

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY – FEBRUARY 9, 2022

**WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING– Wednesday, February 9, 2022
6:00 p.m. – via Zoom Video Conferencing ***

Board Members: Louis M. Accornero, Chairman; John M. Tanski, Vice Chairman; John A. Davis, Jr., Secretary; Daniel Horvath; James Campbell, Richard P. Lawlor (**EXCUSED**), Brian J. Comerford

Gregory J. Mahoney, Senior Engineering Technician; Michael J. Bisi, Superintendent of Sanitation, and Lisa Dunnack, Sanitation Clerk were also in attendance.

Chairman Accornero requested a moment of silence held in remembrance of long-time Commission member, Nils G. Carlson.

1. Election of Officers

A. Chairman

Mr. Horvath NOMINATED Louis M. Accornero for Chairman of the Water Pollution Control Authority.

Mr. Tanski SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

B. Vice Chairman

Mr. Comerford NOMINATED John M. Tanski for Vice Chairman of the Water Pollution Control Authority.

Mr. Campbell SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

C. Secretary

Mr. Brian Comerford NOMINATED John A. Davis for Secretary of the Water Pollution Control Authority.

Mr. Tanski SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

2. Developments

**A. Addison Road Sewer Extension Project- PW-2119
Developers Permit- Agreement #229
Resolution 2022-01
(Town of Glastonbury)**

Mr. Mahoney explained the scope of work for this Town project. Public sewer is to be extended approximately 140 feet up the center of Addison Road to service two of the remaining homes. This is expected to be the final extension of public sewer in the area under Developer's Permit Agreement #229.

Mr. Tanski MOVED that the Town of Glastonbury Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE Developer's Permit Agreement #229, Resolution 2202-01, Addison Road Sewer Extension Project – PW-2119, Town of Glastonbury.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

3. Subcommittees

A. Sewer Use Subcommittee

1. Subcommittee Recommendations – Sewer Use Appeals

Vice Chairman Tanski addressed attendees by reading the following report:

Mr. Chairman, the Sewer Use Subcommittee met in person on January 26 to review and provide recommendations on 99 appeals of sewer bills for the 2020-2021 billing cycle. As is our practice, we discussed each appeal individually and made a recommendation for the disposition of that appeal to the full authority. Our recommendations are contained in the spreadsheet that was provided to each member of the Water Pollution Control Authority for today's meeting. The recommendations were also sent to each individual who submitted an appeal with information about how to join tonight's meeting if he or she wanted to comment on the proposed disposition of the appeal.

For the benefit of the new members of the authority and the members of the public who have joined today's meeting, I would like to say a few words about the process by which sewer bills are calculated and appeals are considered.

Sewer bills are sent annually to sewer users in town on November 1. These bills cover a billing period of July 1 to June 30, meaning that the bills we are discussing tonight were sent on November 1, 2021 and covered a period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021.

For users who have public water—either from MDC or Manchester Water Company—the town calculates the sewer bill by multiplying the amount of water that flowed into the house through the water meter by our sewer rate, which is \$3.25 per hundred cubic feet, or ccf. For residential users who have well water, the town bills based on average residential usage in town, which is 140 ccfs. The Town-wide minimum bill is \$60.

Users have the option to install private meters to try to reduce their sewer bills. We typically see this in two contexts. First, users with public water will often install private deduction meters to record the amount of water that comes into their house but does not go into the sewer. This might include water that is used in a sprinkler system or water that is used to fill a swimming pool. These users provide their deduction meter readings to the town, and the town uses the readings to calculate the number of ccfs billed to the resident.

Second, users with well water can install meters that track the amount of water that goes into the sewer from their house. These users are responsible for providing timely meter readings to town staff, and they are then billed based on the actual amount they discharge into the sewer rather than receiving the average bill.

There is a \$20 charge for users with private meters to cover the additional administrative costs associated with adjusting the bill.

