

**WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2014 – 7:00PM
ANN ANTOLINI SCHOOL LIBRARY – 30 ANTOLINI ROAD**

PRESENT: Acting Chairman Kenneth Krohner, Denton Butler, Robert Fulton, Mary Beth Greenwood, Steve Hanright, Michael LeClaire, Bill Michaud; Jason Hofmann, The Water Planet.
ABSENT: None.

Acting Chairman Kenneth Krohner called the meeting to order at 7:10PM. All regular members present were seated for the meeting. Bill Michaud arrived to the meeting at 7:19PM. The proceedings were recorded digitally and copies are available at Town Hall.

Mr. Butler explained that a question had been raised as to whether or not the noticing of the meeting had been proper. The Town had contacted the Freedom of Information Commission who stated that it was in fact a properly noticed meeting. However, the recommendation was later made to the Town Clerk that the Board should vote to formally adopt the agenda of the meeting.

MOTION Mr. Butler, second Mr. Krohner, to adopt the agenda of the Thursday, February 6, 2014 regular meeting as written; unanimously approved.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. December 12, 2013 special meeting.

MOTION Mr. LeClaire, second Mr. Hanright, to accept the minutes of the December 12, 2013 special meeting as written; the motion carried 3-0-3 with Mr. Butler, Mr. Fulton, and Ms. Greenwood abstaining.

B. January 23, 2014 special meeting.

MOTION Ms. Greenwood, second Mr. Hanright, to accept the minutes of the January 23, 2014 special meeting as written; the motion carried 5-0-1 with Mr. Fulton abstaining.

2. MONTHLY REPORT – THE WATER PLANET.

Mr. Hofmann reviewed his monthly report with the Board. He noted that the plant was briefly slightly above the limits of its discharge permit for BOD and TSS on one sample. Mr. Hofmann expressed the belief that this was partially due to the very cold temperatures and the fact that very little additional septage had been delivered to the plant for treatment; many sludge trucks were needed in January in order to get the pounds of bacteria in the tank down rapidly. Mr. Hofmann stated that approximately 97,500 gallons of sludge were removed, which equates to 15 tanker trucks. Fifteen septage trucks were processed during the month.

3. USER RELIEF REQUESTS (10 STEELE ROAD, 130 RESERVOIR ROAD UNIT 8, 537 MAIN STREET).

MOTION Mr. Butler, second Mr. Michaud, to allow each petitioner to speak on their request for three minutes, and then to act on all requests simultaneously afterward.

Ms. Greenwood suggested five minutes was a more appropriate amount of time. Mr. Butler then amended his motion to five minutes, which Mr. Michaud then seconded.

The Board then voted unanimously to approve the amended motion.

WPCA Minutes 020614

A. 130 Reservoir Road, Unit 8:

No one was present to speak on this issue. Mr. Krohner stated that he just received this request, so he had not reviewed it. The Board agreed to table this request.

B. 10 Steele Road:

The request is in regard to the bill dated January 9, 2014 for the usage period from October 4, 2013 through December 27, 2013 for \$2970.68. Mr. Krohner stated two letters were received on this matter, the first dated February 1, 2014 from Kyle Green and the second dated February 3, 2014 from Mark Green. Mr. Krohner read both letters into the record. Both letters noted that there was a leaky toilet in the apartment for several weeks that was eventually fixed by the landlord. The letters noted the apartment had one bathroom and no washing machine.

Mark Green then addressed the Board on this matter. He explained that the meter was recently read at 426,445; on December 27th it read 415,000. It therefore appeared that the problem was resolving somewhat. He explained that his son and his two roommates are prepared to pay \$500 on the bill at this time as a sign of good faith. While the toilet was part of the issue, Mr. Green questioned whether there was another issue causing such a high bill.

The landlord then addressed the Board. She stated that three young men in this apartment were very conscientious tenants, and she highly doubted they used this much water. She noted that the apartment was unoccupied from February 2013 to October 2013, yet she still had a bill of \$800 for one quarter. She reiterated the request for an investigation. She noted that the meter had been checked twice, and she was told there was nothing wrong with it; however, she stated that she disagreed. She said that the toilet was repaired December 2013.

