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

CALL TO ORDER: David Wilson called the regular September meeting of the Litchfield WPCA to order at 7:37 PM.

ROLL CALL
Present: Members present were Dave Wilson, William Buckley Christian Bratina, and the newest member Ken Merz, Also present was Ted Donoghue, Plant Superintendent.
Absent: Sky Post, David Geiger, John Bongiorno- BOS liaison, and Raz Alexe, Public Works Director,

SEATING ALTERNATICES: None seated.

MINUTES: Motion: None presented.

BUSINESS

1) **Public Request and or Comment:** None presented. D. Wilson explain to K. Merz that we have this first on the agenda, to address any issues or concerns that are not on the agenda for the meeting tonight.
2) **Update on Torrington Inter-municipal Agreement:** D. Wilson spoke with Ray Drew- City of Torrington Public Works Director, and there is no bill issued yet for FY 23. It will be coming soon, as well as a version of the bill under the proposed new IMA agreement, before Christmas E. Tousey told T. Donoghue the FY 23 bill will be around $88,000 in total. W. Buckley in commenting about the proposed IMA pointed out that we should only be billed our percentage of shared capital costs for only the sections of the collection system that only carry our flow to their treatment plant. We should not pay capital cost on a pump station that our flow does not go through. Their proposal has us not paying any less than any customer of the Torrington WPCA would pay. K. Merz asked how much that would be. C. Bratina said that is what we will find out. W. Buckley said what we should do is put the numbers that we want to pay into the draft agreement to see what the usage and capital charges might be. K. Merz asked what we are trying to do with Torrington. D. Wilson said this is the IMA for our flows that go to the Torrington treatment plant. W. Buckley explained that under the old IMA, that has us reserving 150,000 GPD, and we normally flow only 25,000 GPM and we only want to reserve 50,000 GPD for this new IMA, thus we would pay a third of the new capital costs-which would lower our costs even though they just bonded improvements to their plant, and they feel they will raise the cost for us. D. Wilson feels that their proposed IMA is based on past negotiations with Woodridge Lake Sewer District (WLSD). During that time USDA was giving loans to rural areas and thus they would not offer more funding for the project of WLSD connecting to Torrington since it was technically a municipality. That is why they approached the Litchfield WPCA about a possible IMA. D. Wilson will expect this draft before Christmas. R. Drew said the new proposed usage and capital charges are " not that bad"

3) **Woodard & Curran Update:** Tom Schwartz, a Senior Project Manager at Woodard & Curran, called into the meeting at 7:40 PM to update the Commission on the status of the ongoing engineering study. T. Schwartz said they were finishing up the modeling report and that they would forward it to D. Wilson and C. Bratina tomorrow. T. Schwartz said everyone can review it and get back to us. C. Bratina did have some questions, T. Schwartz explained that the gentlemen who prepared the modeling analysis would be better suited to speak to the WPCA on behalf of the report he had prepared.

T. Schwartz sent over a Technical memo on Wednesday on the two Intensification Summary- which was a field trip to Pennsylvania to see the BioMag® and InDENSE systems, as options to lower SVI's. It was very productive and the two locations each had favorable results in reducing SVI's. The technical memo addressed what it would entail to do a full scale trial, which we could only do with the INDENSE system. There will be ramifications for plugging it in to our system, and everyone will need to understand that. It is outlined in the technical summary, and T. Schwartz would like to discuss this with us in more details after we all read the memo. D. Wilson said that they installed an InDENSE trial in the Greater New Haven WPCA plant. T. Schwartz said yes, they did and started it three weeks ago, and he will reach out to them next week so we could plan a visit once they get through two or three SRT periods running the trial on the InDENSE system to achieve a steady state. T. Donoghue mentioned that he spoke with Gary- from GNHWPCA on Monday and they are seeing some promising results on the underflow, which is the biomass that is wasted from the system. Their plant is much larger and they carry a much higher MLSS than us too, around 6,000 mg/l. The issues they have with filament, are different types than we generally see at our plant. When they went to the Ephrata plant, it is a much bigger plant than Litchfield, but they have similar waste streams coming into the plant with numerous industrial food manufacturers coming into their plant, with high FOG and high biological loading as well as historically high SVI's. The operators at that plant shared that the InDENSE has this situation pretty much under control, and they don't even operate this system year round. They only bring it online when they begin to have problems a couple weeks. Their SVI's have been substantially lower over the last two year. He will try to review some data on the performance.

