

**LITCHFIELD WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Town Hall Annex, 80 Doyle Road, Bantam, CT 06750
Thursday, July 13, 2023 ~ 7:30 PM p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER: David Wilson called the regular June meeting of the Litchfield WPCA to order at 7:32 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Members present were Dave Wilson, Christian Bratina, David Geiger, William Buckley, Sky Post and James Koser. Also present was Ted Donoghue, Plant Superintendent and Raz Alexe, Public Works Director.

Absent: Christine Harding.

SEATING ALTERNATIVES: None presented.

MINUTES: Motion: W. Buckley put forth a motion to table approval of the 5/18/23 and 6/8/23 WPCA Meeting Minutes until the next WPCA meeting. C. Bratina seconded. There was no discussion. All member voted “aye” and the motion passed.

BUSINESS

- 1) **Public Request and or Comment:** None presented.
- 2) **Update on Torrington Inter-municipal Agreement:** D. Wilson reported that after speaking with Ray Drew that we should hold off until the November election to formally negotiate.
- 3) **Woodard & Curran Update:** D. Wilson reported that they are currently on Task 1. We have the first invoice to review tonight. D. Wilson shared that Task 1 is the biggest task, as they have to gather the most information. He spoke with both Tom Schwartz earlier this afternoon and Mike Headd earlier in the week. D. Wilson had sent the Fuss & O’Neil flood study for the Stoddard Road Bridge, but the IDF (Intensity, distribution, and Frequency) they used were not adopted by the CT DOT and they also were not the most recent too. C. Bratina asked what IDF’s are. R. Alexe and D. Wilson shared that they are the hydraulics for a flood study. D. Wilson stated that he had seen issues in New York with these IDF’s that were used. C. Bratina mentioned the FEMA flood plain maps are being revised, and D. Wilson stated that it already have been revised by the USDA. R. Alexe stated if you have the wrong hydraulics, this will impact the ultimate CFS, as there are many questions to properly answer. D. Wilson shared that we had meet new members of the staff at Woodard & Curran on their last visit. This included a recent graduate from Smith College School of Engineering, he went onto to say that expects in the next month to have the flood resiliency study completed. Aaron has the most hours so far on the first invoice. C. Bratina asked if T. Donoghue has been tracking the rates and hours worked so far and asked that he put together a spreadsheet to track all the expenses and hours of all who work on the project. The first invoice detailed al who have worked on the projects so far, including 30 minutes by the V.P. of Woodward & Curran. We need to ensure that no mistakes on the billing are made moving forward as we review all future invoices’. D. Geiger-following up on a question by W. Buckley, next asked if we had filed with the state for funding to cover the two CWF projects. D. Wilson said we are on the new Priority List with the two previous projects. Woodard & Curran had taken care of this for us. Buckley asked why there was no schedules of values in his copy of the executed and signed contract he has. D. Wilson said there was,

and it was in it. . He has the breakdown of the scope of services. D. Wilson said there is a cost breakdown sheet that includes it. He asked if T. Donoghue could send it tomorrow, which he could not due to a day off. W. Buckley asked for another member to email it him. He went on to say that there needs to be more detailed cost breakdown-compared to the schedule of task, attached to each invoice and how much of a percent we are paying. As there is no way of knowing how much of a given invoice went toward a specific task or tasks. D. Wilson stated we can ask for more details. C. Bratina said they usually have a summary, which they can easily attach to the invoice. W. Buckley went on to say that the total cost of the project is \$412,000 and they are only billing us \$6,700, so how much of the current invoice is toward Task 1? D. Wilson said they gave us, it is a Gantt chart. W. Buckley asked if this was part of the invoice. T. Donoghue said the invoice is what he presented and there was no Gantt chart included. W. Buckley said the intent was to vote on paying the invoice at tonight's meeting, but he objects to paying the current invoice-as it lack these details and things are not being properly documented. You need to have a clear idea of what percent you are paying for on each invoice, and this is a common practice as he deals with this all the time professionally. D. Wilson said we have that information and he will send it to W. Buckley. C. Bratina asked that they simply attach the summary sheet to each invoice, showing the percent of each task worked on. It is easy now, but will become much harder as we move forward as much more work is completed on various tasks.