Unlike many surrounding towns, Glastonbury has an appeal process for sewer bills. In this process, users can submit information to the town about why they feel their sewer bill is not accurate. This information is considered by the Sewer Use subcommittee, which makes a recommendation to the full authority. This is just a recommendation, and the final decision on the billed amount is for the whole authority to make. If a user wishes to comment on the Sewer Use subcommittee's recommendation, he or she may do so at this meeting.

Last year, the Authority made some changes to its policies in an effort to make the process more transparent and fair. The authority felt these changes were necessary to ensure that information was

received in a timely fashion and the authority would have a clearer set of ground rules that could be applied uniformly to everyone. These changes were discussed at public meeting, voted on by the authority, communicated in writing to users, and posted on the Town's website.

The key provisions of the Authority's policy with respect to appeals include:

1. The appeal must be submitted in writing and must state the reason for the appeal (e.g., major leak) with detailed supporting evidence.
2. If submitted by mail, the appeal must be postmarked no later than December 1 of the year of the bill being appealed. If submitted by email, the appeal must be received no later than 11:59pm December 1 of the year of the bill being appealed.
3. The bill being appealed must be paid in full. (So, if the authority decides to reduce the bill, the user will get a refund.)
4. Only adjustments to the current year's bill (namely, the bill for July 2020 to June 2021) will be considered.
5. Users seeking a reduction due to a non-sewered use (such as a sprinkler system or a pool fill) must install a deduction meter and have that meter read by town staff by April 3 to provide a baseline, by which the deduction can be judged.
6. Adjustments to a sewer use bill without a special meter will only be made in exceptional circumstances (for example, a large water service leak) for flow which did not enter the sanitary sewer system.
7. Users with special meters must submit their meter readings to the Town no later than June 30 of the billing year.

This last requirement has led to a number of the appeals the subcommittee considered this year. The subcommittee recommended not adjusting the bills for these users. But that does not mean that they will be unable to claim credit for the water that went through their deduction meters. What they will need to do is they will need to submit their deduction meter readings on time next year. That reading will then be compared to the last timely reading they submitted, so they'll effectively get a deduction on next year's bill based on their sprinkling in 2021-2021 and 2021-2022. The subcommittee wanted to emphasize that up front because, while the recommendation will delay the application of their deduction, they won't lose it entirely if they are on time this year.

Ultimately, however, the subcommittee felt that as the number of deduction meters increases and the burden on town staff in processing deductions increases, it is very important to get those readings in a timely fashion. It's easy to forget something like this, but the consequence of forgetting is that you have to wait a year to take your deduction credit. That's the policy the authority chose last year and we have tried to apply it fairly to all users.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the process for addressing today's appeals. As members of the public have joined the meeting, they have been asked for their names and addresses. We are going to read off a listing of the addresses for whom we have people here to speak tonight. If your address is read and you would like to speak, you don't need to do anything just yet. If your address is not read and you would like to speak, however, please put up your virtual hand before we continue so we can get you on the list of people wishing to speak.

The reason we are doing this, by the way, is that the authority will first act on the subcommittee recommendations for which no one wishes to speak. We will reserve decision on all of the appeals for which someone is here to speak. And we will address the appeals in alphabetical order by street.

The chairman will call you by address, you will unmute, and you will have three minutes to address the Authority. The Authority might ask you questions. At the end, it will discuss your appeal and vote on the disposition of the appeal. It will then move to the next appeal.

Once your appeal has been voted on, you may leave the meeting, although this is a public meeting, and you may listen for as long as you wish.

If you are happy with the Subcommittee's recommendation for your appeal, you do not need to speak—although, of course, you are welcome to do so.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the report of the Sewer Use subcommittee.

Chairman Accornero began with the first appeal on the spreadsheet list contained in packet Item 3.A.1 and read on through the first five; no attendees wished to speak. Since there were just 22 attendees remaining in the webinar at that time, it was decided to continue with the following currently participating attendees rather than read through each of the 99 appeals.