Next up was the plant in Leesport, PA- which was about 30 minutes from the Ephrata plant. At this plant they use a full scale BioMag® system set up on a tractor trailer bed. They went through a construction period, and only had half of their reactors online, the plant is a Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBR) plant, and were not meeting their NPDES permit during construction. They brought in this system as all treatment had to occur in one tank. The team there was very happy with the performance of this system and T. Schwartz mentioned that our WWCF would use the same size unit, and having it all in a container on a trailer was easy to see and give you an idea of the foot print we may need. Both systems seem to perform well. T. Schwartz asked how we would like to proceed. C. Bratina asked if there was any performance data on the two processes. T. Schwartz said he saw some basic data from the Ephrata plant that he can share, but they are not openly sharing it with visitors. He feels we can get more of the data from the Biomag® system, but he will reach out to other plants with the InDENSE system, as there was some sensitivity around their data but he did not press them on it. It is too bad we could not get more data out of Ephrata, as their plant is very similar, whereas other plants will be different and they will be more variables to consider. We should be able to get data out of New Haven, so that will be good. The limited data from Ephrata showed lower SVI's from the system being on line, which is encouraging. C. Bratina said we need good performance data to compare the two systems as we need to determine which process is more cost effective. T. Schwartz noted that both manufactures are recommending bench tests for comparison. The BioMag® people just need some bench area in our lab for 3 or 4 days to run their bench tests, and based on the results they could design a system for us. They do not want to run a pilot-, which they typically do not do, as they don't see the need for it as they are quite confident in their lab work and will guarantee the system.

InDENSE will not design a system just off lab bench test, as they really prefer to run a full scale trial. The memo outlines what the InDENSE system would need, which would be temporary full-sized unit. We did make a guess for potential costs of this trial, but we would need temporary pumps, .electrical, and piping to connect the skid. If we want to do the trail, like New Haven, we need to accurately estimate what the expenses would be as the WPCA would have to pay for them.

C. Bratina next asked if one of either of these systems worked as advertised, we would not need to upgrade the existing secondary clarifiers. T. Schwartz answered that yes we would not need to upgrade to larger secondary clarifiers if we can get sub 100 ml/l SVIs so we could use the existing tanks. He will double check with A. Brennan but if this is the case, it can change the trajectory of the project. If we can't get the SVI's under 100 ml/l, then we would have to upgrade or expand the existing secondary clarifiers, as the two older ones are way under sized. T. Donoghue next asked if we keep the existing secondary clarifiers, we at the very least would have to upgrade the existing RAS system. He agreed that yes we would, due to the limiting pumping capacity of this current system, so it is still on the planning table.

W. Buckley next asked about the flood resiliency study, and inquired if there are any "show stoppers." T. Schwartz answered that we are showing that the 100 year flood lines do enter the plant. The flood lines do not look threatening, however when you look at TR 16 guidelines and what is recommended for non-critical infrastructure is the 100 flood year elevation plus 2 feet. For critical infrastructure it is the 100 year flood elevation plus 3 feet, and there is a little debate of what "critical" means. When you show the existing flood elevation map, we are inundating tanks at the plant, or very close to it. We have to review the modeling numbers. When we are all comfortable with that, we will have to speak with the team at CT DEEP, Ivonne and Sayid as we all know what happened in Torrington, to get their input. In Enfield the DEEP forced us to build a berm to protect the plant, or we could not get Clean Water funding-even though there was not a lot of FEMA data and we were not building a new plant. The bottom line is that they take a very conservative approach when it comes to flood resiliency planning and construction work. TR 16 does have a very clear statement in it, in an existing facility it is very challenging and expensive to put in these new resiliency measures. So there should be a cost analysis for this planning. Rhode Island DEM does have it, but is up to the state to enforce these guidelines. We have to find out where the DEEP may stand on this type of planning. W. Buckley asked if Woodard & Curran is comfortable with the modeling that you did. He also asked should we ask for a map revision or LOMAR's. T. Schwartz is not a hydrological expert, he has a team which has done the very same thing for other clients and towns and he depends on them to put a flood zone on a map, which does not currently exist. We can put a line on a map, as there is no actually FEMA map for this location, but he is comfortable that they are meeting the industry standards and this map can be used for insurance purposes and for design purposes. It will need to be sealed and stamped by a professional engineer, before it is submitted to the state. If there are any concerns, we will talk it through.

