering it was less of a cost. Mr. Baril responded that cost is not the only factor. There's a factor that you will have a pump that you will own and operate. To some people is a deal breaker. There are more factors than just a cost. There's a cost besides just dollars. If you have a gravity sewer system and public water, even with the power out, you can still flush the toilet.

Mr. Bill Anderson of 59 Paperchase Trail asked when the project will get done. Will that be next year? Mr. Farrell replied that time wise, that is accurate. Mr. Baril noted assuming if AWPCA decides to move forward with the project, that's a realistic time schedule. Mr. Baril described the assessment pay period. Typically, the AWPCA offers two choices for payback. First, you can do a lump sum payback. The second alternative is paying back on a time period – usually 10 years with an established interest rate. The interest rate is based on the current bond rating. There are equal installments over the 10 years. No prepayment penalty. There is a lien on the land records. The third option is to deter an assessment for those people who qualify under the elderly fixed income tax relief program.

Mr. Keith Yoreo of 76 Paperchase Trail inquired about the $2,500 connection fee – what happens when people stop connecting? Does that mean our fees go up? Will our fees go up? Once we reach capacity in the town, should we expect another $200 a month on that bill to maintain that? Mr. Baril responded that yes, there has to be some other means to maintain the system. Mr. Farrell said the annual user fee rates have typically risen about between 1.5 to 3 % after being stagnant for 5 or 6 years. We are relatively low to our neighbors. Mr. Armstrong noted that Farmington is increasing their sewer capacity at a $50 million improvement. Some of that will be passed on to Avon. Mr. Farrell noted that the AWPCA does not need a full commitment from residents to move forward with the project. Mr. Yoreo asked what the impact is on the improvement of soil quality if no one connects. Mr. Farrell said that unless there's a failure that the Farmington Valley Health thinks there's a public health issue, that's outside the scope of our authority – we run sewers. We bring the benefit to your curb. Mr. Armstrong clarified that the Authority does not need anyone to connect but that's not the answer we want.

Mr. Farrell replied to Mr. Gilmore's comment about the odd and even numbers on Hurdle Fence relative to pumping. The overall cost of getting a pump will be reduced because you don't have to dig down as far. There are benefits to both systems.

Mr. Farrell replied to an audience member's comment regarding public utilities stating the Commission is not authorized or empowered to approach the utility companies on your behalf. What we have done in the past, we encourage the neighbors to empower themselves. Have a spokesperson, have a group, have a meeting. Go to the gas company on your own behalf. Get some qualified numbers and maybe that will motivate the gas company to come out and see you. They were invited to attend tonight's meeting.

An audience member mentioned he signed the petition. He had a septic system that failed. We see the value as our home's value. We're in favor.

Mr. Armstrong shared his thoughts to low flow and gravity. I would prefer gravity over low flow where gravity is feasible and can be warranted. If the community were to decide low flow was of interest, I would want input from other people, perhaps engineers to discuss the possibility of additional costs along with the chances of the electricity going off. I am still receptive to whatever the community wishes to do. We haven't done low flow and as Larry mentioned, it creates additional issues beyond yours that all developers are coming in and asking for low flow, once we allow it in. In my mind, I have decided that at some point in time, Avon is going to have to have low flow. In some of these areas where there are areas where gravity just won't work due to bedrock, ledge and things like that. Ciderbrook is one of the areas that may just have low flow because nothing else will work. Mr. Farrell added we just may need more information on the contemporary systems.

Mrs. Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence inquired whether the cost is amortized over the whole project for those residents who might have issues, obstacle wise, bringing the pipe out to the road. Mr. Farrell replied no and stated that if the project comes to fruition, Engineering will visit each homeowner. The cost is borne by that particular property homeowner.

Mr. Baril responded to Ms. Barbara Wolfangel's (70 Paperchase Trail) question and confirmed the road will not widen during the construction and her driveway grading will not be affected. Ms. Wolfangel asked for clarification to see, should she decide to connect, would she be responsible for paying the contractor during the connection should the contractor damage anything. Mr. Farrell replied she would need to pay for the disturbances.