The Committee began with Jim Kask of 11 Cardinal Drive. Mr. Kask shared concerns regarding communication of the strict cutoff of submitting the meter reading. He mentioned his was just seven days late and suggested that rules are clearly stated so users understand how to avoid excess fees.

Mr. Horvath MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 11 Cardinal Drive.

Mr. Campbell SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Wesley Beaulieu of 27 Kelsey Lane of requested an exception stating the large financial impact of the \$1500 bill. He stated he was new to the residence and did not fully understand submittal requirements and the strict cutoff date. He now understands these annual requirements and hopes this extension will be considered for this billing cycle. Mr. Beaulieu also shared calculations from his 50 sprinkler heads and found the annual usage to be 231,000 gallons used by the sprinkler system.

Chairman Tanksi stated that due to the past appeals with similar situations, and rules were sometimes 'bent' in sympathetic situations and sometimes not, the Subcommittee adopted a policy and adherence to uniformity is critical in fairness to all.

Mr. Comerford MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 27 Kelsey Lane.

Mr. Horvath SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Kevin Vigeant of 85 Island Green started with asking Chairman Tanksi that, based on the aforementioned adherence to policy, if his exception would be denied. Mr. Tanksi reassured him that everyone has the right to be heard and considered. Mr. Vigeant then stated his back-to-back invoices at \$700, and that this year, he did not receive a meter card to complete. He also stated that in conferring with the neighbors of equivalent property size, their bills were significantly less. Mr. Vigeant also stated that he stopped using his irrigation system this season, and still received a \$770+ bill.

The Commission asked if Mr. Vigeant has had anyone check for a possible leak in his system and he had not checked. Mr. Bisi shared the Manchester Water billing history for 85 Island Green with the Commission and explained that during COVID it is possible folks were home more and possibly using

more water than anticipated. There was significant consumption in the winter and summer which indicate that more water is being used even without using the sprinkler system.

The Commission worked to clarify water usage in certain months in order to understand the fluctuation in the bills and suggested that the date ranges be considered. It was decided to accept the Subcommittee's recommendation for this situation.

Mr. Comerford MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 85 Island Green.

Mr. Horvath SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Kathleen Waterman represented the building owners of 43 Western Boulevard. This is a commercial business and Ms. Waterman stated that the most current bill was \$4600 when previous bills were just \$80 because of their deduction meter which had since failed. The building is just 50% occupied and this has brought her to this appeal.

The Commission questioned the square footage of the building and Ms. Waterman stated that the first floor is occupied and the second floor is vacant, and then stated that the building is approximately 30% occupied. Mr. Tanski explained that the previous year's billing did not make sense and felt the deduction meter was malfunctioning to the customer's advantage. Therefore, there has no good historical data to extrapolate data and arrive at accurate billing. Ms. Waterman plans to replace the meter and have it ready by March 31 for a baseline reading. The Commission explained how that process works and clarified how the next billing cycle will run.

Ms. Waterman asked if the current data collected with the new deduction meter would be considered for 2020-2021 billing cycle. The Commission suggested that she appeal again next year noting that readings would then be more accurate with a properly functioning deduction meter.

Mr. Comerford MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 43 Western Boulevard.

Mr. Accornero SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Stephanie Ferrall of 309 Carriage Drive referred to a letter she sent in November which explained the reasoning for her late submission. Ms. Ferrall requested consideration as she was out of town handling a family issue.

The Commission noted the billing amounts for the last two years \$92.58 and \$354.42 while the most recent bill was \$1,153. Mr. Tanski then noted that if Ms. Ferrall submits on time next year, she will receive the minimum amount. Mr. Tanski also reiterated the importance of sending meter data on time and reminded attendees that it can be submitted electronically as well to avoid late fees. Additionally, Mr. Bisi noted that users do not necessarily have to wait for the reminder card to submit data, and that there are several ways to submit.

Mr. Comerford MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 309 Carriage Drive.