D. Wilson next asked for a comparison of what his team did and what Fuss & O' Neil did for the Stoddard Road bridge reconstruction project. D. Wilson next asked can we get the hydrology from the Fuss & O' Neill study, so that we can make the file whole again. T. Swartz responded that Fuss & O'Neil referenced a study from 1985, and we would not use it as it does not meet any standard we would currently use, plus it drastically under estimated stream flow at that location. So we would not use their report or data, instead we chose to use USGS stream stat data, with appropriate caveats which will be noted on the report which has to do with Bantam Lake and upstream storage. So to answer D. Wilson's question, no we did not use it at all as it was not appropriate for this purpose.

W. Buckley said before we start thinking about building a berm, we not stamp and seal the flood map so don/t box ourselves in. If we impound water in a waterway we could have a bigger problem. T. Schwartz agreed and he is not saying the berm is a solution or an answer as it was in Enfield. There are ramification if we decide to go that way. D. Wilson thanked T. Schwartz who said it will email tomorrow. We can go over their study when you are ready. D. Wilson said there is markedly different numbers between the Fuss study and Woodard & Curran. W. Buckley asked did they not use the 1955 flood numbers. D. Wilson said no as they have to use acceptable inputs that take into

consideration new IDF (Intensity, Duration, Frequency) curves for precipitation that address certain areas, especially between here and the Hudson River, as there are now substantial differences due to climate, but these new guidelines are very cost prohibitive, even the CT DOT is not using them. W. Buckley want to ensure we don't use the wrong standard. D. Wilson says we should follow TR-16 guidelines. Regarding the map they provided, the flow lines don't match up in his opinion to the site, he believes it is flatter on the north side of the river on the West Morris Rd side. C. Bratina said they have a wide flood area at the head of the plant and he thought we would have issues down at the discharge end of the plant at the UV system, but that is not the case and it is confusing. T. Donoghue commented that for the late September storm, they saw over banking on the north side of the plant, and no issues at the discharge pipe into the river. C. Bratina asked how much it over banked, as this would be helpful to show the engineers. T. Donoghue said not much, just lapping over, and he did send photos of that storm event to T. Schwartz and his team with all the rainfall data. T. Donoghue said that at the discharge end it does bottle neck, and the velocity of the flow increase dramatically but there is no overbanking. C. Bratina said the river elevation drops 8 ft. as it goes past the plant, which is an amazing drop. W. Buckley asked when they put in that new bridge. D. Wilson thought it was four years ago but it was actually 2011. T. Donoghue was shown the map, in which the head of the plant shows flooding. D. Wilson said we need more information and the person who did the modeling is pretty sharp, but no one at Woodard & Curran can explain it. They know we will be asking questions. W. Buckley asked where the Shepaug tunnel is. T. Donoghue said it about 1,000 ft. upstream from the north gate, and that they actually had to raise the interceptor to get over the top of it.