The Board noted that the tenant was billed for 104,000 gallons in a 3 month period, and he was a sewer and water customer. Mr. Michaud noted that the average usage is 3000 gallons per month per household. The landlord said that she planned to have a plumber come out to investigate possible issues. Mr. Krohner suggested deferring discussion until the Board received a copy of the plumber's report.

C. 537 Main Street:

Mr. Krohner said that the property owner sent a letter to Town Hall, which he then read into the record. According to the letter, the homeowner's pipes burst in early January, and water ran down into basement. A foot of water flooded the basement, and the New Hartford Fire Department came and pumped the water out into the street. The property owner had the water meter read on January 23, 2014. A copy of that reading and the readings for the two previous quarters was included with the letter.

Adam LaFaci, owner of 537 Main Street then addressed the Board regarding this matter. He stated that his October 2013 bill was for 13,000 gallons, and his December bill was for 12,000 gallons. He noted that usage was 14,000 just in one month in January after the water pipes burst. He explained that he had the water shut off immediately and the pipes repaired; valves were also installed to shut off water to that area. Mr. Krohner questioned whether Mr. LaFaci had filed an insurance claim, and Mr. LaFaci stated that he had not yet.

Mr. Butler stated that he did have empathy for those who addressed Board; however, it was his belief that there was a certain amount of personal responsibility to be expected of property owners. He noted that a leaky toilet can cause 1-1/2 gallons of water to be used per minute. Mr. Butler also stated that he believed burst pipes are not an issue for the WPCA to address due to the fact that they often arise out of personal choices regarding temperature settings, insulation levels, etc.

WPCA Minutes - 020614

Mr. Butler stated that the Board has a responsibility to represent all users. Mr. Michaud noted a longstanding policy of the WPCA to allow for a one-time rate relief request assuming the user had adequately addressed the problem. He explained that those seeking relief would normally provide documentation of their normal usage to demonstrate this one-time spike. The Board then discussed this policy and the potential for setting precedent. Mr. Butler noted that the Board has a collectibles issue, a lot of outstanding debt, and many maintenance needs throughout the system. He expressed the opinion that the Board needs to show everyone that they are responsible business people, which would not be the message sent by routinely forgiving high bills that were potentially caused by a lack of personal responsibility. Ms. Greenwood suggested the Board table making a decision in order to get additional documentation from the petitioners regarding actual bills for previous cycles.

A member of the audience, Roy Litchfield, questioned whether homeowner's insurance would cover burst pipes, and if so, should that not be the recourse a homeowner uses. Mr. Krohner and Mr. Michaud agreed. Mr. Butler noted that he too had issues with frozen pipes; however, he chose to simply pay the bill himself so as not to affect his premiums.

Mark Green addressed Board to note that this was their first and only bill to date. Ms. Greenwood noted that the landlord had paid \$800 bill for one quarter for an unoccupied residence. The landlord again addressed the Board to state that she was not necessarily requesting full forgiveness of the bill, but rather some sort of compromise. She also reiterated her desire for investigation, stating that she could not rent or sell her property if the water bills are this high. Mr. Butler noted that United Water checked the meter twice and said it was accurate.

MOTION Mr. Butler to deny request for relief on the basis that the Water Pollution Control Authority has fulfilled its obligations with water to the meter as prescribed by reasonable rules and regulations.

As there was no second, the motion failed.

Mr. Butler stated that the Board had just employed Torrington Water Company (TWC) in part to manage their collections function, and the Board was inhibiting TWC's ability to collect outstanding receivables when it made decisions to forgive bills based on unwritten practices. He said that TWC might then receive increased calls from people not wanting to pay bill, since the Board has set the precedent and does not have a clear written policy. Mr. Michaud disagreed stating that this provision of one-time rate relief has been a longstanding policy of the Board, and that previous water companies employed by the Board were not impeded. Mr. Michaud acknowledged there were collections issues; however, he disputed that that resulted from the one-time relief policy. Ms. Greenwood suggested that the Board review and possibly revise this practice; however, she suggested that this was perhaps not the appropriate time to do so.

4. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

Dan Eddy addressed the Board to state that while past operations of the Board may have been lax and need to be tightened up, the fact remains that this is a public utility, not a business. This system has no competition, so customers have no choice but to use this Board's services. He requested that the Board be careful in enacting "good business practices" because of this fact. He also referenced the information put out at the January meeting regarding the septage receiving data. He expressed the belief that worker's compensation insurance, liability insurance costs, and maintenance costs would also increase as a result of this septage contract; however, these factors were not included in the information discussed at the January meeting. When these other factors are included, he expressed the opinion that the Board would likely find it is losing money on the septage receiving contract. Lastly, he noted that the Board had done a good job getting information from The Water Planet regarding the septage receiving program, while other Town boards appeared to want additional outside opinions.

