

**LITCHFIELD WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Town Hall Annex, 80 Doyle Road, Bantam, CT 06750
Thursday, September 14, 2023 ~ 7:30 PM**

CALL TO ORDER: David Wilson called the regular August meeting of the Litchfield WPCA to order at 7:40 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Members present were Dave Wilson, Christian Bratina, William Buckley, David Geiger, and Sky Post Also present was Ted Donoghue, Plant Superintendent.

Absent: Christine Harding, James Koser, and Raz Alexe, Public Works Director,

SEATING ALTERNATIVES: None presented.

MINUTES: Motion: No Meeting Minutes were presented.

BUSINESS

1) **Public Request and or Comment.** None presented.
2) **Update on Torrington Inter-municipal Agreement:** D. Wilson reaffirmed that we will wait until the November election to formally negotiate.

3) **Woodard & Curran Update:** D. Wilson reported that there are a couple issues to address. When Woodard & Curran proposed how they would track their work on the project. Tom Schwartz had created a custom Excel workbook that could itemize and breakdown each of the 8 phases into sub phases as they were worked on toward completed. D. Wilson had first asked for a detailed Excel spreadsheet from the inception of this contract thought what he was first shown, was what they would use for invoicing, but due to the limitations of the Woodard & Curran accounting system, that they can't break the tasks into the original subtasks. The first invoice only showed a cover sheet on what was worked on and the billable hours of staff from the billing cycle, any fees, as well as any subcontractor charges. The billing total was deducted from the contract's total cost, but no information how much of any given task(s) or subtasks was worked on and documented in a specific and detailed manner, The following two invoices were the same format. D. Wilson mentioned that they advised us on the solar project, and then S. Post asked if they had billed us previously, as he thought they had. D. Wilson said no, that this was the first time we have worked with them. At a previous WPCA meeting C, Bratina suggested a Gantt chart. W. Buckley injected and asked if there is an invoice that has a percent of it, and at last month's meeting we did not see the invoices there was a mistake on, and T. Donoghue has sent something out that there was now two outstanding invoices. T. Donoghue answered "yes" and explained to members how the first three invoices were broken down with a cover sheet and the billable hours of the personnel and any additional charges that they billed for.

D. Wilson shared that each of the first invoices broke things down by what they were expended for, total billed, the budget remaining and the percent of the budget remaining and he was not happy with this format. If you look at the one page worksheet sheet the number match up, but this is what they say is the most they can put together. They broke down each task by total remaining, percent of tasks the number s match up. This is the most they can put together. W. Buckley said that Task One is \$79,000, T. Donoghue said that Task1 is \$79.315. D. Wilson explained that the next three columns are what they are billing us on each invoice. D. Wilson then explained the breakdown of the first three