4) **Distillery and Arethusa Discussion:** D. Wilson began by sharing that Mr. Baker had signed the Pretreatment Agreement and they will begin billing them monthly. One of their question was how does this benefit us? We know it benefits your users. We can take their surcharges and use that amount to offset charges for all of our users. W. Buckley want to ensure that we are not subsidizing them. When we applied for our NPDES permit renewal, we determined that both the Distillery are Arethusa are Significant Industrial Users (SIU) that contribute more than 5% of the plant's loading. K. Merz asked are business like the Distillery not supposed to be discharging their wastewater into our collection system. Instead should they be going to a digester such as the one in Southington, CT.? D. Wilson and C. Bratina both said that that is an option, but D. Wilson stressed that so is pretreatment which can ensure it is acceptable to the waste we want. If it is double the normal strength, then we would require pretreatment. W. Buckley said the two locations are close to the plant, so they do not get much dilution of their waste before it reaches the WPCF, it would be less of an impact on the plant. C. Bratina said it is a significant amount of pounds of loading to the plant, for which their payment can help lower rates to all of our users. K. Merz stated that doesn't this extra loading increase our sludge production. D. Wilson said it does, so parameters such as BOD, FOG, Nitrogen TSS, and Phosphorus will be surcharged. T. Donoghue said that we want to encourage them to pretreat or side stream their waste stream. We should be mindful when we do the budget to not over predict what the surcharge could be, as they could install additional pretreatment that will lower their loading and thus lower any future surcharges. Typically we remove 98-99% of BOD and TSS loading that enters the plant, and we see about 1,000 lbs. /day of loading enter the plant. The majority of this is removed biologically and through the use of aeration for which electricity is a substantial cost. We also take in septage and have Arethusa, so in regards to sludge production we do not break it down by a percent of each customer. It is also a very fluid process, and sludge production does vary throughout the year, so it is not always an exact science. K. Merz asked isn't the sludge coming in the same regardless if coming 98% water or 50% water, isn't it the same pounds coming in. Both D. Wilson and T. Donoghue said that is not the case. What we physical remove from the process in Waste Activated Sludge (WAS) along with primary sludge, is what has to be thickened and removed from the site to be incinerated. We do co-mingle our sludge and that can lead to settling issues when we have filaments in the process. Most plants keep

these two sludge's separate. WAS is typically put into a gravity thickening tank, and is allowed to settle and then the filtrate is decanted back into the plant to allow the solids to be greater in concentration before they are dewatered. One of the goals working with Woodard and Curran is to look at this process and make it much more efficient and cost effective. We did invest in a new polymer mixing station, and we are seeing reduced cost for the current FY across the board, which would be polymer usage, and how many trucks we haul out each month. This sludge dewater process is one of the most expensive processes of our operation, as it is even more expensive than electricity. D. Wilson signed the Distillery Pretreatment Agreement early tonight. We have not gotten together with Arethusa to finalize their Pretreatment Agreement. They are working with the CT DEEP with their discharge permit, which was lost and not finished, so that has been a big delay as they need it to actually discharge into our system. W. Buckley was glad it is finally done, since we have talked about it for quite some time. D. Wilson wants to set up another meeting with Arethusa to finalize this agreement. T. Donoghue had spoken with C. Casiello and he had comments about the draft version that was sent to him. T. Donoghue asked him to put his comments into a formal email, so we could review them. That had not occurred yet, as this is the busiest time of the year for the dairy. The Commission felt he could make the time to deal with this. D. Wilson asked T. Donoghue to set up another meeting with C. Casiello on Monday.

5) **2022 Annual Report:** D. Wilson had given T. Donoghue some comments to include, how many connection we have and how we have grown. C. Bratina had some comments he emailed out earlier in the day to include some pictures and graphs and show how we have kept sewer rates flat since 2017. D. Wilson next said he did not want to make the report "too technical." K. Merz next asked who read this. T. Donoghue said many resident do, such as Mrs. Honan. T. Donoghue explained it was a living document that they have done for the last five years. It is mainly focused on the plant and what we do, it does not cover the financial as the audit does, although we do mention the sewer rate. We talk about our challenges, and what goals we have set for ourselves, what capital investments we have made. As many residents don't know what we do at the plant until they have a problem with their toilet. C. Bratina made some good suggestions for the Appendix which T. Donoghue incorporated. This has all the technical information about the plant, including plant flow and precipitation, and how much septage we have taken in. One of the things that we are always paying attention to is the plant's design capacity, which is 0.80 MGD. If for a period of 180 consecutive days we hit 90% of that flow number or 0.72 MGD, that would trigger us having to do an engineering study to explain to the CT DEEP how we will address this. We also monitor the BOD and TSS in mg/l and lbs. /day that enter and leave the plant. We also document the nitrogen and phosphorus loading that enters and leaves, as well as the E. coli. As D. Wilson said we don't want this document to be too technical, and if residents or customers have more questions, they can always call the plant. C. Bratina commented that it is also helpful for the Board as well, the hard part is coming up with a format, that won't overwhelm people with data. D. Wilson instructed T. Donoghue to update the Appendix and submit it to the Town. K. Merz asked if the flow numbers for January were accurate. T. Donoghue explained that we have a Parshall Flume with a transducer flow meter, which we get calibrated yearly. K. Merz was looking at the septage numbers, which vary month to month. Once the winter snow arrives septage number generally drop. T. Donoghue explained that precipitation will also drastically change flows numbers. In September and October we received 7-8" of rain, but during the summer the water table drops and thus our flows at the plant will drop. When the water table rose in December the daily flow was up 200,000 GPD. W. Buckley explained that in the water business you want your reservoirs filled by July and the lowest by November, then we start building up storage after that, and the key in CT would be snow melt, but that may not be the case anymore. In November sodium would be the highest, since the water table is the lowest, in water samples. D. Wilson said that when the ground would freeze, all this rain water would be runoff and not raise the water table so quickly. K. Merz asked what the amount of ground water vs. sewage is. C. Bratina said if we look at the lowest flow month and compare it

