

AVON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
September 10, 2015
Selectmen's Chambers, 5:30 p.m.
Town of Avon

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Avon Water Pollution Control Authority was called to order at 5:40 pm by Mr. Johansen.

AWPCA

Present: Eric Johansen
Tom Armstrong
Chris Roy

Absent: Michael Farrell, Terry Ryan

II. MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING – July 23, 2015

MOTION: Mr. Johansen inquired if members had any comments on the minutes. Mr. Armstrong requested a minor edit to the minutes concerning low flow on page 8, Old Business, 2014-10, Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for the Paperchase Trail neighborhood to reflect the intent of Mr. Armstrong's comment. Mr. Armstrong noted the sentence should be kept the same on page 8, ".....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." Mr. Armstrong requested the following is added afterwards to read, [*sic: the need for back-up generators*]. Mr. Johansen made a motion for approval of the July 23, 2015 minutes. The motion, seconded by Mr. Roy, received unanimous approval.

III. COMMUNICATION FROM THE AUDIENCE – None

IV. NEW BUSINESS – 2015 – 6 – Research on Low Pressure Sewer (LPS) Systems

Mr. Baril noted the new business item was created based on a request from the prior meeting. Mr. Foster contacted FRMA – rep for Eone, the manufacturer of quality state of the art LPS. He learned that LPS mains:

- small diameter (typically ≤ 3 in.)
- buried below frost level
- follow topography
- much less expensive to install
- have check valves in the system so that the flow cannot go "backwards" when the pumps go on.
- Eone does the design with our topo.
- There are a couple of implementation strategies regarding who owns the pumps (municipality or homeowners) - Baril recommends the homeowner own the pump.
- Pump systems have a 10 year median life span but there are replaceable parts. Annual maintenance is not required.
- The system design has not changed significantly since its inception
- The Eone representative is willing to attend an APWCA meeting to obtain an overview and can offer a preliminary design and cost estimate for the Paperchase and Hurdle Fence sewer project.
- There are several models/configurations of low pressure systems like a single pump in a 70 gallon chamber or a duplex (2-pump) system and a fiberglass chamber.

Mr. Baril recommends we should develop a Town standard for low pressure system equipment. Mr. Roy mentioned he visited the Eone web site and noted the direction of flow changes because now you have to pump uphill rather than downhill. Mr. Baril noted that was discussed with the Eone rep and concluded no issue. Mr. Armstrong requested sample regulations from other towns. Mr. Baril mentioned other towns have low pressure pumps like Southwick, Winsted and Bolton. Mr. Johansen mentioned the Master Plan Study relative to the depth in order to maintain a gravity system and whether this was looked into. Mr. Johansen noted an important criteria would be how deep sewers were planned within the Sewer Facilities Plan so we would know what the impact might be (LPS vs gravity). A cut off such as cost could be a determining factor. Mr. Baril responded to Mr. Roy's question regarding the cost difference and where Mr. Baril is leaning. Mr. Baril noted the pump systems typically cost between \$4,000 and \$6,000, with the low end of \$4,000. Eone recommends you don't over-size your storage capacity due to danger of effluent sitting too long. A maintenance issue should be considered for homeowners who are snowbirds and leave the system for two or three months. Mr. Baril noted an automatic flushing system may be required if there is someone towards the end of the line that has few connections. Mr. Baril noted the Town would own from the main to the lateral check valve. The homeowner owns from that point to their system. Mr. Johansen commented there's the concern who will maintain the system and noted there will be some that fail right away but the average one will last at least 10 years and very little maintenance. Mr. Baril mentioned the power amount is comparable to a 100-watt lightbulb on one's monthly usage. Mr. Johansen noted it could be an issue if someone has a 60 amp panel which will be up to the homeowner to consider upgrading their house power. Mr. Armstrong inquired about the cost ratio compared to a conventional gravity system and whether LPS would be more costly. Mr. Baril replied that the cost to go from the lateral end point to the home, the cost of the pump and the installation of the line is about a little bit more than a gravity lateral because the pump is a minimum of \$4,000, you can lay a lot of lateral for \$4,000. Mr. Roy commented that does not include installing the piping. Mr. Johansen noted it's important to relay the message to residents to remind them that should their septic system fail, if sewers are not available they will be looking at costly repairs to their septic systems.