invoices, which adds up to \$58,000. T. Donoghue explained that the total on the first task are not correct, as they add up to \$72,122 and not \$70,315. T. Donoghue asked if this was an Excel spreadsheet and D. Wilson said it was. W. Buckley asked when we consider when a Task is completed. D. Wilson said by the invoicing. W. Buckley next said based on their invoice we are 80% completed on Task 1. What do we actually have to prove it is 80% complied? D. Wilson said nothing. W. Buckley said no preliminary report? D. Wilson concurred. D. Wilson also shared that there was something that Woodard & Curran needed from us. In the initial contract the Flood Study cost looked reasonable. Through their work they discovered that no FEMA flood maps exist between the outlet of Bantam Lake and the Stoddard Road bridge-so the plant area has not been studied. Even though D. Wilson made it clear that was the case from the get go. This led to a discussion that the additional work would have to be added to the current signed contract. D. Wilson stated that it was their miss, but Woodard & Curran said it would have to be paid for, as it was not detailed in the original scope of work. D. Wilson began negotiating the possible costs with Woodard & Curran. One proposal was this suggestion. It has come to Woodard & Curran's attention that Woodridge Lake Sewer District (WLSD) was going forward and constructing a new treatment plant, and if that was the case then the funds required by the contract to do that study could then be moved over to this task of creating a flood map and surveying the Bantam River. This claim was not accurate, as T. Donoghue spoke with the CT DEEP and WLSD was not on the next Priority List for such a project. This claim came from a perspective sub-consultant for the possible project. D. Wilson thought that there was enough cost hours built into the existing contract to do this part of the flood study, but then it was suggested by Woodard & Curran that the cost of the project to study WLSD-which was upwards of \$50,000 could be moved to cover this part of the flood study in Task 1, which D. Wilson thought that was way too high. Woodard & Curran then revised the estimate and proposed an Amendment to the current contract at a cost \$11,300. This would include a Stream Survey, River Flood Elevation Modeling, and a final Flood Elevation Map. D. Wilson stated that this study and the plant hydraulics must be done first before any other tasks can proceed, as this will drive everyone thought the process in the right direction. If not then we will waste time and go in the wrong direction. W. Buckley stated that the Flood Study should have been done as part of Task 1. D. Wilson said "yes". T. Donoghue then mentioned that we were awarded \$35,000 in ARPA funds by the tax payers that can be used to pay for this Amendment to cover the cost of the Flood Resiliency Study. D. Wilson said yes, but W. Buckley stated "you are missing the point" as we think it was part of the original contract and that we shouldn't have to pay anything for it. W. Buckley said that we don't want to pay \$35,000 more and D. Wilson agreed. W. Buckley said he was not comfortable paying the \$11,300 even though we have the money. W. Buckley said that this was part of Task 1, and that they have billed us \$58,000 of the \$79,000m, and they have not even started the Flood Study. W. Buckley asked D. Wilson if that was the case and he said they have shot the plant but not the cross sections of the Bantam River yet and the HEC-RAS (A hydrologic modeling program used for water surface profiles for stream flows.) for flows. D. Wilson did look at the study that Fuss & O'Neil did for the Stoddard Road Bridge and looked at elevation rises for the 100 and 500 years flood events. He looked at NEWEA studies, which now have changed the tech standard had added in the 500 years storm plus 3 or 4 feet, and that is what blew the Torrington plant upgrade costs up by 25%. We need that study first before everyone gets planning.

W. Buckley said "OK", now let's go back to Task 1. They want \$11,300 more for the Flood Study. W. Buckley asked T. Donoghue how much they billed us for the first three invoices. T. Donoghue stated invoice one was for \$6,766.70, invoice 2 was \$20,605.64-not \$27,372.31 which was the total of the first two which was a mistake on T. Donoghue's part, and the last invoice was \$31,317.50 for a total of \$58,689.81. W. Buckley asked the total cost for Task 1. D. Wilson said it was \$79,315. T. Donoghue then showed the proposed Amendment from Woodard & Curran to the Commissioner's in the room and explained what we would get for the \$11,330. W. Buckley acknowledged he understood that cost, but then asked what we got for the \$58,000. T. Donoghue explained that there is a cover

