

**New Hartford Water Pollution Control Authority
TOWN OF NEW HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, January 22, 2015 at 7:00 PM
New Hartford Town Hall
530 Main Street, New Hartford, Connecticut**

PRESENT: Chairman Denton Butler, Ken Krohner, Joe Toro, Mary Beth Greenwood, Robert Fulton, Michael LeClaire (7:18PM), First Selectman Dan Jerram.

ALSO PRESENT: Roy Litchfield, Line Extension Analysis Subcommittee member

ABSENT: Bill Michaud.

Chairman Denton Butler called the meeting to order at 7:00PM. All regular members present were seated for the meeting. The proceedings were recorded digitally and copies are available at Town Hall.

1. Discussion and possible action of Line Extension Analysis (LEA) report dated January 6, 2015

Mr. Butler provided board members with an update on the Line Extension subcommittee's meeting with the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP). The priority list that the WPCA is on a set aside with, in the amount of \$3.7M (\$925K grant, balance low interest loan at 2%), is an annual updateable event, according to Mr. Butler. He commented on the importance of being on DEP's radar so that they know that a sewer commission is taking some action against money that is being set aside. Mr. Butler also noted for board members that towns cannot be assured of the funds until formal plans are accepted and approved and ultimately confirmed by the state bonding commission. He noted that the intent of New Hartford as communicated to the DEP was well received, and reaffirmed a progress path to allow DEP to keep New Hartford as a priority. Mr. Butler reported additionally that new information regarding a set aside for \$40M exists for 2015, with a maximum award of \$4M per community on an 80/20 loan/grant split, granted on the basis of need for rehabilitation of facilities deemed in dire shape. He reported that they are going to ask to temporarily keep open the budget amount for the engineering costs. There may be an advantage in widening the scope of engineering services that will be sought through planning process in terms of getting a better reimbursement rate, according to Mr. Butler. He also reported that the group was encouraged to advance the QBS (Quality Base Selection), even if all the money and approvals are not in place and to move the process forward sooner, rather than later. Mr. Butler also reported to the board that while the Clean Water Fund is dedicated to remediate and/or advance protection in areas to avoid pollution issues and thus funds cannot be used to advance developmental projects. He noted that one option is to apply for DECD (Department of Economic and Community Development), available for capital improvement projects. Another option is a STEAP (Small Town Economic Assistance Program) grant. Mr. Butler further reported that although once considered as options, the subcommittee has now ruled out EPA and Farmer's Home grants. He also reported that action is expected soon to clear the sewer district map which is presently still in a state of review. He noted that the WPCA can at any time recommend the inclusion of properties not currently in the district, subject to the review and approval of DEEP and OPM (Office of Policy and Management), if there is a basis for the WPCA deciding that it is prudent for a given area to hook up from a pollution threat perspective. As a result of DEEP's feedback on timeline contained in the subcommittee's analysis, Mr. Butler reported that the group has modified the 2016 start date to 2017. As a result, a revised financial sheet has been generated and was distributed to board members. A map, entitled "WPCA New Hartford Combined Proposed Sewer Expansion Map" consolidating Option A, Cottage Street, and Option B, Pine Meadow and remediation of Jones Mountain trunk area was distributed and explained.

2. Opportunity for Public Comment on Line Extension Analysis and proposed action

Mr. Rob Fulton inquired what would happen if it is determined that Jones Mountain route is not functioning properly but is not able to be repaired and if so, would it be replaced. Mr. Butler explained that it has yet to be determined whether it would be replaced where it is now or whether it would be rerouted.

Mr. Paul Pabuda of 22 Church Street questioned whether the WPCA is aware that a shut off valve for water is located on or near a property, near where the old canal was in Pine Meadow. Mr. Butler explained that the commission realizes there are numerous conflicts with regard to interruption of the water system by a sewer system in the Pine Meadow district as well as any area where they may lay new lines but that it is yet to be determined.