Mr. Horvath SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Nicholas Bonatsakis of 90 Fairway Crossing explained his reasoning for late submission and stated that he recently purchased this property and did not close until May of 2021. Mr. Bonatsakis stated the bill received in 2021 was substantially larger than the one he viewed at time of real estate closing.

Mr. Bisi explained some factors that would affect the difference in billing amounts, including how the billing cycle fell, and that costs are sometimes underestimated at time of closing. He also shared

historical deduction data for this property. The Commission reiterated that an on-time submission this year would result in a standard deduction, lowering the bill this period.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 90 Fairway Crossing.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Susan Pearlman of 35 Bunker Hill Road explained the basis for this appeal was due to an unnoticed sprinkler system leak discovered in 2020 which was located at an obscure part of her property. Ms. Pearlman also noted that her husband read the incorrect meter, but noted a comparison of bills for the last two years. She is asking for an adjustment from \$157 to \$63 which she felt was appropriate for just two people living in the house.

The Commission asked if the leak was, in fact, in the sprinkler system and the meter should have accounted for it. Mr. Tanski noted that when the meter reading is submitted this year, this data should all be captured in this cycle.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 35 Bunker Hill Road.

Mr. Horvath SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED 5-0. Mr. Comerford ABSTAINED.

Richard Foster of 118 Morgan Drive started by directing appreciation to Mr. Tanski for explaining the rules of meter reading submission. He would have appreciated understanding the rules in advance, however. He concluded by noting that he now understands how to avoid late submission fees in the future.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 118 Morgan Drive.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Michael Makowski of KP Management representing Willow Brook Condominium Association located at 50 Spring Street is appealing the bill as he feels something went awry with this year's reading. Historical data shows there was a significant difference in the last two bills. Mr. Makowski noted there may have been a meter malfunction, however, is asking for consideration of a reasonable credit based on billing since 2017. The difference in 2019 and 2020 were similar while 2021 doubled. He stated that the meter was recently removed from its outside location and brought to an indoor temperature-controlled shop for testing before reinstallation. Mr. Makowski plans to suggest the meter be replaced.

The Commission noted inconsistent historical usage data versus deduction data and said it was difficult to arrive at accurate numbers based on this historical usage and the several additional items that are taken into consideration when deciding the proper deductions. The Commission asked what Mr. Makowski thought was a fair credit. Mr. Makowski noted that an average of the last five years, along with less usage in 2021, suggest a total bill of \$4500.

Mr. Tanski requested from Mr. Bisi further information on historical deduction numbers for this property. Mr. Bisi shared this information and also noted that outdoor meters are no longer permitted, and explained that some are installed incorrectly. He also suggested testing the unit after reinstallation to ensure it is recording accurately.

Mr. Makowski shared meter data he recorded from 2021 and it was still inconclusive as to whether the meter was recording accurately. The Commission reiterated the importance of properly functioning meters and that indoor installation is now required, and they can only extrapolate from the data they are

given. If he has true data for this billing cycle it may be best go from the next reading with a properly functioning meter. However, Mr. Tanski, asked if Mr. Makowski preferred to use the average deduction of 295.99, or to use the next March reading and move forward from there.

Mr. Makowski's preferred to receive the average credit Mr. Tanski suggested, install a new meter for the next billing cycle, and move forward from that point. The Commission and Mr. Bisi concluded that with the credit of 295.99 ccf's at \$3.25 per ccf would adjust the bill to \$5031.86, giving the Willow Brook Condominium Association an approximate \$950 credit of which Mr. Makowski requested on behalf of the Association. Mr. Bisi reiterated the importance of installing a new, properly functioning interior meter to meet the current requirements.