- 4) **Solar Project Update:** D. Wilson mentioned at the last meeting that –Verogy the company that will build and operate the array, wants to cut the amperage from 1,000 amps-which is our present transfer switch, to 800 amps. C. Bratina asked if this was an issue with the maximum generation of the array, R. Alexe said it is not, it is a formula. The NEC has formula for transferring the generation part and it cannot exceed a certain amperage that is based on the plant motor load and whatever it backs up. C. Bratina asked if that is what the array would generate and Raz said yes. The bottom line it that R. Alexe and D. Wilson talked and have asked for a letter from their engineer supporting their calculation. The discussion continued around the shortages of supplies, it could take a year to acquire a new ATS switch and how long it would take to get the array on line. D. Wilson is concerned about future issues with being required to treat PFAS. The main idea is that heat would be used to breakdown the chemical bonds in the PFAS, a method similar to treating petroleum. This could require much more electricity in the future. He also spoke with Woodard & Curran and they agree that we should keep our service at 1,000 amps. C. Bratina stressed that if we can generate more than 800 amps, why would we not want to take advantage of that? He went onto say that the ATS switch does not “care” how much the generator generates. C. Bratina also shared that it will either be the array or the generator feeding the plant, and if the generator can provide 1,000 amps then we should keep it. R. Alexe said we may need to upgrade after the plant upgrade and then we would have to buy it back and C. Bratina said they would also have to upgrade the cabling-which would cost us more money. T. Donoghue then mentioned that the ZREC is ticking off time, and as a result of this they proposed putting in a 400 amp breaker to connect the array sooner rather than later. C. Bratina said we need to check with an electrical engineer. W. Buckley agreed and stated we should not pay for that and that we should wait until they come back with their letter, he also said we should ask Woodard & Curran for their opinion and C. Bratina agreed. R. Alexe stated that the contractor, does not agree with this, but we have asked for it and are waiting to hear back from them. We need an opinion from their engineer. T. Donoghue mentioned that how they came up with this proposal was he gave the kid a year worth of electrical usage- and we normally never draw more than 100 amps per month. Which is our average peak. If everything was to start up at once we could draw a peak of 800 amps. R. Alexe stated that the contractor is using the nominal and saying we are only using 27% of our capacity. C. Bratina said we need to tell them we are doing an expansion and W. Buckley said we don't want to talk about it anymore, and asked why we should even entertain this proposal as starting more motors uses more electricity. S. Post had a question that when the plant is down you draw from this source- the array and the grid so you are never in danger of the

plant going down. T. Donoghue explained this is more about the day to day electrical demands of the plant, and as R. Alexe explained that if numerous motors came on at the same moment there would be a higher instantaneous draw of electrical power until the equipment goes into normal operation. If there is a power outage, there is a 15 second delay before the ATS would turn on the generator. So that first 15 second with the generator running there is peak. The generator is 400 kW to accommodate this, even though the peak is only 100 amps. Plus the ATS switch isolate the plant from the grid when it is running, so that no power would back feed into the grid. This could injure or kill a linemen. Also the solar array will not generate any power when the generator is running the plant and will shut down. We will only back feed from the solar array when we are on line power, so that is the way it works. W. Buckley felt we are being too accommodating. T. Donoghue said that the main person we have been working with is kind of a hard nose. W. Buckley said we should invite him to a meeting, which R. Alexe has offered an invitation to him, and he should lawyer up. W. Buckley suggested that if we have to spend money on an electrical engineer or a lawyer then we will as you just can't do what they are asking. Are we supposed to pay for it later? No he said. C. Bratina then asked when the array is supposed to be finished. T. Donoghue said it was supposed to be done by the end of the summer, but only the trees have been taking down so far, and all the stumps are still there. Nothing is happening right now on the site. The current situation is that the contractor who won the bid has since sold it to the second lowest bidder – who is Verogy, but now he is their consultant for the project. So he blew up my phone demanding why I did not tell him of the Board's decision but T. Donoghue had not had any follow up from Vergoy. W. Buckley asked why he sold it. D. Wilson said he did not have enough money to finish the project. T. Donoghue added the numbers were tight. C. Bratina said we need to have a schedule and T. Donoghue said R. Alexe formally responded to them- in writing, about our concerns, but they have not responded back as of yet. W. Buckley feels we should make the Town Attorney aware of this problem, as we have budgeted for the array to be generating electricity in January of 2024. So if this project is delayed even more it will affect our budget. W. Buckley said he would think that the project will not be completed by next summer, as these parts are simply not available. R. Alexe sated "let's hope not." T. Donoghue said he has been trying to get a 40 amp breaker for the new mixer, and it has been very difficult and he can't get the part. W. Buckley said this is the way it is, regardless if you have the money the parts are simply not available anymore. D. Wilson added they were not interested in coming to our meeting tonight. W. Buckley closed the discussion by saying they could come to our next meeting and hear how we will hire an attorney.

- 5) **DOT Agreement:** This agenda items was not on some copies of the member's agenda so there was some confusion why some had it missing. We cleared it up and added it to the agenda.

Motion: D. Wilson put forth a motion to add "DOT Agreement" to the meeting agenda. J. Koser seconded and there was no discussion. All members voted "aye" except for W. Buckley who voted "nay", and the motion passed.

