

**LITCHFIELD WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
CAPITAL PLANNING SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

Litchfield Firehouse, 258 West Street, Litchfield, CT

06759

February 12, 2026, at 6:15 pm

1. CALL TO ORDER: C. Levesque called the special meeting of the Litchfield WPCA to order at 6:21 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Members present were Chris Levesque (Chairman), John Bongiorno (BOS Liaison), Kate Honan, Bill Buckley, Keith Shortsleeve, Raz Alexe PW Director, and Ted Donoghue, Plant Superintendent.

Absent: K. Merz had resigned from the Board.

3. DISCUSSION RE: APPROACH FOR DEVELOPING A CAPITAL PLAN.

- Discussion centered on creating a capital plan with inputs from studies, GIS data, and field assessments, leading to actionable execution.
- Plan to focus first on the sewer collection system; may span multiple meetings.
- Existing documents include a 1994 SSES/I&I study, a 2017 I&I study (DPC), and a metering study (Fuss & O'Neill).
- Goal: Identify gaps, compile digital assets, and develop a methodical scope (SSES) to quantify inflow/infiltration (I&I) and condition.
- Conclusion: Next meeting will review an example SSES scope, define tasks and deliverables, and prepare to solicit qualifications and proposals.

Funding Strategy—DEEP Planning Grant

- A DEEP planning grant could fund 55% of the work; remaining 45% would be pay-as-you-go from the budget.
- Grant is for planning, not committing to construction; output expected to inform decisions.
- Consultants should assist with grant applications and administration; preference for firms with Connecticut success.
- Conclusion: Use planning grant to advance SSES and related GIS/assessment tasks; select consultants with strong grant experience.
- Managing I&I vs. Treatment Plant Upgrades

- Debate on whether to remove I&I in the collection system or manage peaks at the plant (e.g., equalization tanks).
- Danbury example: equalization tank shaved peak flows effectively; sizing discussed (e.g., up to ~1,000,000 gallons; current spare aeration tanks ~180,000 gallons).
- Parallel storage pipes in the collection system are an option but require maintenance to prevent settling.
- Recognized that homeowner sump pumps/roof leaders often discharge illegally into sanitary; practical constraints for enforcement and alternatives.
- Conclusion: Need to understand system performance before deciding between collection system rehab or plant-side equalization solutions.

4. DISCUSSION RE: GIS-PRESENTATION OF COLLECTION SYSTEM GIS DATA.

C. Levesque shared that he was impressed how far along T. Donoghue and his team were with the Capacity Maintenance and Operation & Maintenance (CMOM) program. The two pillars are the programs Map Express, which is what the one that the Town Accessor' uses and PW. The Sewer department has a working layer on this program. All of the 1994 SSES data was imported into this program, along with a collection system map. The program has some challenges, such as when trying to utilize it to enter and manage O & M work performed on the collection system. This program uses Arc GIS/ESRI, which is an industry leader in collection system management.

As a result, T. Donoghue has been using a program called Diamond Maps. This program is easy to use and we have been utilizing it to document all of our O & M and P & M working we have done on the collection systems. We have included the GIS locations of manholes, manhole inspections and rehab work, along with photographs and other beneficial information. It only cost \$20 a month, and we own all the data. C. Levesque said that they have an unlimited membership, for only \$48 per month which we may want to consider in the future. This would allow a consultant and other board members to see the work performed in real time.

The current GIS lacks details information on building lateral, the teams use a filed card system, for the 1,500 connections. We have about 29 miles of sewer lines in our collection system. GIS will be populated further by an engineering consultant during SSES, and all of this will serve as a baseline tool for CMOM compliance.

K. Shortsleeve asked if all of this work was necessary, as he thought we should be only focused on the treatment plant upgrades. T. Donoghue explained that CMOM is

mandated by the EPA, and we have a legal responsibility to properly maintain the collection system. CMON documents what we have done each year, and is legally defensible, and will help us avoid any failures and set goals for possible

W. Buckley stated that we have had no recent violations reported, such as sanitary sewer overflows or plant issues reported during recent high flow events.

These topics were also discussed.

- Manhole infiltration commonly through frame/cone brick deterioration; repairs (trays/inserts, grout) are ongoing, reducing peak flows.
- Pipes on private property require clear easements; attention needed in scope.
- Conclusion: Proactive maintenance continues; SSES will verify conditions and prioritize rehab without triggering unintended flooding impacts.
- Private Property Inflow and Policy Considerations
 - Homeowner connections (sump pumps, roof leaders) to sanitary are illicit; enforcement is complex due to practical constraints and neighbor impacts.
 - If public storm drain is available and gravity works, connection may be permitted by Public Works (road cuts, permits).
 - Examples of “carrot and stick” approaches (e.g., Wallingford surcharge/penalties); local rules and regs may need updates.
 - Conclusion: Future policy discussion required to address private inflow; include evaluation of options in consultant scope.

Overall, our existing GIS and Diamond Maps provides a solid foundation to integrate SSES results and to effectively manage O & M work.

5. DISCUSSION RE: AVAILABLE ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS.

- Preference to expand on-call bench to include sanitary sewer specialists (e.g., firms like Tighe & Bond, Weston & Sampson).
- Past QBS process: ~20 firms narrowed to 5 interviews at the firehouse; all firms gave strong presentations for the current engineering evaluation of the treatment plant.
- Plan to share prior Requests for Proposals (RFP) responses and qualifications with the board for context.
- Conclusion: Use Quality Based Selection process (QBS) to select a consultant with sewer expertise and grant experience; board to review qualifications.
- Timeline and Next Steps

- Next meeting (by March): Review example SSES scope, finalize task list and deliverables, confirm understanding.
- Following meeting: Decide if scope is thorough; authorize Raz and Ted to solicit proposals/qualifications.
- Work could run into fall; align possible flow metering for next spring; multiple tasks can run in parallel.
- Conclusion: Structured, phased progression toward consultant selection and SSES execution, targeting metering readiness by next year.

6. DISCUSSION RE: FORMAT FOR EVALUATION OF THE COLLECTION SYSTEM.

Covered in above discussions for item number 5.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS FIR ITEMS ONLY ON THE AGENDA. None presented.

8.COMMISSIONER REQUESTS FOR CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

Review and discuss an example SSES scope for the collection system at the next meeting (by March).

Define and finalize tasks and deliverables for the SSES, including GIS updates and metering needs.

Prepare to solicit qualifications and proposals from sewer-specialist consultants. Share prior RFP/QBS materials and consultant qualifications with board members.

Identify grant application requirements and assign responsibilities for DEEP planning grant pursuit.

Catalog easements and private property segments to include in the SSES scope. Determine initial strategy preference (I&I removal vs. plant-side equalization) pending data from SSES.

Confirm GIS data standards (including lateral mapping and attributes) for consultant deliverables aligned with CMOM and O&M.

Verify easement records and legal access for private property segments to avoid scope gaps and field delays.

Establish the DEEP grant timeline, required evidence (prior studies, preliminary scope, cost estimates), and roles for application and administration.

9.ADJOURNMENT.

Motion: W. Buckley moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:02 pm. J. Bongiorno seconded and there was no further discussion. All members voted “aye,” and the motion was carried.

Terrence Donoghue, Interim Recording Secretary