Mr. Tanksi MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 50 Spring Street with the MODIFICATION that instead of a deduction of 3.88 ccf's, adjust to the above-mentioned 295.99 ccf's resulting in a total bill of \$5031.86. Mr. Makowski verbally agreed to withdraw the appeal on behalf of the Willow Brook Condominium Association.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Saliesh Kalangi of 140 Shelley Lane explained the basis of his appeal and understood that it was due to late submission. He worked with Lisa Dunnack in the Sanitation office to submit his appeal along with a meter reading and documentation. He stated that he was reading the meter incorrectly and there was a serial number mismatch. Mr. Kalangi requested the Commission overlook the late submission and provide a credit. He added that he has never been late on payment and now knows how to read the meter correctly.

Mr. Bisi confirmed that the next the reading should provide retroactive deduction data. Since no good data was provided, it is difficult to comprehend exactly what the deduction should be. Mr. Tanski noted that readings have been inconsistent over the last few years, and Mr. Bisi added that the deductions have been extremely low. No deduction was made in the 2021 due to the late card submission. Mr. Bisi and Mr. Tanski agreed and reassured Mr. Kalangi that it will work itself out with an accurate and punctual submission in this billing cycle.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 140 Shelley Lane.

Mr. Horvath SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Robert McKinney of 78 Ladyslipper Lane says he now understands the rules but could not recall if he was late on the card or if it was ever sent. The Commission confirmed that his card was received on September 13, 2021. Mr. McKinney asked for clarification on how billing will work and if the 2021 billing cycle would be accounted for in the next billing cycle. Per Mr. McKinney's request, Mr. Bisi clarified that if the meter reading is submitted according to the policies and guidelines, Mr. McKinney would receive a deduction for the 2021 cycle base on a prior submission that included a deduction. Mr. McKinney understood that he would receive two years' worth of deductions with the next meter reading granted it is submitted according to policies and guidelines.

Mr. Horvath MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 78 Ladyslipper Lane.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Elaine Akely of 33 Hanover Fields Road explained the premise of her appeal and noted that she has sent her cards in each year and hoped that the deduction from 2019 and 2020 could be applied to her 2021 bill. Ms. Akley noted that she has not had a deduction since 2018 and submitted all requested meter information to the Sanitation office this past year in her last appeal. Mr. Bisi confirmed that

adjustments were recommended for both 2020 and 2021 but Ms. Akley would like 2019 be considered as well. Mr. Tanski noted her usage for the past three cycles and that it is outside policy and practice to go back as far as 2019 at this point. However, the Subcommittee recommendations for deductions 2020 and 2021 were approximately \$340 and \$380. Ms. Akley stated that she did install a new meter for the next billing cycle. She mentioned that she did not fully understand the process but does now.

The Commission decided that they were unwilling to add the deduction for 2019 as requested. However, Ms. Akley stated that she now understands the process and will ensure timely submission with the newly installed meter.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 33 Hanover Fields Road.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Peter Guastamachio of 107 Island Green opened by stating that he appreciated the report read earlier by Mr. Tanski and that it clarified policies and guidelines. He would have liked to be made aware of the policies before this meeting, however, he wished to withdraw his appeal.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 107 Island Green.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Philip Fite of 98 Hillcrest Road began by noting meter data for previous years. He does not understand why the usage has changed significantly and there are no known leaks in the system. Mr. Fite thinks his MDC water meter is functioning properly. He was unable to confirm if the meter is displaying accurately. Mr. Fite asked if it would be possible to average deductions from last three bills and to somewhat reduce their current bill which was much higher than prior bills with no apparent increase in usage.

The Commission asked for dates of prior two reading submissions to clarify Mr. Fite's deductions and explain why there was such a large difference. Mr. Bisi shared the meter reading data and noted a difference in submission dates. One done with 10 months of usage and the other with 14 months of usage. Mr. Tanski added the many variables that show possible increase in usage due to COVID, and rainy versus dry seasons. Based on the data, Mr. Bisi does not feel the meter necessarily malfunctioning but he suggested that users pay very close attention meter data. The Committee concluded that he was given a larger discount on his 2019 bill and a smaller in 2020. The 2021 invoice appeared to even out the deductions. Inconsistency in submission dates could also have been a factor.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 98 Hillcrest Road.