D. Wilson began by saying that DOT has an agreement-which he deferred to R. Alexe to, who explained that DOT is replacing a bridge at Cathole Road and Rt. 202 and apparently the downstream section would affect the sewer line going underneath the stream bed. Initially they were going to ask for modifications, but that has since changed and there are no proposed modifications to the existing sewer line, which also included moving the channel and the fisheries. In the process of doing this there were hours put in by T. Donoghue and DOT is asking us, if we want to submit a reimbursement request. D. Wilson said there a universal agreement with the town, that if we incur costs for one of their projects we can request reimbursements. He compared it to if we had to replace manhole sin a street they were paving, they would give us back 10% of what it would actually costs. R. Alexe went on to explain T. Donoghue has spent time attending meeting and gathering information for them, so we could be reimbursed for his time, but it is a lot of paper work. T. Donoghue shared that they also CCTV's the line under the stream known as Still Brook. W. Buckley asked if the line was to be replaced. Both R. Alexe and T. Donoghue said "no." T. Donoghue shared that at first the CT DEEP wanted to put in a fish ladder at this new bridge, but because of the amount

of ledge in this location it would not be feasible to lower our sewer lines, which is literally a foot and a half below the stream bed and it is encased in concrete and we did CCTV'ed it and it is in good shape, but they said they might have to lower the line and then they said we have "this agreement" to reimburse you if that was to happen. We asked ourselves "why should we pay up front for your project?" R. Alexe said the design now shows the line will not be touched, so that is where we are today, but that is not to say that will be the case a year from now. T. Donoghue mentioned they are in the design stage and construction is slated to begin in 2025. W. Buckley asked if the line was in the project they would pay for it. R. Alexe said "yes." C. Bratina, W. Buckley and D. Wilson agreed we should be reimbursed for our labor. R. Alexe will put us in touch with Ms. Xiuyun from DOT. D. Wilson ended the discussion by sharing that DOT has a checklist, which they pass onto the CT DEEP. The DEEP will review for possible fisheries and make recommendation. In this project just 500 ft. upstream is a pond which is dammed, so the fish will not be able to go any further upstream, so a fish ladder might not be the best option. W. Buckley asked what the request here is. D. Wilson said there is the universal agreement to sign and R. Alexe said the project manager asked if we want to be reimbursed for any work so far. If we chose to do so, they will offer all the templates and booklets to fill out. D. Wilson and D. Geiger said it is not worth it at this point and we should pass and we are not interested at this time, but reserve the right to do this in the future if this project gets out of control. T. Donoghue said if they accidentally damage the pipe during construction, but D. Wilson said that would be a different situation and the discussion ended.

- 6) **NPDES Permit Update:** T. Donoghue said he had no update but he did receive an email on June 27th from our DEEP Inspector- Susan Unger, inquiring about the issues of us not being able to report the UV dose on our MOR during disinfection season. She had brought it to her supervisor's attention Carlos Esguerra at a team meeting. T. Donoghue had to explain the limitations of our existing UV system, which cannot generate the UV dose, but can calculate a UV intensity percent, and the time line since 2018 when it was first formally addressed by the CT DEEP. By not reporting it is a violation that shows up on EPA Echo website and on our MOR during disinfection season. W. Buckley asked why we were in violation and T. Donoghue explained that all the new permits require reporting UV Dose, even our last permit required it. The UV Dose is based on the intensity of the bulbs and flows, C. Bratina said it is a calculation. Susan Unger asked because we are in disinfection season and we are not reporting it properly. Carlos Esquerra emailed T. Donoghue asking for more details on the UV system and explained that if we can't update the UV system by next spring, then we might have to modify the new permit-that is currently in the renewal process, to accommodate the inability of us to report the UV Dose. W. Buckley asked why they would do this. T. Donoghue stated that the DEEP does not want to see on going violation because our antiquated UV system cannot report the UV dose. W. Buckley shared that is the difference in UV vs. chlorine you can measure the chlorine residual. R. Alexe shared that we cannot quantify that value. C. Bratina stated we could provide the UV intensity. T. Donoghue then talked about learning more about what the UV intensity actually means, as many of these parameters were proprietary 20 years as there was no one unified standard for UV systems. It used to be UV intensity but as now evolved to UV dose in Connecticut. If we have to modify the permit renewal, this might slow it down some more, but we have not heard back formally from Chris and Carlos. They are considering them, but have not gotten back to us. C. Bratina asked if we can report UV intensity. T. Donoghue was not sure as it displays it as a percent on the OIT panel. We have to determine what this really mean. He explained that the scale on the OIT screen is 0-80% and the UV intensity was "0", so he has to speak with Suez about that and then he will speak with Carlos. D. Geiger asked weren't we not going to update the UV system? T. Donoghue said yes, but with the least year or so, things have been very fluid with waiting for Woodard & Curran to start their work, and there is much to consider for setting the new design criteria for the next UV system. One issue is that we put into our permit recommendations was to

have a minimum 5.0 mg/l DO on the final effluent before it goes into the river. More than likely that will take an engineered solution. It could be steps before it goes into the river. There is not a lot of real-estate between the Parshall flume and the river. C. Bratina mentioned an aeration system might work. As W. Buckley mentioned supply chain issues, even if we went out to bid tomorrow for a new UV system, it might be a tight schedule to get it installed for next spring. D. Wilson suggested we wait to hear back from Carlos as the new permit does not begin until it is issued by the DEEP. T. Donoghue asked the group if they are familiar with the EPA Echo website, which is a national data base open to the public that displays the performance of all the NPDES permitted systems in the country, and will show how well or not a system is running. If you go to Litchfield you will see the permit violation for not reporting UV dose. The EPA had not said anything, but this communication is the first step in us working out a solution to stop the violations.