sheet, which details what was completed for each invoice, than a breakdown of the billable hours for their personnel, and then any other outstanding fees or expenses. Again W. Buckley asked what they have given us. T. Donoghue said they have not given us anything as of yet. W. Buckley simply wants to get that on the record, and continued by saying we are going to pay them \$59,000-out of \$79,000, and we don't even have a preliminary report yet? W. Buckley is troubled by that and feels that they could come back next month and claim they need more money to complete Task1. He went on to say that we have no way of knowing that because they have not logged it on an AIA Form. T. Donoghue suggested we should invite them to the next WPCA meeting. W. Buckley said we are not going to pay them the \$58,000. T. Donoghue said that we had already paid the first invoice of \$6,766.57. D. Wilson said we had not approved it and T. Donoghue said it was approved at the July meeting. W. Buckley said let's deal with the two outstanding invoices, so we have \$20,605.64 and \$31,317.50. So until we get a better break down, W. Buckley's calculation is that we pay \$22,661 toward the two invoices. T. Donoghue suggested we can pay the August 10th invoice. D. Wilson said we do not want to pay any invoices completely. W. Buckley agreed with that position. D. Wilson asked if W. Buckley had a percent we should consider paying, instead of the \$58,900 W. Buckley said he did and he understands what D. Wilson was asking for. S. Post stated that so far we don't have any data or reports from them? T. Donoghue shared that he has spent a lot of the time speaking with the team and giving them data about the plant, and has given a lot of information about the plant and what occurs when we have problems, including the event we had the day before related to the microburst of rain, He emailed photos and flow data detailing what exactly happened, so that they have a better understanding of the challenges we have faced historically. He went on to say there is much that has happened, but the flood resiliency is still not done, and it has been six months into this study. W. Buckley said he does not want to talk about that because none of the invoices reflect the flood study. T. Donoghue said we paid for the survey- it was technically billed on the third invoice, and D. Wilson reiterate that all the elevations were only shot on the pant side of the river. T. Donoghue said yes, because they thought we had FEMA maps, even after we told them they did not exist from the get go

W. Buckley said we should pay them 70 % of the two outstanding invoices and D. Wilson said we will pay them the rest when we can understand what they have completed. W. Buckley feels that we do not owe them the rest yet, we have nothing in front of me that shows they are as far head as they are saying on the invoices. So he will put it into a motion. D. Wilson then asked C. Bratina what he thought. He agreed with W. Buckley but felt it would be important for W. Buckley and D. Wilson to reach out to Woodard & Curran and share our concerns. C. Bratina went on to say he was disappointed that they did not break it down by the sub-tasks, but he is comfortable with them showing the breakdown of the tasks completed and not done in their reports. He asked if they are they going to complete Task 1 for the \$79,000 that they proposed, as he thinks that is what we all expect. W. Buckley said the problem is I that that they disagree that the flood study that was part of Task 1 number, and that they want a change order in the amount of \$11,300 to do it. That is C. Bratina's understanding of it, but he agrees with D. Wilson position that it should've been pretty clear to them that we didn't have the FEMA Maps, and they could have checked to see if they weren't sure, but he feels the price is reasonable. If D. Wilson and W. Buckley speak with them, we will get to a better meeting of the minds with them, and he tends to agree with W. Buckley's suggestion to make a partial payment, but we need to talk to them about it and he does not want Woodard & Curran to stop work over this. D. Wilson agreed that we do not want them to stop, but that we need the Flood Resiliency Study.

W. Buckley asked D. Wilson how he got to the \$11,300 amount. He is comfortable talking to them about paying the 70% of the last two invoices but he ask D. Wilson if he had negotiated with them, and D. Wilson explained that he did negotiate over it with them. The first go around they wanted \$55,000 and he said no. When he asked them, they said that they would take the WLSD money. W, Buckley asked if he was speaking with Mike Headd and D. Wilson said no, he was talking with the