Mr. Horvath SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Uday Patel of 22 Paxton Way started by noting the amount of his bill was significantly higher than previous years and he does not feel usage has changed.

The Commission noted that Mr. Patel had been paying estimated MDC bills that were quite low. He was then sent an enormous 'catch-up' water bill which drove the 'catch-up' sewer bill in 2021. It was also noted that Mr. Patel has a sprinkler system with no deduction meter installed. Mr. Patel did not feel it was fair of MDC to give credits but then send a large bill in 2021. Mr. Bisi clarified that those credits were not related to consumption and that if the MDC bills were estimated too low, it was more likely that cards were not submitted. Mr. Bisi also noted that MDC has changed out all meters to an automated system and now sends monthly bills. He and the Commission also stated that the absence of the deduction resulted in estimates from MDC that appeared to be too low for Mr. Patel's usage. The Commission reiterated the importance of installing the deduction meter to account for his sprinkler

system usage, therefore, giving Mr. Patel a more accurate reading and sewer bill deduction. The Commission suggested that Mr. Patel contact MDC for any water bill discrepancies and explained that sewer bills are based on MDC usage data.

Mr. Comerford MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 22 Paxton Way.

Mr. Campbell SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously

The Commission requested and was granted two-minute recess.

While the last caller was having audio difficulty, the Commission asked Mr. Bisi to discuss 88 Sherman Road. Mr. Bisi explained the significance of the bill was due to an MDC underground leak that did not go into the sewer system. The current bill is \$1500 and bill under normal usage was approximately \$350. Mr. Bisi stated that the Subcommittee's recommendation in this situation would be to confirm that MDC applied a credit to the user and that would then be reflected on the sewer bill. Mr. Bisi confirmed that MDC did issue the credit and, based on that credit, the new sewer bill would be \$1,312.06. While not a significant deduction, the Subcommittee could recommend a further credit based on the users very consistent usage in the past two years. The Subcommittee's recommendation is to apply the deduction based on consistent usage data and that the increased usage began in October/November 2020, ran through the winter and the leak was repaired in May of 2021. The elevated timeframe was during months a sprinkler would not typically be in use. Mr. Bisi finalized the proposed deduction for 88 Sherman Road at \$347.75 which is in line with the previous year.

Mr. Tanski MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 88 Sherman Road.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Mr. Bisi explained that the appeal for 2000 Main Street was forwarded after the Subcommittee met and not included in the packet. This appeal was not entertained by the Subcommittee since the irrigation system meter card was not received until January 19, 2022, although the property owners were sent a link to this meeting so they could speak on behalf their appeal which was sent in on February 2, 2022. The user was billed for 306.91 ccf's with no deduction and the bill totaled \$1,017.46 while their previous bill was \$80 with a \$251 deduction. Mr. Bisi shared a letter sent by the property owner asking for an adjustment. He noted that, although late, there is a current reading available and another reading should be received this billing cycle. As with all users, a notification will be sent to the property owner, and that any hardship cases will be referred to the Tax Collector's office. The Commission proposed no adjustment to the current bill given that both the meter card and appeal were received late.

Mr. Tanski MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 2000 Main Street.

Mr. Campbell SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Mark and Eve Davis of 93 Shelley Lane had difficulty connecting to the meeting and no phone number was available to reach out to them so Mr. Bisi familiarized the Commission with their situation. He noted that this user has an irrigation system with no deduction meter. Mr. and Mrs. Davis stated that they are unable to afford one, however, the Subcommittee suggested no adjustment to the bill and recommended that they install a meter. This year's bill was 271 ccf's at \$882, last year's bill 198 ccf's at \$625, the prior year 473 ccf's at \$548. Mr. Bisi noted that usage indicates the customer is sprinkling in the warmer months. The Commission mentioned that, if they are in fact using the irrigation system, it would be more efficient to install a deduction than not.