WPCA Minutes - 020614

Mr. Eddy then expressed frustration that members of other Town boards seem unable to comprehend that the treatment plant is not capable of receiving any additional septage. He noted that he had been present at no less than three WPCA meetings where the reasons for not setting up additional septage contracts were discussed in detail, yet others in Town government appear to be unwilling to see that the plant cannot handle any more septage.

Mark Green addressed the Board to state that regardless of the Board's decision on their relief request, his son and his roommates at 10 Steel Road would be making a good-faith \$500 payment for their bill. He reiterated the request for relief and an investigation into the source of the billing difficulties.

Another member of the audience addressed the Board regarding the lien policy. He questioned whether any additional properties had been liened. Mr. Krohner stated that the former chairman had been dealing with this issue, and Mr. Michaud had agreed at the January meeting to look into this issue; it was going to be discussed later in the agenda.

Jack Casey then addressed the Board to express the belief that it would be unfair to deny those present tonight requesting relief and not give them the same dispensation that was given to previous users. Noting that the Town also recently suffered significant water damage due to frozen pipes and burst sprinkler heads, he suggested that the Board look into whether the Town filed an insurance claim for the water bill payment for the water that was "used" as a part of this incident. The question was then raised as to whether or not the Town is a sewer only or sewer/water user. Mr. Michaud stated that the Town was in fact a paying water user.

Mr. Butler then responded to Mr. Eddy's comments, explaining that he had distributed a "Problem-Opportunity Analysis Worksheet" to members of the Board regarding the septage receiving issue. Mr. Krohner then stated this would be discussed later in the agenda.

Maria Moore, Town Hill Road then addressed the Board to ask about the new proposal of 25% payable by the users. She expressed frustration with the many changes in the percentage amounts attributable to the system users. Ms. Moore stated that this was a Town debt and should be paid as such.

Brian Zelaski then addressed the Board to question whether anyone had obtained the opinion of the USDA as to whether the payment debt had been applied correctly. He questioned whether the requirements of the USDA grant had been met. Mr. Michaud concurred that this was a good question and suggested that the Board take up this issue.

Another member of the audience then questioned whether there were any other public services in the Town that were only billed to those actually using them; were seniors only billed for the senior center and were families with children the only ones paying for school costs?

Roy Litchfield addressed the Board to state that any other public service such as the senior center or the schools, any Town resident can access. However, there is a significant amount of the Town's citizens that will never be able to access and use the sewer and/or water system.

5. CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES FOR WPCA:

Mr. Michaud stated that his highest priority was to balance revenue and expenses in a way that minimizes user rates and ensures continued effective and compliant operations. For revenue generation, this would include hooking up non-deferred abutters, improving the collection rate, optimizing septage receiving revenue, and extending the sewer service area. For expense minimization, he also suggested the Board speak with its operators to find out what improvements would be recommended to minimize nonroutine costs; he also suggested looking into cost-savings

WPCA Minutes - 020614

sharing arrangements. Lastly, he stated he believed the Board needed to establish a fair allocation of the debt repayment. Once this was allocation was finally established, the Board could either continue a surcharge or explore benefit assessments and then plan for how to fund sewer line extensions.

Denton Butler referenced the document he distributed to all Board members via email the day previous. He suggested that the Board review the information Board members submitted. From there the Board could perhaps meet at a second monthly meeting to discuss these lists, research problems and opportunities, and develop an action plan.

Ms. Greenwood noted that Mr. Butler had suggested the Board appoint a liaison to the Board of Finance. She said this was a great suggestion, but also thought it would be a good idea if the Board of Finance appointed a liaison to the WPCA.