They brought this issue to our attention six years ago, and they have been situational with us as our E. coli reporting results have been in compliance with our permit. D. Wilson mentioned they approved our UV system, regardless we do not want to have unnecessary violations on our permit. W. Buckley noted that when he hears this he asks “what is the solution?” As the licensed operator, what would you do to fix it? T. Donoghue said that the existing PLC is antiquated and cannot be updated to calculate the UV dose. W. Buckley said that is not what I asked. What would you do to fix this and be in compliance? T. Donoghue replied that he has explained this many times before to this Commission, and W. Buckley asked just explain it one more time. T. Donoghue replied that we need a new UV system. W. Buckley said then let’s buy one and how much is it. T. Donoghue explained that we received \$250,000 in ARPA funds from the Town toward a new one, but we have to write the bid spec and as C. Bratina previously explained, we want to have the contractor do everything. Buy the unit, install it, test and guarantee it will work as designed. R. Alexe asked do we have a spec. C. Bratina said we do, but needed the maximum flows to finalize it so we are set for the next 20 years. He went on to say that since we have Woodard & Curran onboard, we should wait for them to review all of our flow data to ensure we get it right. As we don’t want to make the system too big by over estimating the design flow capacity. W. Buckley said that these systems operate with a range. T. Donoghue agreed and our current system is rated to 2.3 MG peak hourly flow, and as long as we are not “burping solids” over the weirs we can still stay in compliance with proper disinfection. C. Bratina stressed we have to design it for that peak hourly flow, which is uncertain. T. Donoghue said we have that data going back to the DPC study of the plant. C. Bratina became alarmed when he saw the instantaneous peak flows at the plant, which at times were well above our design capacity. Often this was done artificially as the way we use to load septage, was by mixing it with the plant influent and not loading it straight into the septage receiving tank. We have since stopped that. C. Bratina also mentioned how we clean the bar screen too. T. Donoghue then mentioned that we had a little excitement last Monday due to a rainfall event, when our flows reached 1,800 GPM or 2.7 MGD, which did lead to an effluent non-compliance event due to the turbidity of the effluent degraded by burping solids. W. Buckley said that had nothing to do with the UV, correct. T. Donoghue said “yes”. W. Buckley just wants to fix the problem. T. Donoghue asked D. Wilson what part of the Woodard & Curran task list the UV will be under. D. Wilson answered it would be “down the line.” T. Donoghue asked do we want to move this task up. They currently have five years of our MOR data and we can easily provide any other data they may need. It is up to the Commission if we want them to look at this and to think about if that part of the plant is going to change dramatically. D. Wilson said we need to speak with the DEEP and get the proper modification to our new permit. D. Geiger asked on the current system and D. Wilson said yes. T. Donoghue mentioned that in regards to the ARPA funds, there is a stipulation that they must be spent by a sunset date, which he believes is 2026. We have \$450,000 to spend on the UV and mechanical bar screen. W. Buckley said at the rate you are going, you are not going to make that. We have a 1,000 steps and” we’ have to start the process which he wants to do. He went on to say you won’t have to explain it to me anymore. How about that? T. Donoghue thanked him for his efforts.

He next asked how we get there. As he still did not have a clear answer C. Bratina said he had estimated the peak flow, but we don't have actual peak hourly flow numbers, as he made rough estimates. We should have Woodard & Curran look at the flow data and come up with their numbers, which he estimated would take only a couple months. W. Buckley suggested at the next meeting with Woodard & Curran that we have them begin to look at this, so if the DEEP wanted to play hard ball with us we could say we are already on it. R. Alexe asked what design criteria or matrix would trigger different sizing of a future unit. C. Bratina said he would have to look at it. R. Alexe said if we could do this ourselves as it would speed up the process. C. Bratina said the issue is with the existing channel and the plant hydraulics. T. Donoghue had had issues with the plant flow backing up into the secondary clarifiers-surcharging. We really don't understand what is causing this back up. Is that the UV system or is it the pipe from the secondary tanks? C. Bratina looked at it and it should be able to handle this capacity. T. Donoghue even CCTV's it and there was nothing obstructing it. One thing we have asked Woodard & Curran to do is the hydraulic profile of the plant as it could be that we have some hydraulic issues. R. Alexe then said it is a qualitative decision. C. Bratina said there are a lot of little factor that go into this. And R. Alexe acknowledge that is a lot of information to get to the possible answer. T. Donoghue mentioned our E. coli numbers, as our daily maximum cannot exceed 410 colonies per 100 ml and the monthly geometric mean cannot exceed 136 per 100 ml. If we have one day where we are at 200 colonies per 100/ml, that will not hurt us and lead to a violation even if we did 2.0 MGD. The issue is the turbidity of the water, and as long as it does not get turbid we will not have a violation One we start "burping solids" the UV transmission is shot, we will not properly disinfect. C. Bratina stressed that would be the case with a new system as well. It might be better, but not perfect. T. Donoghue mentioned that we have had some issues to due foaming and M. Parvicella, which he will talk about later, but as long as we are not burping solids a UV system can outperform it design criteria and not trigger a violation. C. Bratina mentioned that a UV system generates head loss. W. Buckley said he is 100% on board, but what bother him is that our Chief Plant Operator says we have a violation and I am sitting here not doing anything about it. C. Bratina said it is a reporting violation and W. said but someone is going to look at it and say you have had a violation for the last four years. C. Bratina mentioned what D. Wilson said, that we have to work to have the new permit modified so that we report UV intensity and not dose for the old system. W. Buckley agreed that we should be able to do that, and if you can't do that we need to buy a new piece of equipment. T. Donoghue mentioned that when he worked in New Hartford they bought a colorimetric meter to record UV intensity four times a day and that was the workaround the DEEP suggested.