to the highest flow month that is the amount. T. Donoghue said there is also an inflow component as well. T. Donoghue explained that the lowest we get is about 200,000 GPD with only 1,300 connections. D. Wilson said not all 1,300 connections come to the plant, we have flow that goes to Torrington and Thomaston.

K. Merz then asked how many connections actually come to the plant. We have about 160 connection from Morris, 165 users on Torrington Road and Hart Drive. They typically use 110 gallons per person on design flow for a treatment plant. W. Buckley said that is way over actual usage, due to water efficiency of appliances and low flow toilets. In Stamford they just built 4,000 units and they are averaging 96 GPD per unit. There are acceptable design criteria for I & I when building a plant, W. Buckley said it is 25 GPD per inch diameter per mile. As they are designed to leak. T. Donoghue shared that we have lots of clay tile pipe which has joints every 3 feet, and they become offset over time and ground water will leak in. W. Buckley mentioned manholes will leak if beaver's over run a section of line, water will get in that way. He mentioned the city of Boston did a study and 33% of their flow was unaccounted for. T. Donoghue said we have done a lot of work trying to find the low hanging fruit. D. Wilson mentioned that the guys now go out during rainstorm to find the flow, which is mainly from manholes.

6) **Solar Array Update**: D. Wilson said the Interconnection agreement looks like it is not accurate, as it looks like the same one that they sent before, which was wrong. T. Donoghue said that what needs to be signed is the "Process Generator Interconnection Agreement" which was approved by Eversource, and now needs to be signed by D. Rapp. D. Wilson said the photo they have attached to that agreement, Appendix H, which T. Donoghue confirmed was our ATS switch, but the electrical connection drawing does not represent our plant. And they want D. Wilson to sign it to. K. Merz asked how much power they would supply. D. Wilson said about 80% of the plant usage. D. Wilson said they need to give us something we can read. W. Buckley asked when they gave this to us. D. Wilson said just this afternoon. W. Buckley said we should table this to next month. J. Zullo said at a recent BOS meeting that they will begin mobilizing onsite in March of 2024 to start work. R. Alexe has replaced the existing culvert, which had the bottom rusted out and the last storm in September it ripped the flared off the end of the end of the pipe. The pipe was partially blocked. Raz had Towne & Aurell replace it, and they were able to get the driveway paved as well. R. Alexe asked D. Wilson if we can pick up the cost of that crossing, the bill came up to $49,370, $30,000 of 36" RCP and $19,000 for Towne & Aurell to install it. They also installed 4 electrical conduits for the future solar array connection so they would not have to dig across the road again. W. Buckley asked was it 5" conduit. T. Donoghue thinks it is 4". C. Bratina asked why we have to sign something else. T. Donoghue explained this if the Agreement for the generation of power from the array, as we will be able to back feed some of it to the grid. C. Bratina asked if this is not something we had signed before, T. Donoghue said that is correct as this was the last thing that needed to be signed. Noel Lafayette said we were waiting on Eversource for this agreement. C. Bratina said we haven't even received an accurate site plan yet. N. Lafayette also sent a 60 day update and D. Wilson asked what he said, and here it is:

> Below are the activities scheduled for the next 60 days. Funds could not be released for any construction activity until we had the Interconnection Agreement for Eversource in hand, which we received today, and Denise is signing tonight. All construction financing is 100 % secured.
>
> - Phase 1 Environmental study is complete.
> - ALTA Survey: Already contracted with Hrica Associates for this month.
> - Pull Testing – Scheduled second week of January (this determines foundation design for racking vendor to engineer from) we are trying to pull this in given holiday. We will have final answer this week on schedule.