6. UPDATE ON WWTP FINANCING SUBCOMMITTEE – BILL MICHAUD:

Mr. Michaud explained that the subcommittee met the previous Tuesday. A recommendation was developed for each member to bring back to their respective Board a split in the debt share of 25% to the user base and 75% to general tax base. Mr. Michaud said that the subcommittee requested we discuss this split and come back to the next meeting in approximately 2 weeks with feedback. Members discussed whether this was a set arrangement or whether the agreement would change from year-to-year. Ms. Greenwood stated that she had understood that this would be a part of the annual budget process, and therefore would be a possibility of yearly change. Mr. Butler stated that he thought the only thing agreed to at the meeting was exploring the idea of a 25%-75% split; if that was something everyone agreed to, then in two weeks' time the subcommittee could then finalize the details. This arrangement could potentially be reviewed annually in the event grants or other additional revenue sources were obtained by the Board, such that the share paid by the Town could be lessened. Members discussed the history of the wastewater treatment debt split.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the portion allocated to the user base was a significant amount of Board's yearly budget; however, the 75% portion payable by the tax base was a substantially less portion of the Town's budget. She expressed discomfort with moving the user's payment share from 19% to 25%, stating that she felt the users have already shouldered a significant portion of the financial burden. She also expressed concern with the Board's ability to generate and meet its annual budget given this additional payment.

Mr. LeClaire also expressed concern in light of how much had already been paid by the system users. He agreed that it was time to finalize this issue and move on; however, he noted that the Board had already voted in the fall and agreed that the users should get some credit for the overpayments they had already made over the previous two years. He stated that he would not be against the 25%-75% split as long as there was some arrangement made regarding the past two years of overpayments by the user base.

Mr. Hanright concurred with Mr. LeClaire's statement, reiterating that the Board had already voted on this matter in the fall.

Mr. Michaud stated that he too believed the users should not pay any more than 19%. He reiterated that the 81% share attributable to the Town would still be the same amount as if the original arrangement had actually been implemented. Mr. Michaud noted that the town's tax base had actually been paying less than they had originally agreed to. He suggested that remaining at the 19% would provide relief to the user base, which would then potentially be observable in a higher collections rate.

WPCA Minutes - 020614

Mr. Fulton said that the sewer treatment is for the Town. He expressed the belief that the user's percentage should remain at 19%. He noted that the higher the amount to be paid by the user base, the more likelihood of unpaid user bills and ultimately foreclosures in the sewer service area.

Mr. Butler stated that he had made his views known at the subcommittee meeting. He expressed concern that the Board's apparent desire to stick with 19% will be viewed by nonusers as a lack of willingness to compromise and work together with the rest of the Town.

Mr. Krohner stated that he concurred with the 19%-81% split. However, he noted that the sewer plant was a Town asset, and if economic development occurred such that the user base expanded, then the split could and should be revisited.

Mr. Hanright questioned who owned the sewer plant once it was paid for, and members explained that it was owned by the taxpayers of the Town of New Hartford.

The Board discussed Ordinance 86-1 which established the Water Pollution Control Authority. Mr. Butler expressed concern that expecting more from the nonusers may result in their wanting additional representation on this Board. Mr. Michaud noted that the ordinance said in part that "...said Commission shall have the responsibility of establishing water and sewer rates sufficient to ensure at least a break-even operation that may provide for amortization of indebtedness and carry their operations of the water and sewer plants without cost to the general taxpayers of the Town." He suggested that the word "may" is different than "shall".

MOTION Mr. Michaud, second Mr. Hanright, the WPCA recommends that the debt share on the wwtp be split 19% existing users, 81% general taxpayers with the consideration that as future growth occurs, any revenues associated with that growth would be put against the 81% to lower that percentage; the motion carried 5-2-0 with Mr. Butler and _____ voting in opposition.

7. MONTHLY REPORTS.

A. LIENS:

B. SEWER HOOKUPS:

Mr. Butler noted that this was on the agenda in error. He said this was an item he had recommended be added to future agendas, along with a sample of the information that could be included in the report. He requested that the Board ask Lila Tuxbury in the Fiscal Office to provide the listed information on a monthly basis for the Board's review at their meetings. Members agreed to implement this plan.

Mr. Michaud said that the previous billing company was to provide a report of outstanding accounts so they could make decisions as to possible liens; he recommended that a similar arrangement with Torrington Water Company. Mr. Krohner noted that on January 14, 2014, there was \$122,000 outstanding over 90 days. The currently due balance at that point was \$159,000. As of January 30th, the past due balance decreased to \$109,500 and the currently due balance was \$129,900. He noted there was a substantial number of customers close to or over the \$500 amount between 90-120 days and over 120 days past due. Mr. Krohner stated that he believed these properties should therefore be notified of the intent to lien.