2nd in command on the project, Tom Schwartz. W. Buckley asked D. Wilson what he thought of the \$11,330 number. D. Wilson said the \$11,300 is a decent number for what they are proposing to do. W. Buckley asked is it in the written change order. D. Wilson said yes it is and he does not want to be at complete odds straight off. W. Buckley said if we issue this change order to Task 1, when they invoice us next time, they should have all the Task1 broken down by each sub-tasks including this change order. Every contractor I work with does this. C. Bratina agreed and said that is we are changing the value of the task, then it needs to be reflected in the proper invoicing. D. Wilson said they have made that proposal with us. D. Wilson got the flow study down to \$11, 300. He has no problem calling Mike Headd and telling him we are only paying 70% of the two most recent invoices in absence of then not sending us anything, it leaves us no choice. T. Donoghue asked to make a suggestion to the Board, as he is frustrated on how long this study is now taking. That he strongly suggested that D. Wilson and C. Bratina, and he meet with Woodard & Curran once a month before the WPCA meeting so that they can properly update the Commission at the WPCA meeting and not simply just present an invoice. T. Donoghue went on to say he is having conversations with the engineers, D. Wilson is having conversations, we are sharing data and you all need to know that they are threading the needle here, as you feel they are not doing anything, and they are but this project is going way too slow. W. Buckley said T. Donoghue was totally out of line, and if he felt they weren't doing anything I would not pay them anything. He asked rhetorically to T. Donoghue "do you think I am paying them 70 % because I think they are doing nothing?" "Is that what you are suggesting?" T. Donoghue stated it is clear that W. Buckley is frustrated. W. Buckley said he is not frustrated at all, and we have a fiduciary responsibility like all the members here at this table to ensure we get what we are spending money on. T. Donoghue said the problem is that all the communication is going through D. Wilson. W. Buckley said that this Commission voted that all communication should go through D. Wilson and C. Bratina. T. Donoghue acknowledge that and shared he does not think it is the best course of action moving forward and just wanted that noted for the record,

Motion: W, Buckley put forth a motion that we pay only 70% of the two outstanding invoices owed to Woodard & Curran, on the conditions that we need a better break down of Task 1, S. Post seconded and there was the following discussion. C. Bratina requested that both D. Wilson and W. Buckley reach out and discuss with Woodard & Curran our concerns of how much work has actually been done so far. W. Buckley agreed and D. Wilson stated he has negotiated with Woodard & Curran concerning the Amendment for the Flood Resiliency Study regarding the flood study change order. W, Buckley said he wanted to separate the two issues, as he feels D. Wilson has already worked that out with Woodard & Curran. C. Bratina agreed with D. Wilson on the change order. All members voted "aye" and the motion carried.

Motion: D. Wilson put forth a motion that we issue a change order for the proposal dated 8/23/23, for completion of the flood resiliency study at the treatment plant for \$11.300. C. Bratina seconded and there was the following discussion. D. Wilson stated that this task must be completed first, and once completed we can move forward with the rest of the study, C. Bratina requested a summary report when Task 1 is finally completed. W. Buckley said if we are going to do anything with invoices, we will do it next month. All members voted "aye" and the motion carried.

- 4) **Distillery and Arethusa Discussion:** D. Wilson reported that he, C. Bratina, and T. Donoghue wen to the Litchfield Distillery to walk through their operation. Based on sample data C. Bratina ran some numbers on what might be an appropriate surcharge for them based on the sampling we have conducted so far. They do have a low flow, but their loading for BOD, TSS, FOG, Nitrogen and Phosphorus in the neighborhood of 10% of the plants loading, similar to Arethusa, so this would constitute them as a "Significant Industrial User" (SUI). As a result of this discovery that will need s permit issued by the CT DEEP to discharge- which we will administer and control, which is the same for Arethusa Dairy. They say they have taken some actions to reduce their

discharge. They will need a permit from DEEP to discharge. D. Wilson shared that Arethusa's SIU permit somehow fell through the cracks at the DEEP which explains why they have never been issued a permit by the DEEP for the WPCA to review. The two users combine flows to equal 20% of the plants loading. In regards to the Distillery, they have long floor drains under tank discharges and they don't have a suitable sampling spot. They need to install a good sampling location so we can get good sound data. T. Donoghue shared that the sampler they had set up there failed due to the temperature of the discharge- it is around 100 degrees, compromising the vinyl tubing and another possible issue is with the percent solids of the discharge stressing the vacuum pump. T. Donoghue will speak with the manufacture about this issue. D. Wilson shared that they have made some minor modifications to when they are discharging-one load is going out after 11:00 PM, and some other items. We will have to see if this has made any real impact on the loading. We got their attention and now we have to sit down again with them to see they develop a plan. S. Post inquired what the concerns are. T. Donoghue said it was BOD, TSS, TKN, T-P, and FOG. W. Buckley asked if they have a consultant. T. Donoghue said "no", and Arethusa doesn't either, claiming they don't have the money. W. Buckley responded that they say to themselves why they should hire a consultant when they are dumping for nothing. D. Wilson said C. Bratina ran the known loading through a revised surcharging spreadsheet and the number he came up with was over \$95,000. W. Buckley asked how we came up with the \$95,000. C. Bratina shared that he modified the existing workbook T. Donoghue was using, which was emailed to the board, and calculated our cost to treat all the parameters, and what their share should be. D. Wilson sent the draft copy to both the Distillery and Arethusa whose charge would be around \$48,000. He suggested meeting with both of them by next month to hammer out a Pretreatment Agreement so they start paying the revised rates as soon as possible. Once they start paying the revised rates, they will make great efforts to reduce their discharge. The current sample location at the Distillery is not the best and the results may not be very accurate, but it is their responsibility to install a better one. We did meet with Chris from Arethusa and he said he would try to minimize their peaking factor. Both Arethusa and the Distillery discharge over a short period of time which shocks our biological process. So we want them to spread out their discharge over the day, at least over a 10-12 hour period.