Mr. Roy mentioned there's about a 50/50 mix from his neighborhood in connecting to the sewer system no matter what the cost compared to other residents who say otherwise based on the cost. Mr. Roy also noted that it's not always a repair cost of \$28,000 to fix a septic system. Mr. Johansen noted it becomes a health issue when residents use a failed septic system.

Mr. Baril noted there has been a re-design where the sewer has been lifted in several places. The deepest gravity sewer now is designed at 15 feet. The original slope design was based on 1 % minimum. Standards say you can go down 3/10 of a foot of slope. That's a pretty flat pipe. If the whole subdivision connected, 3/10 of a foot would be fine because you know the system will consistently be flushed. Because the Town does not mandate connections, there could be problems with dry effluent.

V. OLD BUSINESS -

2014 – 10 Potential Sanitary Sewer Service for the Paperchase Trail neighborhood –

Mr. Baril suggested that by the next meeting, he will show the re-design and its impact to residents. It's also suggested that there should be another public information meeting and Mr. Baril encouraged members to have a position on the consideration of LPS to present to the residents at the meeting. Mr. Armstrong noted that the LPS regulations be established so that it only applies to existing housing. Mr. Roy questioned whether the Authority can say 'No' should a developer come in (with a request for low pressure sewers). Mr. Baril noted there are individual homes in town that pump into the gravity system and some of those pumps are not pumping to a gravity line that's right outside their house. On School Street, there are several homes that pump up from the intersection up to gravity further down. Mr. Baril noted he plans to place a CIP request to fund a low pressure system for the School Street

area, even though it can be gravity fed out to New Road. New Road neighborhood is not the one having the issue. The cost to residents is going to be expensive as New Road was paved two years ago so that the project will have to pay for the complete restoration of that road which will drive the costs up again. Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Johansen's question that the Paperchase neighborhood was not expecting to have the sewer project completed by this year. Mr. Johansen noted this will give the Authority time to work out a standard so the Authority is crystal clear for the next time anything comes in the door. Mr. Baril said there should be consensus on this before holding another public information meeting as this will be precedent setting.

2015 – 5 Accounting and Management of Fund 5 – Mr. Baril noted that Mr. Farrell had an issue with the operating side of the budget dealing with IT. Mr. Baril spoke to Mr. Brandon Robertson who agreed to look into this item for the next budget cycle. Mr. Baril noted he does not have much input for the IT budget portion for the Town, which is handled by the Finance Director who establishes the budget for each department. The Sewer Fund takes a big hit from this and Mr. Robertson concurred that it seems like a larger number than he would have expected and that he will meet with the Finance Director to gain additional information on this matter. Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Johansen's question that before the budget is established and approved, you will have the ability to weigh in on it. This will happen before the February Board of Finance budget review workshop. Sometime between end of October and February will be a good time to discuss this.

Mr. Johansen commented these are not taxpayer funds – these are sewer user funds. It's a separate authority and expressed concern over Mr. Robertson's response regarding who has the financial authority on the sewer fund. Mr. Johansen noted a next step may be to approach the Town Council. Mr. Johansen noted that the budgets Mr. Baril prepares, both capital and operating, the money ultimately comes from Fund 5 for projects the Authority feels needs to be done to maintain the system. Mr. Armstrong said he still sees a need for a reserve to be set aside that can be used to address such projects without the need to go to Town Council or Board of Finance. Mr. Baril mentioned he has never been declined a supplemental appropriation request. Mr. Johansen noted he has not received a response based on the labor request. Mr. Baril noted Mr. Robertson has replied he will table the request to the next fiscal year. Mr. Roy commented that Mr. Farrell's request was to have the part-time position move to full-time, out of Fund 5, with a supplemental appropriation effective October 1. Mr. Johansen commented that the supplemental appropriation process is not necessary because we were told by law, by statute, that does not need to happen on this fund. All the other towns around us who offer a water pollution control authority don't do that because you are not required to but in Avon you are. That's what we want to change. You have to decide where we stand on that. Mr. Armstrong mentioned a Town Attorney could render an opinion. Mr. Johansen noted that one of his thoughts regarding this matter was to go to the Town Council noting the Authority met with Mr. Andrew Lord and what he discussed is not being followed.