The Board discussed what to do in the situation where the bill was owed by the tenant, and whether the property owner should be held accountable. Roy Litchfield addressed the Board from the audience to state that Torrington Water Company required the landlord to have their potential tenant sign an agreement regarding financial responsibility for water and sewer bills. He said that the paperwork is on the TWC website. Mr. Michaud stated that he believed the Board could pursue collections against tenants if this was specifically mentioned in the rental contract.

WPCA Minutes - 020614

Mr. Michaud then updated everyone on the status of the Orders to Connect. He noted that the Board still needed to make final determinations on the deferral requests. The Board discussed the definition of “abutter” to the sewer line. Roy Litchfield questioned from the audience whether the post office property and its neighbor were notified that they are abutters and are required to connect. Mr. Michaud stated that he was not sure. Mr. Litchfield questioned whether it would be possible to get a list of the 38 abutting properties, and Mr. Michaud stated that he could get a copy of the list to him.

8. ADOPTION OF TORRINGTON WATER COMPANY RULES AND REGULATIONS.

MOTION Mr. Butler, second, Mr. Krohner, to adopt the Rules and Regulations of the Torrington Water Company as the Rules and Regulations for the water system of the Town of New Hartford.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the TWC required deposits, and she questioned whether that would be the case for New Hartford water users. Mr. Michaud noted that TWC regulations say “company” however, the Town of New Hartford’s water system was not a private company. Additionally, the Town of New Hartford did not report to the DPUC, which was also mentioned in the regulations. He stated he believed in general these were very good regulations; however, he suggested that they have a legal review of these Rules and Regulations in order to make sure they are correctly worded. Mr. Michaud suggested contacting Andrew Lord from Murtha Cullina or the Town Attorney.

The motion on the floor was then withdrawn to allow time for review by legal counsel with the understanding that, in the interim, TWC should administrate New Hartford customers in the same way they administrate their other customers. The Board agreed to bring this up for discussion and action at the March meeting.

9. SEPTAGE HAULING:

Roy Litchfield stated that he was reviewing the septage hauling operations at the request of the Town administration. He reviewed all the costs associated with the operation that he was reviewing, and he stated that he anticipated having a report prepared for the March meeting. Mr. Butler noted that Mr. Litchfield had also met with Jason Hofmann about the plant’s capacity.

10. MDC BILLING.

Mr. Butler distributed information to the Board regarding this matter. In 1969, the Board had to tap a 48-inch main from MDC to bring raw water to a fire hydrant at a pumping station at the corner of Route 219 where it crosses the East Branch of the Farmington River. In 1972, raw water was no longer permitted as a result of the Clean Water Act. However, from 1972 to 2009 the Board continued to pay for this connection even though they did not have use of the fire hydrant. Approximately 15 years ago, MDC physically removed the connection on their side of the pump house. Therefore, since 1972, the WPCA had paid \$56,100 for a connection they could not use, and since August 2009 when Mr. Butler first pointed this issue out, the Board has paid more than \$7300. The Board was now paying \$185.52 for this connection.

MOTION Mr. Butler, second Mr. Krohner, to immediately discontinue payment to the Metropolitan District Commission for the fire hydrant connection at the pumping station at the corner of Route 219 where it crosses the East Branch of the Farmington River and to seek a credit from the Metropolitan District Commission for all past payments made between from 1972 to present as the Board has not had beneficial use of this equipment since 1972.

WPCA Minutes - 020614

Mr. Michaud noted that the Board had a water right with the Metropolitan District Commission. He said that he had questioned in 2009 whether the Town would lose this right by discontinuing this payment. Mr. Krohner stated that Ray Adamaitis from CT Water had stated at the time that the Board would lose their right if they terminated payments. Mr. Michaud said that the Fire Chief, Mark Worsman had been contacted to find out whether he thought it would be beneficial to have that fire hydrant charged, and he had stated he thought it would be beneficial. However, nothing had been done since. Mr. Butler stated that in 2009, he had contacted Jim Randazzo of the MDC, who indicated that they would not be willing to activate the hydrant. Mr. Butler said that he had placed an additional call to see if anything has since changed. The Board then discussed selling the right to the water to the Fire Company. Mr. Michaud suggested that this too would be an item to have reviewed by the Board's attorney. Ms. Greenwood said that she was hesitant to vote as it did not appear that it was resolved as to whether or not this was an item that had potential value.