- 7) **2022 Annual Report: Motion:** S. Post put forth a motion to table the agenda item "2022 Annual Report" to the next WPCA meeting. J. Koser seconded and there was no discussion. All members voted aye-except for W. Buckley who voted "nay", and the motion passed.

- 8) **WPCA Tax Collector:** Before this agenda item began. W. Buckley inquired if we have had any communication with the Woodridge Lake Sewer District (WLSD) as he had read an article in the newspaper that they said they may be receiving state funds to address their issues. The group said they had no communications, but D. Wilson did mention that we have been barraged with letters from concerned citizens advising us to take WLSD to help preserve Bantam Lake. These residents believe that we are part of the problem with the issues affecting Bantam Lake, even though we are downstream from the lake. C. Bratina believes it is actually the existing septic tanks surrounding Bantam Lake that are a bigger problem, and thinks they all should be connected to the sanitary sewer system in Litchfield and Morris. D. Wilson shared that they have no problem asking the state for \$2 Million to add alum to the lake. C. Bratina suggested that they set up a group to address this issue. R. Alexe shared that the study- commissioned by the CT DEEP, states that the lake is being polluted by the WLSD system, and that they think that by Litchfield helping them out it will fix the problems. C.

Bratina asked if these people want us to take WLS. R. Alexe said "yes". W. Buckley asked who they came to and has there been any formal communication. R. Alexe said no there has not and went on to share that Connie Trolle the Chairman of that Commission on Bantam Lake Authority wants actions, since they have an issue and that report is stating that. We know there is an idea that WLS could be treated here in Litchfield. W. Buckley asked why they would not ask the same of Torrington. W. Buckley went on to say if Torrington took it, it would solve their problem. R. Alexe said "sure but that is not what is happening," W. Buckley said he does not follow their logic of their argument that the only place they can go is to Litchfield. R. Alexe agreed with W. Buckley's point and feels that they are "throwing a dart and seeing that it sticks." The question to ask is if the town management going is to listen and agrees that they have a point, and he has not heard anything. D. Wilson said that the 1st Selectman agrees that there is a problem. W. Buckley said that everyone is concerned, as he is concerned, but W. Buckley is also concerned that he does not know about everything going on and D. Wilson acknowledged that neither does he. Buckley asked that we put "WLS Discussion" on the monthly agenda, so that the Board can discuss these things that may come up. W. Wilson said "no". W. Buckley responded "OK, then I will add it to the agenda during "Commissioner's Request." D. Wilson said that we agreed that we agreed to not negotiate with them until after we studied our plant's capacity. W. Buckley is not saying we should negotiate with them at all, but with a this scuttlebutt that is going around, it would be nice to have it discussed around the table. He went on to say what is up with this money being put up? R. Alexe had no idea and it was the first that he heard of that, he went on to say that all these people who live around the lake want satisfaction when they feel something needs to be done. W. Buckley suggested that maybe the State Rep up there heard about the problem and trying to get money for them. C. Bratina said his problem is with the whole study, and it's clear to him that septage tanks are the issue and he think they did not adequately address that, as it is very hard to determine how much septage is entering a lake, as you are talking about sub-surface. D. Wilson said there is no one at the DEEP qualified to do this type of work and that is why they hired a consultant R. Alexe said what about all the homes in White Memorial on the lake that dump right in the lake? It is a known fact. C. Bratina said he did not know that. W. Buckley said the sanitary sewer is on the other side of Rt. 209. T. Donoghue said at Breezy Knolls there are four properties in Litchfield that connect to the Morris collection system. W. Buckley said that the line goes down to Deer Island. W. Buckley said that all these septic systems were abandoned thirty years ago. T. Donoghue mentioned that in the letters, they are asking if connecting all the properties along North Shore Road is a project that the Litchfield WPCA is considering, which it is not. D. Wilson chimed in that we have not responded back to their letters. C. Bratina said it is a good question if we are expanding the plan does the town wanted to expand sewer services to the homes on Bantam Lake in Litchfield? W. Buckley agreed that was a good question. Now is the time to tell them. D. Wilson said that we made a proposal to those property owners if they want to do it and White Memorial agreed to put the funds into their yearly lease of the land, to carry the cost of financing the connection, but they did not want any part of it. White Woods was on board but the residents were not. C. Bratina asked should we formally ask the Board of Selectman if we want to consider this project. D. Wilson answered no. W. Buckley said that we all have a good working knowledge of how a septic system works and that you cannot put a well within 90 feet, and that all the nutrients don't migrate beyond the 90 feet. Why not bring it to a head and call the DEEP. And get them onboard. He went on to say that hypothetically let's say they prevail and WLS connects to Litchfield, and all the lawsuits go away, or it goes to Torrington- they are still going to have a problem. C. Bratina agreed. W. Buckley said he does not want to be the person that says "I told you so." C. Bratina said they need to tell them all now. R. Alexe mentioned that the homeowners use the lake water to flush out their septic systems. W. Buckley shared a professional story in which properties along Candlewood Lake had failing septic systems, and they asked to be connected to city sewer. Soon after the wells on all these properties dried up and they all needed to have the city water service extended to their properties. . Wilson proclaimed the exact same thing happened at Woodridge Lake. W. Buckley then asked "how do we do it guys?" C. Bratina said we ask