W. Buckley asked what this is, and it seems it will be for the racking, as you pull to determine how much resistance it takes to produce a failure. We do that on micro piles, try to pull them up, and do the test until they fail. D. Wilson said J. Zullo felt it was the WPCA, who was holding up the project because we would not approve the plan to reduce the breaker on our ATS switch, but it was our engineer that discovered that we never had 1,000 amp service to begin with.

- Permit Sets – Complete 2/26. This finalized design is contingent on results from pull testing above.
- Rain garden construction and rebuilding drain channel to the river is being planned for first week April. (Trying to coordinate with Matt Blasavage this week.)

We are also working towards determining exact lead times for ordering the racking.
All of this is, as the entire construction schedule, weather dependent.
You can expect the next update in February."

D. Wilson asked T. Donoghue to forward him that email, so that he could review it later tonight, as we need more information from them. T. Donoghue asked again if D. Wilson actually needed to sign it, and D. Wilson said it was there for him to sign.

7) **NPDES Permit Update:** T. Donoghue said there was no update, but saw C. Falk at the Manager's Forum on December 11th. It seems they are still severely backed logged as they have 14 permits awaiting renewal. They only issued 3 new permits in 2023 and there are 12 more permits to review in 2024. W. Buckley asked if we still operate under the old permit and T. Donoghue explained that the expired NPDEA permit is still in effect. We still have not even discussed the comments that we sent in regarding the draft permit. They have accepted and acknowledged them, but we have not formally had any discussion around them. C. Motasky from CT DEEP did confirm that the 5.0 mg/l minimum dissolved oxygen limit for the final effluent will be part of the new permit. D. Wilson said that we have received the new UV intensity sensor for the UV and we will install it to ensure that it will work, and if so we will ask for a modification to report the UV intensity rather than the UV dose on the new permit. If it does not work fine, we will then discuss another work around or remove the UV dose requirements. Normally the UV channel is taking off line after October 1, but it is now on line in anticipation of a forecasted storm this coming Monday.

8) **WPCA Tax Collector:** D. Wilson reported that S. Mitchell is working on some recommendations for our revenue report, as after speaking with H. Bunnell the Munis system cannot generate an accounts receivable (AR) report like the one Sandy used for years, or tell who is connected to the systems and other functions. We need to have more bookkeeper function, so that all other revenue we collect, such as assessments, and septage, is properly accounted for, and as this cannot be addressed by the "Q" system. This system basically just receives and documents payments. D. Wilson asked if S. Mitchell had reached out to him yet, no she has not. K. Merz asked who was S. Mitchell. D. Wilson explained that she was the Acting Tax Collector before she retired this past July. K. Merz asked who is collecting revenue now. D. Wilson said it is through H. Bunnell. T. Donoghue is doing the septage billing right now. D. Wilson said to satisfy D. Rapp, it will cost us more than 3 to 4 times more compared to what we previously paid for this work. K. Merz asked what our collection rate is. We explained that we budget for 94%, and that we collect a lot in arrears for past due accounts. He then asked do we collect the 94% each year and we said yes. T. Donoghue mentioned that he and D. Wilson will start working on the FY 25 budget and will have a first draft for review at the next WPCA Meeting.

9) **Fund Balance Update:** T. Donoghue had handed out the latest report, which has the Fund 66 account at just over $900,000. The current Engineering study will cost us $428,000 and if it is accepted by the CT DEEP, we could see up to a 55% reimbursement on that total. So currently we have about a half million dollar left in that account. C. Bratina inquired was this the Operating Fund Balance, and T. Donoghue said no, this was our Fund 66 Capital Reserve account. Coincidently D. Cappelletti sent an email for the FY 23 audit, and that will show what is available in the Fund Balance. We also have a line item in the budget, which we have used for the last five years to set aside funds into Fund 66. D. Wilson said we should not transfer funds yet from the Fund Balance to Fund 66. We can wait until we get the full audit. T. Donoghue mentioned that there was $14,000 in encumbrances that he will need to work with Stacey to reconcile. W. Buckley mentioned that the $49,000 for the culvert will have to come out of Fund 66, which will be the next agenda item.