Mr. Roy inquired about the marking of the mearstones relative to the width of right of way. Mr. Brown responded there are just a few sticking up around the neighborhood. Everyone has their own lot corners. The monuments represent the Town's right of way.

Mr. Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence noted he received a letter from the Town dated April 10 stating residents would receive notification 4 weeks in advance of a meeting. Mr. Gilmore understood there was a planned meeting two weeks ago that was cancelled but he did not know about the meeting. Mr. Farrell noted it was a regularly scheduled meeting that was cancelled and noted all meetings are open to the public. When there is a public meeting with formal invites, we change that meeting to 7 pm to accommodate people's schedule. Mr. Farrell encouraged Mr. Gilmore to sign up for email notification from the Town's web site. You can pick and choose the nature of the emails you would like to receive. Mr. Armstrong noted a public hearing would be held before any assessment.

Mr. Gilmore of 44 Hurdle Fence stated the meeting held tonight was great and you covered a lot of specifics he was looking for. Mr. Gilmore stated he is not in favor of the project. He and his father designed and built his house. He dug his yard and did not notice a water table on his property. The cost of the project is exuberant. It will cost more than it would to replace a septic system. We built our house right. We have the right sized lot. It sticks in my throat that I would have to pay a lot of extra money because someone else's mistake. Mr. Farrell acknowledged Mr. Gilmore's comment but noted the Authority has an obligation to serve the greater good and we can't undo what developers put in the ground 50 plus years ago. Mr. Gilmore mentioned he would pay for the betterment but the betterment to Mr. Gilmore is not $20,000. Mr. Farrell mentioned the Authority and the Engineering has, historically, enjoyed a very phenomenal success rate at coming in on or under budget and on time.

Mrs. Gilmore noted that prices increase the longer we wait and this is not a $10,000 per house project. We are looking at between $20,000 and $35,000 per resident. Mr. Farrell mentioned maybe other options should be explored such as the low pressure sewer system.

Mr. Gordon Stead of 55 Hurdle Fence expressed his gratitude. He noted he did not receive the notice until a week before the meeting and 25% of the homes were represented at the meeting. Mr. Stead noted his house had a complete renewal about 2 years ago and the total cost for a brand new system was $28,000. Mr. Stead replied to Mr. Farrell's question stating he has a 5 bedroom home. Mr. Farrell commented he knew a family who lived in a 4 bedroom Colonial had to spend $48,000 on a new system a year before the Town was going into the Deepwood Drive neighborhood. This family also had to pay the assessment. Mr. Baril remembers talking to the owner and remembered this owner was still in favor of the project.

Mr. Brown encouraged residents to visit the Engineering Department with any questions. We're happy to meet with you after hours. Please call us. Mr. Foster commented that when the numbers came in, he realized it was a lot of money. Low pressure sewers would be on the back burner – it's an option that can be explored. Mr. Foster encouraged residents to learn about low pressure sewers. The big pro is dollars and cents. But, you will own a pump.

Mr. Roy mentioned he has worked for the Town of Simsbury Water Pollution Control for twenty years. He mentioned that with the exception of Mr. Gilmore who put his own system in, no one knows what is under that grass. In my opinion, if a system is 50 years old, it's on the end of its expectancy. With the ground conditions we have, you can't hit anything without hitting rock. Going into the meeting, I was a lot more for this project because it's a benefit all around. Hearing $22,000 stopped me cold. We have to refine this a bit – look at low pressure. I don't want a pump in my yard. It's a machine and machines fail. There's an insurance – you have that insurance in the road should that system fail and you don't want to take down $5,000 worth of trees and put in $24,000 worth of sand. You have to weigh the pros and cons. It's better to be on the pipe at the end of the day.