Mr. Butler then requested from board members any open questions they might have resulting from having read the subcommittee's report presented on January 8, 2015 meeting regarding line extension analysis.

Ms. Mary Beth Greenwood inquired on a bullet item she noted in each section indicating no known issues evident that affect health and safety and whether this was a conclusion. Mr. Butler recollected that this was specific to Johnny Cake Lane and Highland Avenue, Town Hill Road section. He noted that they did not do a soil analysis determination to understand what type of capabilities the soils have. Ms. Greenwood then inquired about the significance on the map representing replacements and repairs done on leaching fields since 2000. Mr. Butler explained that this document prepared by Wright Pierce using data from Farmington Valley Health District (FVHD). He explained that while interpreting the data was not a task undertaken by the subcommittee, a review of the map revealed extensive activity on septic systems in the Cottage Street area and as well as activity in Pine Meadow. Should there be availability of a public sewer system FVHD identified only one area currently with a septic system that would be prohibited from continuing with a private septic system, according to Mr. Butler. In response to a question from Ms. Greenwood about projected liabilities of the project, Mr. Butler explained that the subcommittee's reports do not include revenue projections and for illustration purposes only, using today's rate schedule, it was to demonstrate a usage schedule.

Mr. Fulton asked if moving forward with this, whether the WPCA would possibly incur more of a liability with these extensions and what phase would a better grasp of the numbers be available. Mr. Butler explained that after the quality base selection process is completed, a professional analysis would provide these types of projections. Mr. Fulton asked about whether a new or better fee schedule for application and hookup will be adopted. Mr. Butler explained that the subcommittee will undertake the creation of a master checklist as well as update necessary revisions to rules, regulations, practices and procedures, applications, permitting, etc.

First Selectman Dan Jerram inquired about the starting point and ending point of the Jones Mountain trunk line and while the map does not depict them, whether the figures used for the distance calculations are accurate. It was confirmed that the map was just for illustration but that the calculations are right. Mr. Jerram asked if replacement numbers were used, remediation numbers were used or whether the figure represents a blended rate. Mr. Roy Litchfield, line extension analysis subcommittee member, explained that it was blended and what was used was a combination of costs to line the whole route and spot repairs. Mr. Butler reminded the commission that due to elevation of the property being adjacent to the high tension wires that run alongside the right of way, the commission needs to hire a company that is licensed to work in power right of ways. This clearing is necessary in order to access the manholes located in this area which will then allow the cameraing of a sample area of this line. A quote of \$8,500 for lightweight excavation equipment has been secured from a company to do this work, according to Mr. Butler. He reminded the group that only a narrow section will be cleared so that the full right of way can then also be surveyed so only the easement portion of the property is cleared. Mr. Jerram asked how many properties outside the perceived district were in the consideration for extension as part of the plan. Mr. Butler responded that there are four, comprising twenty four connections, which were taken into the evaluation as it was deemed to make sense. Mr. Jerram inquired as to whether there are known contamination risks or suggested data in this regard. Mr. Butler responded currently there is not.

Mr. David Hurley, of New Hartford Industrial Park, LLC, 37 Greenwoods Road, inquired about the diameter of the pipes in Option A of the Combined Proposed Sewer Expansion Map. Mr. Butler responded that the diameter is a twelve (12") inch main.

Ms. Polly Pobuda, of **22 Church Street**, inquired as to the time line of the camera work and where it would be performed. Mr. Butler responded that it would be from the pumping station to the plant and the time line is dependent upon three things: how soon the clearing could get done, weather conditions allowing this to happen and whether or not the funds are available to do so.

Mr. Jerram commented that subcommittee's report is a great starting point for analysis. Regarding the Pine Meadow section, he suggested whether seeking lateral easements through the old canal might save distance and help to stay out of Route 44. Mr. Butler responded that the subcommittee knows other alternatives exist and will depend on the professional engineers to report on those that may be more feasible and economic. Mr. Jerram once the video of the lines is gathered, it will help a great deal.