10) **Commissioner's Request:** D. Wilson began by mentioned that there is a new Town Treasurer and we need to get our hands on the Assessment accounts where we have collected interest, this is close to $500,000 in this account. The finance department feels that this belongs to the Town and not the WPCA.

The next item was the approval for the culvert payment. D. Wilson said Towne & Aurell portion was $19,500 and United Concrete was $29,970 for the concrete piping. K. Merz then asked if there was any back up for the work completed, the invoices. T. Donoghue said this did not include the paving, which we would not have to pay for. C. Bratina said we should get copies of the invoices for the completed work, and the Board agreed.
Motion: W. Buckley put forth a motion to reimburse Public Works $49,370 out of the Capital Reserve account for the installation of the new double barrel culvert located at the front gate entrance to the plant, with the stipulation that the two invoices for the project are presented to the WPCA for review. C. Bratina seconded, and there was no discussion. All members voted "aye' and the motion passed.

W. Buckley would like to revisit the report that was issued by the CT DEEP on the loading into Bantam Lake from WLSD. He would like us to ask the CT DEEP to perform a study of the loading from all the existing septic systems currently on Bantam Lake, because he feels that has to be a bigger load. D. Wilson said they did study it many years back. W. Buckley asked if they did a study when they installed the collection system for Morris. They did not study it, because they wanted to pay for it. D. Wilson mentioned a property on east Shore Rd, on the other side of the lake, and said the newer systems are good, but it would be the seasonal cottages systems that could be a problem. The TMDL study did not address this at all. T. Donoghue said that with our plant being downstream, do we really want to kick a "hornet's nest". W. Buckley said we are environmentalists and that is why we are asking, but the DEEP did a study saying that all this loading is coming down from WLSD and polluting the Bantam Lake. T. Donoghue said that it was 26% of the nutrient loading. So his point is that maybe it is a better solution to have these new connections from Bantam Lake in Morris come to our plant, and have WLSD go to Torrington. C. Bratina reminded the Board that we offered this suggestion to the Litchfield BOS and they did not want to act on it. W. Buckley's concern was if we were to take in WLSD and it did not solve the problem, then we would have no plant capacity left to take in more customers from Morris. It was then suggested if we should ask Bantam Lake Protective Association (BLPA) to bring up this issue. D. Wilson said the engineering consultant that Perley Grimes had hired from Upstate New York, was very good as they determined that the sampling points up at WLSD were not even the correct locations, and that that data that they used cannot be strongly supported. W. Buckley argument's was even if it was true, why did it not go to Torrington? The reason was that Torrington was going to charge them more, and they did not want to pay. He then asked how we should proceed. Are we not going to pursue it as a Board, or does he need to go it alone. D. Wilson had previously spoken with D. Rapp

and she was not interested. C. Bratina said we should really have Bantam Lake Protective Association (BLPA) deal with this. D. Wilson asked K. Merz if he could speak to them about this. The question is how many septic systems are on the lake and what is the loading from the BOD, nitrogen, and phosphorus. T. Donoghue said that if we take all these septic systems off line and connect them to the collection system, they would come to our plant and use up capacity. W. Buckley and C. Bratina said yes that would be the case, but we need to make that decision now before we do any work on the plant, plus we already have an IMA with the Morris WPCA. We need to ask D. Rapp again about the benefits to the lake if all these properties were connected to the collection system. K. Merz will speak with BLPA. D. Wilson suggested that we should review the study that came from Perley Grimes too.

C. Bratina asked if Arethusa had their FY 22 and FY 23 BOD surcharge bills mailed out yet, as in the past Arethusa was unhappy that last year, they got two surcharge bills in one FY. T. Donoghue believed that we have billed for FY 22 and FY 23, and would check with S. Mitchell. C. Bratina reminded that Arethusa was unhappy that last year they got two surcharge bills in one FY. Moving forward he may prefer to be billed monthly on the surcharge,