The Distillery may need a larger storage tank. T. Donoghue reported that they discharge three times a day, and they have delayed their last discharge so it is over night. He said the high loading over a short period of time causes a high food to mass ratio which encourages filamentous bacteria. Mr. Bratina reported that the current collected data shows that the Distillery is 19% of our BOD loading, and 5% of TSS loading. Arethusa is 8 % of BOD and 4% of their TSS loading. The bottom line is that we must work out a written Pretreatment Agreement with them that delineates what their charges will be, for them to set up a permanent sampling location, and have them discharge be over a longer period of time. W. Buckley asked if they pay the surcharge then will they not reduce their loading and wanted to know what as a Board must we do. C. Bratina stated that Woodard & Curran will review all the plant loadings and it could require them to pay for an increase in our plant capacity at their cost. However at this point in time with our low plant flows and effective treatment, it looks like we can handle their loading as long as the BOD is spread out over time. W. Buckley asked what we must do to bring them to the table. C. Bratina suggested that we present our Pretreatment Agreement which they can either agree to or stop discharging as they are not in compliance with our Sewer Use Ordinance. D. Wilson said we want to get this in place before DEEP makes a move so it reflects our needs. T. Donoghue noted that breweries in Vermont have treatment systems and use land disposal, and there is a farmer who could take their waste but they need to get state permits. W. Buckley summarized that there are technologies available to lower their discharge to us, but they have not done it. C. Bratina advised that further treatment is expensive but there are companies in Connecticut and Massachusetts that would take these

commercial wastes. Once our businesses see what their surcharge costs will be, they may find it cheaper to haul their wastes offsite.

Motion: W. Buckley put forth a motion that if the Litchfield Distillery should be charge a surcharge of \$91,000 for the high strength wastewater they are discharging into our system. , the Chairman can work out the details, until such time as they lower their discharge to meet our standards, put in proper treatment, or find alternate disposal. It was seconded by S. Post. D. Wilson had some serious concerns about charging this amount, as he was not confident that our sampling of their waste stream was representative of their discharge. T. Donoghue thought it was relatively accurate, but improvements will be made to the sampling. W. Buckley felt that this surcharge would motivate the Distillery to make the necessary changes and not aversively impact the plant and our residential customer, who he believes are helping to subsidize the cost of treating this wastewater. His intention is to get them motivated and not paying a high surcharge would be a good motivator, C. Bratina stated that we had sent them a copy of the draft Pretreatment Agreement, and suggested that we meet with them in October to finalize it. That surcharge fee in that agreement varies with the flow and strength of their discharge. We do need them to install a permanent sampling location so the results will be more accurate. As part of this agreement, they would pay the cost for the analysis of these samples and send the results to us. W. Buckley stressed if they receive the surcharge bill that this will motivate them. W. Buckley rescinded this motion, as did the seconder, and it was not voted on.