Mr. Bisi attempted once again to reach the customer but could not.

Mr. Campbell MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on 93 Shelley Lane.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously

Mr. Tanski MOVED to ACCEPT the Subcommittee's recommendation on all appeals listed on the spreadsheet in packet Item 3.A.1 with the following exceptions: #12 35 Bunker Hill Road, #18 11 Cardinal Drive, #21 309 Carriage Drive, #29 90 Fairway Crossing, #38 33 Hanover Fields, #40 98 Hillcrest Road, #45 85 Island Green, #46 107 Island Green, #47 27 Kelsey Lane, #53 78 Ladyslipper Lane, #63 118 Morgan Drive, #71 22 Paxton Way, #86 93 Shelley Lane, #88 140 Shelley Lane, #89 88 Sherman Road, #91 50 Spring Street – Willow Brook Condominium Associates, #97 43 Western Boulevard.

Mr. Campbell SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

B. Assessment Subcommittee NO REPORT

C. Engineering Subcommittee NO REPORT

D. Legal Subcommittee NO REPORT

4. Acceptance of Minutes

A. Regular Meeting and Public Hearings – November 10, 2021

Mr. Horvath MOVED that the Town of Glastonbury Water Pollution Control Authority ACCEPT the minutes for the Regular Meeting and Public Hearings of November 10, 2021.

Mr. Campbell SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED with a 5-0 vote. Mr. Tanski abstained.

B. Informal Meeting with NO QUORUM – December 8, 2021

Mr. Tanksi noted that there was NO QUORUM, therefore, the Commission is not eligible to officially accept the minutes of the Informal Meeting of December 8, 2021.

5. Other Business Properly to Come Before the Authority

**A. Transfer of Funds- Sewer Sinking Fund
Resolution 2022-02 – Addison Road Sewer Extension Project – PW-2119**

Mr. Davis, Jr. MOVED that the Town of Glastonbury Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE Resolution 2022-02, Transfer of Funds – Sewer Sinking Fund, Addison Road Sewer Extension Project – PW-2119.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

**B. Transfer of Funds- Sewer Sinking Fund
Resolution 2022-03 – Developer Reimbursement
Developer's Permit-Agreement #227 - Stallion Ridge Subdivision**

Mr. Davis, Jr. MOVED that the Town of Glastonbury Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE Resolution 2022-03, Transfer of Funds – Sewer Sinking Fund, Developer Reimbursement, Developer's Permit Agreement #227 – Stallion Ridge Subdivision.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

6. Correspondence

A. Application of Manchester/Hebron Avenue, LLC for Allocation of Sewer Capacity and Approval to Connect a Multi-Family Development at 1199 Manchester Road, Glastonbury, Connecticut

Mr. Mahoney provided the Commission with some background on this application and the letter included in packet Item 6.A regarding the application for 1199 Manchester Road. He mentioned that this will be brought before the Commission for their Sewer Impact Report at the next meeting. The Attorney handling the project forwarded this letter to Mr. Mahoney and noted that the project will be 200% over the allotted flow for this parcel. The Attorney is questioning the policy. Both the Town Engineer and Town Manager were made aware of the letter.

Mr. Davis, Jr. MOVED that the Town of Glastonbury Water Pollution Control Authority APPROVE legal review of the letter by the Town Attorney for the Application of Manchester/Hebron Avenue, LLC for Allocation of Sewer Capacity and Approval to Connect Multi-Family Development at 1199 Manchester Road, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Mr. Davis, Jr. MOVED that the Town of Glastonbury Water Pollution Control Authority Legal Subcommittee be deputized to receive legal advice from the Town Attorney with regards to the Application of Manchester/Hebron Avenue, LLC for Allocation of Sewer Capacity and Approval to Connect Multi-Family Development at 1199 Manchester Road, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Mr. Davis, Jr. MOVED to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Comerford SECONDED the MOTION and it was APPROVED unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Dawn Luke
Recording Secretary