the BOS if they want us to consider it, as it is part of Litchfield's problem. W. Buckley asked what the town would do. He posed this question to R. Alexe who agreed that the town would hire an engineer to do a load study and determine the details of connecting to the sanitary sewers. D. Geiger asked how many properties are involved. R. Alexe did not know. Someone mentioned 100. T. Donoghue said it is more like around 30 properties, just on North Shore Road. D. Wilson said there is only eight properties. W. Buckley said we should study all the properties in Litchfield along the lake, as we want to make a point here. C. Bratina concurred. T. Donoghue said that we don't know if they sent the same letters to the Town of Morris First Selectman or the WPCA. D. Wilson said he did know and they did not send the letters to those officials. T. Donoghue asked why did they not sent the letters to them. R. Alexe answered they have no money. T. Donoghue mentioned if that they have no money, they probably have no debt, so then they could borrow some money. T. Donoghue shared that the letters first came to Denise and him, then they started sending them to D. Wilson. W. Buckley asked why the Board did receive a copy of them. T. Donoghue said there were over a dozen and D. Wilson did not want us to respond to them. Regardless W. Buckley and C. Bratina want to see them. T. Donoghue will forward them to the members. W. Buckley read about the elected officials, and D. Wilson said the article stated that they would meet with the folks at WLSD. T. Donoghue said that when things comes to Denise and me, Raz was involved too, it next goes to Dave. Dave and Raz had the opinion that we should not respond, which was what the final decision was. R. Alexe said he was only aware of the Connie Trolle letter that was mentioned in the paper. T. Donoghue said these were the letters that came from the Morris residents. D. Wilson mention that he was going to take one of his clients out to lunch, his wife was one the residents that submitted a letter. W. Buckley said we all have a common goal to help clean up Bantam Lake, so let's all put our environmental hat on, as we are environmentalists first, an if someone is going down the wrong track, we have an obligation to help them get on the right track- or at least see the other train. And there is another train and it is all the houses around the lake-which could be 100, and all that waste goes into the ground. C. Bratina mentioned some do not even have septic tanks, as they still have cesspools. C. Bratina recommended that D. Wilson write a letter to D. Rapp asking them if we should consider this, where pollution is an issue we can provide sanitary sewers. This would only be the Litchfield side as we do our plant study. T. Donoghue mentioned that a customer connected on Rt. 209 years ago and they put in a pipe that was extended to possibly connect North Shore Road in the future, unfortunately the WPCA never received an easement from the property owner. D. Wilson said they are getting permitting for that pipe in the ground that will connect West Shore Seafood. R. Alexe said we had this conversation three years ago. D. Wilson said the owner of West Shore Seafood paid for an easement through the property that has the pipe in it. The discussion closed with T. Donoghue saying he would send out a couple of the letters to the Commissioners. C. Bratina reaffirmed the idea to draft a letter. D. Wilson mentioned the possible sewer service area and zoning. If we want to get it changed we would have to get it change on the state PCAD mapping for this area. W. Buckley said you need to have a study of the septic system on Bantam Lake. C. Bratina said we could add this to the letter. D. Wilson said let the BOS decide what to do it. W. Buckley said we could make a motion and someone could second it to make a decision. D. Geiger suggested we draft a letter. S. Post asked could we see a list of the 5 or 6 things that are an option for WLSD and what are the 3 or 4 option that Litchfield WPCA has, and what is our position is on them. He knows one of our position is to "wait and see". T. Donoghue said we stopped any talk of an IMA with WLSD. D. Wilson stated we never entered into any discussion over an IMA, and that we just allowed them to study our plant and see what they may find before we go any further. T. Donoghue explained that the agreed course of action was to study the stand alone plant first, and then the last part would be to study what it might take to take in 100 to 150 K from WLSD. W. Buckley next said if you went around our table you might have different opinion of what to do, his being they should go to WLSD. His point being we are the smallest facility and why would you send WLSD to Litchfield, he also said there are numerous opinions of why they did not go to Torrington in the first place. He then said if you want to come to us, they you need to follow the state statues over how to negotiate and how

you go about creating an. IMA. WLS D should not have come to us. C. Bratina reaffirmed W. Buckley point that it was the Town of Goshen who should approached Litchfield about a potential IMA. In fairness the 1st Selectman of Goshen did come to a recent WPCA meeting to approach the idea of working together on a possible solution. He may have spoken with D. Rapp or wrote a letter to her. W. Buckley said that there is much information floating out there about all these different ideas-included from the CT DEEP, on fees charged by Torrington.