Mr. Baril mentioned he could reach out to Murtha for a legal opinion. We have a budget item for legal expenses. Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Armstrong's question stating Mr. Baril will know Mr. Robertson's decision relating to the full-time employee request in December. Mr. Robertson prepared a draft budget for the Town Council to review and each item is reviewed at the budget workshop in February. Here, items are accepted or revised. Mr. Armstrong mentioned it does not hurt to have Murtha Cullina begin to kind of echo and prove Andrew Lord's statement to us that the Authority has the discretion to do this so this meshes with the same time that these November / December discussions are taking place. It doesn't hurt to have those two things coincide. There are more things that come in to play such as pension, benefits. All kinds of things that we may not know here and yet we also need to negotiate the other part of her time. Mr. Johansen noted this is not tax payer money and has no effect on the tax base. Discussion continued regarding the next step in approaching someone from Murtha Cullina. Mr. Armstrong clarified the question stating we are seeking reconfirmation that the Authority has the right to spend money from Fund 5 without the approval of the Board of Finance, Town Council

and specifically a request is being made to increase the hours of a staff member of the Water Pollution Control Authority. Mr. Roy mentioned the members of the AWPCA were appointed by the Town Council to manage this department. Mr. Johansen commented that the Authority is related to the Town and they will have some kind of audit or oversight and that is fine but we are just trying to cut-out red tape of a process that is unnecessary preventing us from doing what we believe our job is.

2011-10 I/I Study

Mr. Baril mentioned the study is on hold because of the dry season and he agrees with Fuss and O'Neill and does not want them to collect data that is no value although he is anxious to find the leaks in the system to correct them but not at the cost of quality information. There is money budgeted for this project. We were approved with the Clean Water Fund. We can begin submitting bills from the I&I Study that we've already paid. We have an established ACH account. They do the accounting on the 2nd of every month. The reimbursable amount will be 55%.

VI PLANNING & ZONING MATTERS – Mr. Baril mentioned the presentation made from the developer, The Carpionato Group, regarding the Avon Park North project. The sewer related issues are not insurmountable. He was able to show and prove what they need for flows out of that site and what they have projected are greater than what was allocated within our current agreement with Simsbury. This leaves two options. 1) They pare back their development or 2) There could likely come a point where they will have to purchase additional capacity from Simsbury. Tonight is the Simsbury's WPCA meeting and that is on the agenda as I reached out to Tony Piazza who is the Superintendent there. I am in the process of working with the Planning Department to do a build-out analysis with the Simsbury Shed. The goal is to identify what is the ultimate build-out potential for the Simsbury Shed and how does that compare to our existing capacity. Right now we are using just under 600,000 gallons per day. We have 980,000 gallons as purchased capacity. The Simsbury Shed has uniqueness compared to other sheds in that it has industrial and commercial capabilities potential for flow. The Farmington Shed does not have that. We don't want to purchase capacity and we don't want the Carpionato Group to purchase capacity unless it's deemed really necessary. When you buy capacity, now you are increasing your percentage for any costs that go along with the treatment plant. Eventually Simsbury will have to do their next treatment plant upgrade to deal with phosphorus. Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Johansen's question that should the developer purchase capacity, they are purchasing capacity for the Town of Avon. The amount that they are requesting for a full build-out of that site compared to what was allocated – the differential is about 40,000 gallons per day. There are a lot of unknowns at this point.

VII COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF – Mr. Baril noted he and the Town Manager met with Town of Farmington Town Staff including the Town Manager, Kathy Eagen and Russ Arnold, Director of Public Works and is in charge of the sanitary collection system. Meeting discussion included the inter municipal agreement with Avon and Farmington and the build-out analysis. The Town of Avon should allocate about 200,000 gallons per day based on Mr. Baril's estimate at full build-out (including vacant parcels) of that shed. Prior to the meeting, The Town of Avon received communication from the Town of Farmington stating they request the Town of Avon to do an I/I Study and a request to replace the 12" interceptor by Sanford Hawley in Farmington. The meeting also included discussion on how the numbers will be calculated for the cost of the plant upgrade. The current agreement says that the Town of Avon will pay a proportionate share on the actual quarterly flow of sewage from Avon divided by the total flow to the plant for the same quarter times the cost of the treatment plant upgrade less grants received from Federal or State funds. If we are talking about the quarter of January, February and March, that would be one number. If we are talking April, May, June, that would be a different number. It can rain a lot if you are talking about the flow during the winter months when we have half of Farmington Woods vacant, as opposed to June, July and August when more people are living there. Farmington believes that the language is skewed