Dan Eddy from the audience questioned whether the payments could be suspended until further clarification was obtained regarding this issue. Mr. Hanright questioned whether this right had value to any potential buyer of the water system.

The Board then restated the motion and acted upon it.

MOTION Mr. Butler, second Mr. Krohner, to immediately discontinue payment to the Metropolitan District Commission for the fire hydrant connection at the pumping station at the corner of Route 219 where it crosses the East Branch of the Farmington River and to seek a credit from the Metropolitan District Commission for all past payments made between from 1972 to present as the Board has not had beneficial use of this equipment since 1972.

IN FAVOR: Mr. Butler, Mr. Krohner.

OPPOSED: Mr. Fulton, Ms. Greenwood, Mr. Hanright, Mr. LeClaire, and Mr. Michaud.

ABSTENTIONS: None.

The motion **FAILED** 2-5-0.

Mr. Butler stated that he was disappointed that this issue had been allowed to continue unresolved for five years. Mr. Michaud stated that it had been resolved at the time; the Board had agreed it was a right worth continuing. However, the Board could certainly revisit the issue periodically to determine whether this was still the case.

MOTION Ms. Greenwood, second Mr. LeClaire, to refer this issue to the Board's attorney for his review and comment; the motion carried 5-0-2 with Mr. Butler and Mr. Krohner abstaining.

11. TARGETED CONNECTIONS – LIST REVIEW.

No business was discussed.

12. CORRESPONDENCE.

A. USER BILLING – 584 MAIN STREET AND 280 MAIN STREET.

Mr. Krohner said that he had received a sketch from a resident depicting the sewer line leading to the property. The concern was raised that the property at 584 Main Street was connected but not being billed. Mr. Butler also expressed concern about the property at 280 Main Street was connected but not yet added to the billing roster. Members of the Board discussed that the owners of this property had been granted approval for disconnecting until the property was sold; however, the property had since been sold and the connection had been made. The Board agreed to look into these issues and have the necessary testing performed.

WPCA Minutes - 020614

MOTION Mr. LeClaire, second Ms. Greenwood, to address item #14 prior to discussing item #13; unanimously approved.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS PROPER TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD.

A. Karl Nilsen on behalf of John Castellani – Blue Ridge Development, LLC.

Karl Nilsen addressed the Board to express frustration that he had come before the Board 3-1/2 months ago with a plan to bring in 200-300 new paying users that would be hooked into the Torrington sewer system; however, he had not heard back from the Board since. Mr. Nilsen explained that the proposal could not go forward unless the Town of New Hartford WPCA spoke with the City of Torrington WPCA. Mr. LeClaire offered to be the point of contact with Ray Drew of the City of Torrington WPCA.

13. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN.

Mr. Krohner stated that he had agreed to be Acting Chairman until all the vacant positions on the Board were filled. The vacancies were now filled, and due to the demands of his business operations, while he could be available for a Vice-Chairman position, he did not feel he could be available as much time as was needed for the Chairman position.

The Board first discussed the position of Chairman. Ms. Greenwood nominated Bill Michaud to the position of Chairman of the Water Pollution Control Authority. Mr. Krohner nominated Denton Butler; however, Mr. Butler respectfully declined the nomination.

MOTION Ms. Greenwood, second Mr. LeClaire, to nominate Bill Michaud to the position of Chairman of the Water Pollution Control Authority; the motion carried 6-0-1 with Mr. Michaud abstaining.

The Board then discussed the position of Vice-Chairman. Mr. LeClaire nominated Ken Krohner to the position of Vice-Chairman. Mr. Hanright then nominated Denton Butler to the position of Vice-Chairman; however, Mr. Butler respectfully declined the nomination.

MOTION Mr. LeClaire, second Ms. Greenwood, to nominate Ken Krohner to the position of Vice Chairman of the Water Pollution Control Authority; the motion carried 6-0-1 with Mr. Krohner abstaining.

MOTION Mr. LeClaire, second Ms. Greenwood, to adjourn at 10:01PM; unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

**Stacey M. Sefcik
Commission Clerk**