Mr. Farrell closed out public comment at 9:25 p.m. noting there's a demonstrated need for sanitary sewers, whether it's a gravity system, low pressure system. We are very preliminary. We need to hear more from you. Please stay in contact with us, attend our meetings and keep an eye on the web site. At the end of the day, we are going to do what's best for all of you collectively and the greater good of the community. Mrs. Gilmore inquired whether the proposed project will go on a town ballot. Mr. Farrell said the decision comes from the Water Pollution Control Authority and we are influenced by a lot of different factors, including collective input from the residents. Mrs. Gilmore said she spoke to the engineers who came into her neighborhood she learned it was a done deal. Mr. Baril requested names. Mrs. Gail Downs of 38 Hurdle Fence looked towards Mr. Brown and mentioned he said the consensus was everyone wants this. Mr. Brown clarified what he said stating the Town had 20 or so signatures. Mr. Farrell noted the Authority has an ethical and legal obligation. One of the fundamental responsibilities is to protect groundwater, protect healthy people and systems, and eliminate water pollution. It is highly probable this process would have been occurring within the next five or six years. There is no vote at the end of the day. Mr. Farrell answered Mr. Gilmore's question stating that a sewer system is a continuous system and that even though there may be a block of people who do not want the sewer, the pipe will still be placed.

Mr. Foster noted a preliminary plan has been presented and inquired from Mr. Wesneski if he needs a formal commitment to move forward. Avon Water Company said they will hang tight for now.

Mr. Bob Proctor of 82 Paperchase mentioned a 50 year old system is not worth anything. He also noted that those people who back up to wetlands don't have the capacity for a new system.

Mr. Farrell thanked everyone for attending and closed out Agenda Item 2014-10.

*NOTE: Mr. Roy, re-joined the meeting at 9:30 p.m.*

**2015 – 5 Accounting and Management of Fund 5 –**

Mr. Farrell followed up on an earlier request that he is looking for more information on encumbered funds. Mr. Baril mentioned Ms. Essex can provide that to Mr. Farrell. Mr. Baril answered Mr. Armstrong's question that the uniform charge is for the shirt Mr. Foster uses. Mr. Farrell expressed concern over the IT budget. Mr. Baril noted Mr. Robertson will take a hard look at these numbers this budget cycle. The Capital Budget process begins in about two weeks and the Operating Budget process begins in about two months for next fiscal year. Mr. Armstrong inquired whether Mr. Baril can break out items that are in your control of and which accounts are allocated by other departments. Mr. Baril mentioned he can prepare the report to include the requested detail. Mr. Armstrong suggested Mr. Baril give the budget to the AWPCA before submitting to the Town officials and also put in a line item for reserves for items such as emergencies and to ensure that it is adequately funded. Mr. Roy's asked if there is a savings account and whether members receive a quarterly report. Mr. Farrell responded the account is Fund 5 and there is a quarterly report, however, it is hard to decipher what everything is. Mr. Ryan expressed concern over the financial handling of Fund 5 and suggested Mr. Andrew Lord and Mr. Robertson should meet. Mr. Farrell noted that since he's been with the AWPCA, from 2003, when requesting emergency appropriations, there has always been a favorable response from the Town. He clarified the word emergency stating it's when a project comes up after the budget process has been filed. Mr. Ryan suggested going after financing when Mr. Baril has requested funding for a project that does not get approved. There hasn't been a battle to fight. Discussion continued regarding the correct process to take in authorizing financing for those AWPCA projects needed such as easement access and increase to staff. Mr. Farrell encouraged Mr. Baril and Mr. Foster to come to the AWPCA for whatever they need to run the sewer system.

Mr. Baril stated that in his eight years with the Town, he never had a supplemental appropriation denied. He noted that this year, every capital project he has requested for sanitary sewers has been approved. This has not always happened in the past. Mr. Baril responded affirmatively to Mr. Farrell's question that there is a demonstrated need for a full-time secretary. Mr. Farrell discussed account options on where to finance the additional hours to make the position a full-time status. Mr. Baril noted that it is his understanding that there would be no net cost to the taxpayers to make the Engineering secretary a full-time position if paid for from the Sewer Fund. Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Armstrong's question stating Ms. Essex performs sewer related and non-sewer related duties for the Engineering Department.

Mr. Farrell suggested he make a supplemental appropriation request to staff an administrative assistant position to meet the needs of the sewer division of the Engineering Department effective October 1. Mr. Baril noted he does not need a full-time administrative assistant just for sewers.