to Avon's favor and is confusing. There is a meter at the town line and data is getting picked up here for the I/I Study. The big issue expressed from the meeting with the Town of Farmington is how the Town of Avon will calculate their proportionate share of the cost of the treatment plant upgrade. It will be determined once the final costs are determined for the treatment plant upgrade. Our costs for that upgrade will be based on the actual costs of construction. We should be paying for our actual flow to Farmington. We pay based on Farmington's budget, not on actual. Farmington believes the agreement needs to be revised based on what we flow compared to what Farmington treats in total and the total cost to operate – the plant only. We believe that we should not pay for pump stations that don't touch Avon's effluent. They agreed in concept that that was reasonable and they will look further into what it will take to make the reconciliation happen. They believed if Avon wanted 200,000 gallons per day allocated and specifically earmarked, every other town that treats, they believe we should pay a proportionate share based on that.

There will be an opportunity for members to become involved in revising the inter municipal agreement which needs to be revised to make it more contemporary, which is 45 years old.

VIII COMMUNICATION FROM MEMBERS – Mr. Armstrong reviewed hand-outs he prepared from Chapter 8, 'Public Facilities & Utilities' from the Planning and Zoning's Plan of Conservation document which members received. He highlighted text which will need to be updated from an AWPCA perspective and also reviewed questions he has such as should there be a section included for the potential Town Center Development, the potential Avon Old Farms School development? Do we need to discuss the increase cost due to sewer expansions in Simsbury and Farmington? Mr. Baril replied to Mr. Armstrong's question pertaining to the Town's 1979 Master Sewer Facilities Plan (which has been updated in 2006) and noted that he is not aware of a state mandate requiring that it is updated. However, it seems reasonable to update on a timelier basis, perhaps every 15 years. Mr. Baril confirmed the text that Mr. Armstrong circled will need to be updated. Mr. Johansen recommended including a brief paragraph on the Town's web site, similar to the text included in the hand-out from Chapter 8. Mr. Baril noted such language is also included in the Annual Budget and the Annual Report and can also be included in the Engineering / Sewer Department web site. Mr. Armstrong noted the Plan of Conservation and Development is updated every ten years, which is a timeframe mandated by the State.

Mr. Armstrong inquired about the prior discussion held regarding the proposed increased hours for the Engineering Department Administrative Assistant. He noted it would be a good idea now that Mr. Baril lock up that Engineering Department will agree to pay pro-rata any expenses. Mr. Armstrong clarified Mr. Baril's question stating that whatever we requested we get, in terms of additional hours, if that kicks her into something else, can you run by your other side of Engineering, are you willing to pick up pro-rata? Mr. Baril said he is the one the question should be directed to. Mr. Baril mentioned that there are items in the budget that he is not responsible for such as compensation and deferred pensions.

Mr. Armstrong requested that Mr. Baril send a copy of the Operating and Capital budgets to members in advance of submitting to the Town Manager. Mr. Armstrong expressed concern that there is a category for Contingency. Mr. Baril said he could submit a request for Contingency based on the Commission's request. Mr. Baril reviewed the four categories that will appear on the CIP Budget. 1) Pump Station component for Rt. 44 2) Lateral Extension Program 3) A technology increase of some kind for metering and SCADA 4) One other miscellaneous item. One year it was Easement Clearing, one year was the Truck. Mr. Armstrong is interested in Reserves to avoid calling anyone to get approvals. Mr. Baril said that will come down to a policy question. Mr. Baril noted there's an emergency reserve in the Operating Budget. He noted he has a budget line item of \$100,000 for I/I Related Improvements / Expenses Expected. Mr. Armstrong inquired about the need to size-up the

pipe going to Farmington and whether that was in the budget. Mr. Baril commented that \$220,000 was requested to replace the pipe which will include re-designing the pipe.

Mr. Roy inquired about the \$50,000 easement clearing request and whether it's been used. Mr. Baril replied it will be spent this year.

Mr. Johansen wanted to honor and thank Michael Farrell for his time with the Authority. He was Chairman for several years and he was in it a lot longer than that. He did a really good job and was dedicated to it. It's unfortunate to see him go because he has a lot of knowledge of the Town. I wanted to recognize that. On that same note, we need to pick a new Chairman. What I think we should do when the four of us are here, we should bring this up and make a decision. We do need a new member.

IX OTHER BUSINESS – None

X ADJOURNMENT -

MOTION: Mr. Johansen motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m. The motion, seconded by Mr. Armstrong, received unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Essex, Clerk