Motion: W. Buckley put forth a motion to encourage Litchfield Distillery to enter into an agreement with the Litchfield WPCA to discharge their wastewater before November 1, 2023. In the absence of a Pretreatment Agreement not being signed in October, then we would issue the \$91,000 surcharge based on our current calculations until such time as a Pretreatment Agreement is executed. S. Post seconded. S. Post felt that this business could afford this surcharge. T. Donoghue noted that this is almost 10% of our revenue. W. Buckley noted that this is not a fine, it is calculated based on our ordinance. He encourages them to come up with a plan that is beneficial to both us and them. T. Donoghue noted that we are meeting with them next week. W. Buckley stressed that we have to protect the environment, and that they should fix the sampling location issue. D. Wilson advised that they are working on it. All members voted “aye” and the motion carried.

Motion: W. Buckley put forth a motion to encourage Arethusa dairy to enter into a Pretreatment Agreement with the Litchfield WPCA to discharge their wastewater before November 1, 2023. If the agreement is not signed then we would issue the \$41,000 surcharge based on our current calculations until such time as a Pretreatment Agreement is executed. S. Post seconded. T. Donoghue noted that their last bill was about \$16,000 just based on the BOD. There was no discussion and all members voted “aye” and the motion carried.

C. Bratina noted that our staff will need to continue taking samples of each company regularly during the month for the surcharge calculation until such time as the Pretreatment Agreement is in force. This will enable us to know what to bill them. T. Donoghue noted that Arethusa only takes one grab sample per week, we need composite samples.

5) **Solar Project Update:** T. Donoghue had to pay for another 6 month extension of the ZREC, due to the delay in completing this project. It costs \$6.610 and will be reimbursed to the WPCA once the project is completed. D. Wilson shared they are revising the site plan to flatten the grade on the current site, as he does not want it to look like the array at the High School, they will also add various plantings to give it better curb appeal. T. Donoghue asked if they need to back to P & Z to modify the site plan. D. Wilson said no. It has been brought to our attention that there are supply chain issues with the posts now, so that could delay the project as well. The other big thing is running the electrical cables down to the main building.

6) **NPDES Permit Update:** T. Donoghue said he had no update, but he is trying to find a work around on the UV dose issue.

7) **WPCA Tax Collector:** D. Wilson shared that the WPCA is in a little bit of a stew, as the BOS voted to go to the Town Attorney to review the proposal to use Hellen Bunnell as the Acting WPCA tax collector and make sure it is legitimate. M. Rybak came back with numerous different answers. D. Rapp and J. Zulu questioned how we will pay, as the tax collector is an elected position, and Finance stated a town employee cannot have a 1099(sub-contractor) and be paid FT by the town. There are additional costs that may have to be addressed, FICA, insurance. The usage bills have been mailed out. T. Donoghue has noticed some irregularities with the mailings. The fiancé Director thought QuickBooks was “too simple” but they did do the upload to Q- Public. D. Wilson thinks Munis is too cumbersome. D. Rapp said that any work who does work for the WPCA should be compensated, which is mainly the assistant that work with. H. Bunnell. D. Wilson stated the best way to move forward is that H. Bunnell created her own book keeping company. It is now in the hands of the BOS, as M. Rybak gave his opinion.

8) **2022 Annual Report:**

Motion: D. Wilson put forth a motion to table the 2022 Annual Report agenda item. S. Post seconded, and there was no discussion. All members voted “aye” and the motion carried.

9) **Commissioner’s Request:** W. Buckley wanted to follow up from a topic discussed two meetings ago in which the WPCA discuss the idea of running sanitary sewers around Bantam Lake. D. Wilson spoke with D. Rapp and she was not interested in moving this forward. T. Donoghue mentioned that the majority of the homes on the lake, are within the Town of Morris, and it would make sense that the Morris WPCA make a decision about such an idea. D. Wilson mentioned that in the past residents on North Shore road did not want to pay an assessment to connect to the sanitary sewers. W. Buckley reiterated that his point was to have sturdy commissioned on septic systems and how they might be impacting Bantam Lake. D. Wilson once again, states as a Town, the Litchfield BOS is not interested in this idea at this time.