- 9) C. Bratina next asked T. Donoghue if he had a chance to look at the Arethusa data-which he had, and T. Donoghue stated that it is consistent with the historical data they have collected over the years. The issue is the variance of the daily flow data, which can range from 3,000 to 8,000 GPD. The BOD is around 2,000 mg/l. C. Bratina said we need to have a discharge permit with them. D. Wilson said they need that, but they have not completed what is required for their permit and give it to the CT DEEP. C. Bratina said that is not how he understands, that it is the local authority that is supposed to be the administer a pre-treatment permit with those industries, and DEEP relies on the locals to manage and oversee it. We have to work with the user and the CT DEEP, as he feels the last permit was not accurate. D. Wilson said it was based on what they submitted to the DEEP at the times. C. Bratina said we need to write the permit to reflect what they are actually discharging, as we have been dealing with this for years. If you look at the plant influent BOD for June, it is 486 mg/l. He has never seen a treatment plant with such a high BOD, he can't say it is all coming from Arethusa, as it might be coming from Litchfield Distillery too. But the fact is that this is an incredible amount of loading, and it is no wonder the plant is having problems, as the plant was designed for 150 mg/l BOD loading, not 3 times that. We need a permit with Arethusa, W. Buckley said and with anyone else. Too. T. Donoghue said that they have begun testing the discharge from the Distillery, and the results has been shocking. C. Bratina said we need a permit with Arethusa, and more than likely with the Distillery too. T. Donoghue said we should talk as they have been loading much data from the Distillery in WIMS, but we have to create some new variables for some data sets. T. Donoghue does not disagree with C. Bratina's points- and this is coinciding with the plant study the plant goes on a roller coaster of loading during a given day. At points we have too little food coming in and later we will have way too much coming in, and that is one reason we get the low F/M filament in the process which we have year around, and this explains why our SVI's (Sludge volume index), are never under 150 ml/l. Between Noon and 6:00 Pm we have enormous loading, as they have done COD grab samples and the COD was 1,100 mg/l. Composite sampled from the Distillery has been 500 ml/l in the Imhoff Cone. C. Bratina said we need to initiate a pre-treatment permit with them. T. Donoghue next said that we need to bring Woodard & Curran into the discussion to look at how we can support these businesses, but not have problems at the plant. C. Bratina once again said we need permit in place, and the business can pre-treat it to our standards before discharging it into our collection system or we can bill them for it. It is their choice. Donoghue said that he would like to discuss this first with our consultant, before we approach the Distillery. As we have had long standing issues with M. Parvicella- as it is really gotten bad with the foaming over the last two weeks and lead to a couple non-compliance issues. He continued that the Distillery FOG is between 200-400 mg/l. How can it be that high coming from a distillery? The phosphorous is also very high too. There are all these variables that we have to put on the table with our consultant and then we can have the same message for both- and all of customers moving forward C. Bratina does not want to go another five years like this, and T. Donoghue agreed. C. Bratina said he is frustrated that we have done all this studying but we never do anything about it. T. Donoghue said there is balance we have to work with these businesses. W. Buckley said you are talking more like a politician and not a plant operator and you need to stop it, as this is not a political issue. D. Wilson agreed. T. Donoghue said it is not a political issues as one of the things we do at the treatment plant is supporting economic growth within the town of Litchfield. C. Bratina said that is not within our guidelines and W. Buckley said we are environmentalist, and one thing we do is make sure businesses discharge within the rules, and they are making a profit off not complying and C. Bratina stated that W. Buckley is paying more on his bill to support them. W. Buckley said why