**MOTION:** Mr. Farrell motioned that the AWPCA make a formal request in the form of a supplemental appropriation to fund an administrative assistant full-time, compensable out of Fund 5. The motion, seconded by Mr. Ryan, received unanimous approval.

Mr. Farrell commented he will draft a memo to Mr. Robertson. Mr. Armstrong suggested the wording as additional hours rather than full-time. Mr. Farrell responded that the AWPCA can only resolve to staff the needs of the sewer division. Mr. Farrell commented the position would increase to 12 ½ additional hours to make it to full-time status, 37 ½ hours.

Mr. Farrell noted he is interested in receiving the information on those purchase orders which have been encumbered. Additional information regarding the IT Budget is appreciated.

**2011-10 I/I Study**

Mr. Baril provided an update on the I/I Study. Mr. Baril said he met with Fuss & O'Neil the prior week and they have completed the dilution testing they did in May. The groundwater conditions became low

enough whereby the dilution testing was not worth continuing to pursue. Part of the I & I budget was reallocated from video inspection to dilution testing because it was proving to be so valuable. Mr. Baril received a map which illustrated the high infiltration areas and those will be targeted for videoing. The groundwater condition needs to rise again. There is no hard schedule from Mr. Baril's perspective nor the DEEP. It's important to wait to get valuable information instead of rushing through the project. Manhole inspection findings identified areas which can be fixed, such as a leaking part of the system in the Blueberry area that was gushing approximately 50 gallons a minute of clear water. It was coming from up the street – not the brook. Mr. Baril mentioned he will view the video inspections.

*NOTE: Mr. Ryan departed the meeting at 10:22 p.m.*

**VI PLANNING & ZONING MATTERS** – Mr. Baril provided an update on Avon Town Center. He noted that Fuss & O'Neill conducted the sewer capacity analysis for the site and downstream. Mr. Baril expressed concern to Fuss & O'Neill regarding a conflict of interest. Mr. Armstrong, from a Planning and Zoning side, questioned the Fuss & O'Neill's potential involvement with the Plan of Conservation. He understands they are not going to work on the study. Mr. Armstrong noted there's a possibility that there will be a recommendation that the Carpionato Group will meet with the AWPCA to review the sewer drawings. Mr. Baril stated he would like to hire another engineering firm to review and comment on the report by Fuss & O'Neill. Mr. Baril noted there is going to be an impact on the allocated flow with the sewer agreement with the Town of Simsbury. Mr. Armstrong commented that the Carpionato Group indicated a realignment of the MDC. Mr. Baril replied that it will not happen. Mr. Baril noted there's an advantage in working with a single developer and he is excited for the project.

**VII COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF** – Mr. Baril noted there's a development plan on Climax Road, just into the Town of Simsbury. He referenced the letter sent to Mr. Anthony Piazza (Superintendent, Water Pollution Control for the Town of Simsbury) which was provided to members. The developers met with the Town of Simsbury informally and noted that Simsbury is embracing the project. The plan is to build a 15-lot workforce subdivision. They are building homes in a more clustered type development which leads to some relaxation on terms and zoning requirements. Public Sewers is a requirement for building. Mr. Baril clarified the location to members stating it is right over the Avon line on the right hand side. Mr. Baril highlighted the terms in the letter.

**VIII COMMUNICATION FROM MEMBERS** – Mr. Armstrong recommend adding low pressure regulations on the agenda. Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Farrell's question stating there are two vendors who are known in the arena of low pressure sewers – E1 is the most common in this area. They will do the full design for the Town for free. They will be more than willing to attend a meeting and offer a one-hour primer on low pressure sewer systems.
Mr. Farrell noted that the September meeting will be his last AWPCA meeting as he is moving out of town. He plans to submit an exit report to Town Council for their meeting on August 6 with a resignation date effective for the evening of the September meeting date.

**IX OTHER BUSINESS** – None

**X ADJOURNMENT -**

**MOTION**: Mr. Farrell motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 p.m. The motion, seconded by Mr. Armstrong, received unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Essex, Clerk

N:\ENGINEERING_SEWER_FILES\AWPCA\Minutes\2015 Minutes\07 23 2015 AWPCA Meeting MinutesDRAFT.doc