W. Buckley shared that C. Harding is not seeking reelection on the BOS. D. Wilson said that is correct and after the election the BOS will appoint a new liaison to the WPCA.

10) **Public Works/Treatment Plant Report**

a) **Easements:** No report.

- We processed a total of 217,100 gallons of septage during the month of August a 7% decrease over last August. YTD we are down 10.5%.
 - For August effluent BOD removal percent was 99% and TSS removal percent was 98%. The minimal removal rates per our NPDES permit is 85%.
 - The daily average of Total Nitrogen lbs. /day discharged into the Bantam River was 4.3 mg/l or 14.0 lbs. /day. Our daily limit is 24 lbs. /day.
 - The daily average for Total Phosphorous discharged in the Bantam River was 2.8 mg/l. or 9.7 lbs. /day. The monthly average cannot exceed 3.7 mg/l and our daily maximum cannot exceed 7.43 mg/l.
 - On 8/1/ & 8/2/23 we replaced two manhole frames on Westover St. in preparation or paving project.
 - On 8/3/23 installed new properly sized manhole covers on Meadow St, in preparation for paving project.
 - On 8/8/23, Dave, Christian, and Ted had a tour of Litchfield Distillery.
 - On 8/9/23 installed new Pro Rings and 5 new water tight composite manhole frames on the interceptor line.
 - 8/14 to 8/20/23 Ted was on vacation, Joe lead the team and no had no major issues to deal with,
 - On 8/21/23 H.O. Penn installed new control panel on the Northfield generator.
 - On 8/22/23 we installed two more water tight composite manhole frames on the interceptor line. We have two more to do.
 - On 8/24/23 we reported a Monitoring Equipment Failure for the influent sampler, as the condenser failed, and we could not sample properly.
 - On 8/31 Dave, Christian, and Joe meet with Chris from Arethusa to discuss loading from the dairy.
- c) **Collection System Work:** T. Donoghue shared that they have been doing much work utilizing the Pro- Rings and composite water tight manhole frames and covers over the last several weeks. They fixed three more manholes on the White Woods interceptor line, and only have two more to do. These final two need to be grouted first before they are raised and make them water tight. They will rent docks to traverse the 40 ft. across the water to reach and then have Green Mountain come in and do the required grouting and concrete work to finish this section. T. Donoghue hopes to do this with in a couple week. Years to date they have repaired and grouted 49 manholes. D. Wilson shared that we will also hire Green Mountain to CCTV Torrington Road, due to the tough environment with the traffic. We expect to CCTV between 9000-11,000 linear feet. This will push us up to over 15% of the collection completed this year. After this project is completed they will finish jetting and plan on doing some smoke testing too.
- 11) Financial Report:** T. Donoghue reported that FY 23 was officially closed this week, and that he will be able to get the Fund Balance number for the Board. Go through August's expenses, some of the big ticket item under 3201-52111 were Acting tax collector invoice for \$3,545, Green mountain (Grouting & Concrete work) \$4,750, EML for \$1,962 and Synagro for \$8152. Under plant supplies 3202-51106 \$1,890 for 10 manhole covers for Meadow St. Pro-Rings for water proofing manholes \$4,257. Under Plant repairs we updated the control panel and block heater on the Northfield Generator for \$12,300. For electricity the plant was \$6,647, Northfield \$1,207 and the six month extension on the ZREC was \$6,610. T. Donoghue will spend more money over the next month on the collection system as they continue to water proof manholes in wetland areas. All other spending will begin to slow due to the fall season approaching.
- 12) Old Business:** None presented.

13) Adjournment:

Motion: W. Buckley moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:30PM. S. Post seconded and there was no discussion. All members voted “aye’ and the motion carried.

Terrence Donoghue
Interim Recording Secretary