should he be subsidizing them? T. Donoghue then asked about the many users who don't pay their bills? You are subsidizing them too as there is \$200,000 on the table still in uncollected revenue in the current FY of people who have not paid. D. Wilson said that is the wrong argument to make. T. Donoghue then said Arethusa pays a lot in usage and in their surcharge bill each year, and they do pay it. W. Buckley said he does not see the balance. The balance is they have to comply with the rules. Do you think they are going to close up and move to Torrington? R. Alexe said that the Commissioners are making a good point and argument for the sake of environmental issues and the cost associated with treat it and how it impacts the users. He once agreed with T. Donoghue's point, but is now more sympathetic to the consensus with the Commissioners on these issues, as the Distillery is growing fast and we need to fix this. The group does not think that the consultant needs to be involved in the pre-treatment permits that are needed, as it is not part of the plant study. The next point T. Donoghue said is that when both of these customers came to us to apply for approval to discharge into our system, we did not do our homework on how each of these industries could impact the plant. W. Buckley said we are doing our homework now, and if someone want to open a brewery in Litchfield the first thing I am going to do in hindsight is go visit another town that has a brewery and go to their treatment plant and find out as much as I can. C. Bratina said the onus is on the business to tell us what their discharge will be, W. Buckley said the bottom line is they are in violation and they need to fix their discharge and that we don't need the consultant and he does not want to talk about this again, as we been having these conversations about Arethusa for a long time. T. Donoghue said it is up to Commission to come up what we will surcharge them on. W. Buckley said he does not want to surcharge them, he wants them to pre-treat. D. Wilson said that for them to get their permit they need to meet our regulations or ask for an exception. R. Alexe recalls that we told Arethusa nearly 7 years ago what the issues were and what we needed them to do. They hired a consultant and it took them a year and they came up with their pre-treatment system, but the issues are still there. W. Buckley said they hired a consultant to avoid having to pre-treat, and the bottom line is we just want them to get into compliance. As they are violating the sewer use ordinances and they need to put in a pre-treatment system. C. Bratina said if they don't fix their discharge they must pay the surcharge. W. Buckley asked what the surcharge was, T. Donoghue said it was \$15,000, which the group said was only on BOD. T. Donoghue said plus they pay their usage fee, which is based on 1 million gallons of water, which you divide by 42,500 gallon per EDU times \$408. C. Bratina said he has written many surcharge permits and he will create one and present it to the board for review W. Buckley said he uses 1,000 gallons a month and he pays the same cost for an EDU. T. Donoghue said he just wants to ensure that we have the same message for both Arethusa and the Distillery. C. Bratina agreed and looks forward to seeing the data, and the group said it has to be done. T. Donoghue mentioned there is some ambiguity in our Rules and Regulations, which are vague and we need to tighten them up, as for BOD it simply says "high strength BOD." C. Bratina said the plant was designed for 150 mg/l of BOD and peak of twice that is your limit. T. Donoghue stressed as they are too vague and should be updated. D. Wilson said we need to move on. W. Buckley asked T. Donoghue to put in writing what the new ordinance should be and have it ready for the next WPCA meeting.

Going back to the WPCA Tax Collector agenda item. We have made the switch to the Litchfield tax collector office. This will cost between \$1 to \$2K per year. This will give the ability to have customers pay online, as that is the direction that we want us to go for. Q Public will interface will interface with the Munis system as well.

8) Commissioner's Request: None presented.

10) Public Works/Treatment Plant Report

- a) **Easements:** No report
- b) We processed a total of 178,200 gallons of septage during the month of June a 12% decrease over last June. YTD we are up 27%.
- c) For June effluent BOD removal percent was 99% and TSS removal percent was 96%.The minimal removal rates per our NPDES permit is 85%.
- d) The daily average of Total Nitrogen lbs. /day discharged into the Bantam River was 2.3 mg/l or 6.0 lbs. /day. Our daily limit is 24 lbs. /day.
- e) The daily average for Total Phosphorous discharged in the Bantam River was 3.0 mg/l. or 7.6 lbs. /day. The monthly average cannot exceed 3.7 mg/l and our daily maximum cannot exceed 7.43 mg/l.
- f) On the 6/1/2023 effluent composite sample, the survival rates for *Daphnia Ppulex* was 100% and *Pimephales promelas* was 100 %.
- g) On 6/7/23 Cretex demo with the Pro-Ring® system for making manholes water tight.
- h) On 6/9/23 reported an Effluent Non-Compliance event for exceeding TSS and E. coli, due to higher than normal flows from work at a local gas station. Woodard & Curran visited earlier in the day as well.
- i) On 6/12/23, Ted, Eric, and Jay had Cyber Security training through CIRMA. We also set up composite sampler at the Litchfield Distillery. We also started up the new Pro-Minent polymer mixing station.
- j) On 6/14/23 H.O. Penn out at Northfield generator. We need a new controller to address the issue of failing to start properly.
- k) On 6/20/23 Eric and Jay began mowing right-a-ways. M. Parvillacella was beginning to get dramatically worse with foaming in the tanks,
- l) On 6/26/23 Neponset Controls calibrated the Morris, Torrington Rd, and Hart Drive flow meters.
- m) On 6/30/23 trouble call at Litchfield Montessori School-in Northfield, as an internal cracked pipe drained into a floor drain, reported a Sewage Bypass event.

11) Financial Report: T. Donoghue reported that we are more than likely going to exceed our budget for FY 23. This is due to high electricity and bio solids removal and processing costs, as well as supplies, and items he was authorized to spend for plant supplies and professional services. He estimated that he may be over by \$60,000 against the FY 23 budget, but will have updated numbers next month.

12) Old Business: None presented.

12) Adjournment:

Motion: W. Buckley moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:21 PM. J. Koser seconded and there was no discussion. All members voted “aye’ and the motion passed.

Terrence Donoghue
Interim Recording Secretary