C. Bratina said that CD's and Treasury bills are currently paying 4-5% interest rates now and we should speak with the Town Treasurer about investing some of our monies in these accounts. We know how much we spend each month, and we have the money in Fund 66. One of the issues that came up with speaking to Jack Baker from the Distillery about the Pretreatment Agreement, was a question about loading from restaurants, and his point was could they be considered significant users. T. Donoghue reported we had not looked at that and explained that the CT DEEP is mainly concerned with the FOG from restaurants and there are regulations around that, and that we do not consider them Significant Industrial Users (SIU). We do have a FOG limit in our Sewer regulation, but the Commission thought it would be a good idea to at least do some sampling collection to get some snap shots of this type of discharge. T. Donoghue went on record to say he did not think this would be a good idea, as there are many variables that impact their discharges and often they are busy and discharging after we leave each day, and how would we collect these samples. If we find one discharges 400 mg/l are we going to start charging them? C. Bratina said we could consider it, or increase their EDUs. K. Merz asked if there is something coming from the state that restaurants can't dump their food down the sewer. T. Donoghue said there is a move to go to composting. W. Buckley pointed out that it is a similar issue to charging EDUs for homes with low flow. That J. Baker is asking if he is being treated differently and we should give him an answer. T. Donoghue said we have a high plant BOD/TSS loading because of the Distillery, Arethusa, and septage. C. Bratina pointed out that the septage is after the influent sampler, and we have a very high influent BOD and TSS. Donoghue said the answer is an SIU permit, if it is a percent of the plant loading. When they did the last plant design, the designed the loading to be 150 mg/l BOD and TSS, and our data is much higher, but the pounds are still the same. C. Bratina said our BOD is double what the plant was designed for, and 300 mg/l is very unusual. It is typically 120-200 mg/l. T. Donoghue said many plants nitrifying have a problem because they don't have enough carbon coming into the plant. Regardless of his concerns he will begin grabbing samples anonymously after the holidays.

11) Public Works/Treatment Plant Report:

- **a) Easements:** No report.
- **b) Operations:** T. Donoghue reported that Permit compliance has been maintained since the last report. Routine operations and maintenance work continues, and for the month of November the total flow was 12.727 MG and the daily average flow was 0.424 MGD. We removed 45,500 gallons of bio-solids for final disposal during the month of November. YTD we are down 27%

over last year, which is 97,500 gallons or 15 trucks. We are also back to nearly 7% total solids going onto the trucks.

- We processed a total of 156,800 gallons of septage during the month of November a 33% increase over last November. YTD we are down 2%.
- For November effluent BOD removal percent was 99% and TSS removal percent was 99%.The minimal removal rates per our NPDES permit is 85%.
- The daily average of Total Nitrogen lbs. /day discharged into the Bantam River was 3.0 mg/l or 11.0 lbs. /day. Our daily limit is 24 lbs. /day.
- The daily average for Total Phosphorous discharged in the Bantam River was 2.1 mg/l. or 7.3 lbs. /day. The monthly average cannot exceed 3.7 mg/l and our daily maximum cannot exceed 7.43 mg/l.
- On 11/3/23 H.O. Penn performed a generator service and load bank testing on the plant generator.
- We installed QSR rings in nine manholes on Hart Drive and CCTV'd an unknown capped line which was a private line it was gushing water and was repaired by the homeowner later in the month.
- On 11/7/23 we CCTV'd private sewer lines at Litchfield High School to determine possible cause of recent blockage. Grit leaking in between manhole frames and cones, as well as bad pitch on older cast iron pipe.
- We installed repaired VFD on nitrate return pump.
- Pumped out Northfield pump station wet well, for annual preventative maintenance.
- On 11/16/23 Ted, Dave and Christian met at the Distillery for a tour and discussion on the pretreatment agreement. Towne & Aurell installed a double barrel culvert at plant's front gate and patched paved the drive way.
- On 11/27/23 a brief power outage at the treatment plant. Ted responded and no issues to report.
- On 11/30/23 a brief brown out at 7:40 AM. No issues to report.

c) Collection System Work: Above

12) **Financial Report:** T. Donoghue provide a quick overview and mentioned the focus will be tapping on the breaks for the winter and drafting the FY 25 Operations Budget.

13) Old Business: None presented.

14) Adjournment:

Motion: W. Buckley moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 PM. C. Bratina seconded and there was no discussion. All members voted "aye' and the motion passed

Terrence Donoghue
Interim Recording Secretary