Mr. Fulton acknowledged the efforts of the subcommittee and agreed the cameraing will be beneficial. He noted that he does have a concern, which he realizes will be addressed after the QBS is completed, regarding the cost as it will affect user's rates. Ms. Greenwood praised the opportunity to review the whole picture. She noted that evaluating the trunk line will aid in setting priorities. Mr. Butler noted that the variances that can be seen, the town undoubtedly has an influent/infiltration and leak issue, the magnitude which has yet to be defined. Mr. LeClaire commented that while it appears that Option A of Cottage Street is most likely to be chosen, he would like to see the line from 'B' to 'E' on Option B also included. Mr. Butler noted that the determination will likely be made resulting from the QBS. Mr. Krohner commented that while he thinks the report is a very good plan, he notes that Johnnycake Lane and Highland Avenue were reviewed and considered. While this area is not among the recommendations, Mr. Krohner opined that an area that should also have been reviewed and considered is down through Satan's Kingdom. He opined that the growth will be down in this area as he recalls a housing and shopping project been proposed for the old Waring location and that the prospective developer had spoken about bringing water to this area. Mr. Butler noted that the Satan's Kingdom did not currently have a plan for development nor are discussions currently taking place surrounding development.

Mr. Jerram noted that the plan includes extensions for new lines and new users. He inquired as to whether the subcommittee considered a blended approach or repair of existing lines as part of the proposal. He noted that with the recommended options, it would almost double the size of the system. Mr. Jerram asked whether consideration was given to repair the system. He commented that while in the planning process, some element for remediation might be warranted. Mr. Butler responded that as the group gets involved with more detailed specifics, they do want to change the scope of work from the current Statement of Work and would like to get more for their money. Mr. Toro concurred that remediation may be a recommendation of the engineering firm. Mr. Toro noted that the rates paid by the users in New Hartford are the second highest rates in the state. Also, he noted that the resulting negative effects on economic growth affect every tax payer and not just those connected. He noted his strong support for the expansion of the sewer system.

Ms. Maria Moore of **104 Town Hill Road** clarified whether the town has an 80/20 financing option for the \$6.1M. Pending the camera work determines that the line is in a category that should be restructured, according to Mr. Butler, then it is entirely possible the town could make immediate application for this money. If it is deemed to need to be lined and spot repaired, the town could make an application for the money, too, according to Mr. Butler.

Mr. Bob Moore of **104 Town Hill Road** opined that the WPCA does need to have a regular plan of upgrade and repair to the existing line and that there really hasn't been a lot of major maintenance done on the lines for a while. Regardless of what happens with the expansion plan, there needs to be a recognition of the costs associated with maintaining the current system, according to Mr. Moore.

Ms. Pobuda commented that she would like to see the commission keep in mind economic development and opined that developers will go elsewhere if the town does not have the sewers in place already. She noted

that if New Hartford is going to entice commercial development in the center, the sewers should already be put down where there might be development.

Mr. Pobuda commented that while this is a large project, it should not be only the users bearing the cost but instead a town wide project for the development of the town.

Mr. Hurley commented that they are going to be doing their part to add to the sewer base and that hopefully through the added users through his property, it will cut down the current rates to half. The one hundred, twenty five (125) users that would be added as a result of developing the field, in addition to up to forty (40) additional residential units in the Hurley building itself, will serve to lower the rates being paid by the current users, according to Mr. Karl Nielson, representative of the Hurley family.

MOTION: Mr. Krohner, Mr. Toro second, **to use the company that provided the bid of \$8500, and not to exceed that amount, to clear the trunk line from the Mobil Station on Route 44 to High Street; unanimously approved.**

MOTION: Mr. Toro, Mr. Krohner second, **to put forward an advertisement to begin the QBS process thus finding an engineering firm to formalize the activities in the handbook; unanimously approved.**

MOTION: Mr. Krohner, Ms. Greenwood second, **to adjourn at 8:15PM; unanimously approved.**

Respectfully submitted,

**Pam Colombie
Recording Clerk**