



**AGENDA**  
**Water Pollution Control Authority**  
**Special Meeting**

**Tuesday, January 22, 2018**  
**Council Chambers**  
**6:30 PM**

1. ROLL CALL
  2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
    - Special Meeting – October 15, 2018
    - Special Meeting – November 19, 2018
  3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS
  4. OLD BUSINESS
  5. NEW BUSINESS
  6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION
    - A. Discussion: WPC Plant Project Update
  7. MISCELLANEOUS
  8. ADJOURNMENT
-

**ENFIELD TOWN COUNCIL**  
**Acting in its capacity as**  
**WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY**  
**OCTOBER 15, 2018**

A meeting of the Water Pollution Control Authority was called to order by Chairman Ludwick in the Council Chambers of the Enfield Town Hall, 820 Enfield Street, Enfield, Connecticut on Monday, October 15, 2018. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

**ROLL-CALL** – Present were Commissioners Arnone, Bosco, Cekala, Cressotti, Davis, Deni, Falk, Ludwick, Muller and Szewczak. Commissioner Unghire was absent. Also present were Town Manager, Christopher Bromson; Town Clerk, Suzanne Olechnicki; Senior Assistant Town Attorney, Maria Elsdon; Director of Finance, John Wilcox; Director of Social Services, Dawn Homer-Bouthiette

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION #4686** by Commissioner Falk seconded by Commissioner Arnone to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2018 meeting.

Upon a **SHOW-OF-HANDS** vote being taken, the Chair declared **MOTION #4686** adopted 10-0-0.

**PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

David Sacerdote, 29 Ohear Avenue

Stated his belief the ready-to-serve fee is nothing more than a tax under a different name. He noted the Town should have formed a budget for the water pollution control facility, counted the number of houses in Enfield, divided it by that and charged a flat fee. He stated his sewer fee more than doubled with the ready-to-serve fee, and he's very upset about this.

Dawn Percoski, 384 North Maple Street

Stated she has a well, and she gets a flat fee of \$43.84. She noted she called to find out why she is getting charged a \$21.00 ready-to-serve fee because it's her understanding that there was already a maintenance fee worked in with this. She questioned what happened to the maintenance budget. She was told she should be happy because she's being charged the small meter rate. She pointed out she does not have a meter, and she doesn't understand this. She noted there are households with three people paying less than she's paying.

Karen LaPlante, 166 North Maple Street

Stated she's responsible for paying four sewer bills with two well services and two metered services with Connecticut Water. She noted she received the bills in late September. She stated the two metered bills were through July 15<sup>th</sup> and the well bills were through the end of June. She

noted she recalculated the bills she received based on the same way all the utilities recalculate their bills when an increase happens. She stated they first calculate the bill at the old rate, and they then calculate the bill at the new rate and then take the percentage of days at the old and new rate and multiply it times those and add them together. She noted well owners do not have dates of coverage on their bills, but the sewer service started effective January 1, 2014. She stated she calculated the amount for the well users first, so the bill she received would have been the second quarter billing, which would be through the end of June, and that wasn't after the rate increase of July 1<sup>st</sup>. She pointed out the rate increase didn't go into effect until July 1<sup>st</sup>. She stated she recalculated her sewer bill based on the rates effective for April, May and June, and she paid the tax office the \$43.32, which was the old rate, not the \$64.84 that was printed on the bills that included the ready-to-serve charge. She noted for her two metered accounts, she was also surprised that the bill wasn't properly pro-rated because they pro-rated the rate, but they did not pro-rate the \$21.00 fee. She stated her understanding that should also be pro-rated because on her first bill she had consumption less than the minimum charge at the old rate, so that would have been the \$13.00 minimum charge, and the new rate would have been a certain number. She stated one bill should have been for \$17.52, but it was \$34.59, and she believes the second bill should have been \$15.77 and not \$27.79 printed on the bill. She requested the balances totaling \$72.13 on those four bills be corrected by the Finance Office, and she was told the \$21.00 fee was a fixed charge for one day or 90 days and no credit was due and that well owners would have to pay the \$21.00 also.

Charles Harris, 5 Ohear Avenue

Questioned whether the added ready-to-serve charge covers this quarter and the next quarter. He noted his waste water service was only \$23.73, and the ready-to-serve charge is \$21.00. He stated he didn't see any notification that this was going to happen.

Ronald Army, 30 Field Road

Referred to the company that did the estimations and questioned whether that company was chosen through a bid process. He noted the initial \$4 million-dollar figure jumped to \$6 million dollars, and a lot of people should be upset that the town hired a company that could not produce a better estimate. He questioned if there's a line-by-line budget for this, and does such a budget exist. He questioned what part of the \$6 million dollars is the maintenance of the sewer facilities, salaries, infrastructure repair, etc. He questioned where this big mistake was made, and when did they discover this mistake.

Mr. Army stated the original budget ended in 2015, and he questioned how much the budget was at that time, and did that money just get folded into the General Fund and then people were told there was no tax increase. He feels there should have been a tax decrease because the Town took the daily maintenance of the sewer out of the general budget and factored in a fee. He stated he heard a rumor that the Town is going to stop having a line item with the police and there's just going to be a fee, and the Town can say taxes were cut.

He concluded stating these fees should be called a tax, and he should be able to deduct it on his federal income tax.

Jack Sheridan, 7 Buchanan Road

Agreed this is a tax. He noted the Town took one-half mill off the taxes when they switched from ad valorem to this system, and it should have been a full mill. He stated Woodard and Curran came up with a rate that they claimed was commensurate with surrounding towns, and a short time later they say the rate is no good. He noted another report concerning Public Works references Woodard and Curran, and under Water Pollution Control they talk about adding personnel at \$240,000 and Recommendation #16 says the Water Pollution Control Division is charged for equipment maintenance and repair at approximately \$140,000 per year, the basis for which could not be ascertained.

Mr. Sheridan pointed out people paid for the sewer lines when they were installed, it was part of the ad valorem system, and then the Town gets \$39 million dollars for updating and fixing the sewer system. He questioned where that \$39 million dollars went, and why did they have to add a service fee, which they never had before.

He cited a recommendation in the report that says the Town should start charging for anything more than one tipper barrel. He stated it seems people will have the same rate of tax, but then they'll have to pay for such services.

Mr. Sheridan stated his sewer use fee doubled, even though there was no extra use.

Ed Poremba, 8 Overhill Road

Stated it seems all of sudden things are breaking down in town. He raised the possibility of the Town looking for another way to tax, which is this fee. He noted he is upset about communications because he never knew this additional \$21.00 fee was going to happen. He referred to previous mill rates, which included water pollution control operation and maintenance. He questioned if they're really maintaining the water pollution control plant. He stated his impression that's not happening. He noted the funds were there for capital improvements year after year, but he has no idea how those monies were spent.

Mr. Poremba stated Enfield voters approved a referendum in 2015 to spend \$36 million dollars to update aging infrastructure, and it's no longer adequate according to Woodard & Curran, a company specializing in waste water budgets. He stated he does not know what happened. He noted the taxpayers of Enfield put their trust in the Town Council by supporting the referendum. He says he now can't trust anyone.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

There were no Old Business items on this agenda.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There were no New Business items on this agenda.

**RESOLUTION #4687** by Councilor Szewczak, seconded by Councilor Falk.

RESOLVED, that Michael Ludwick, Chairman of the Water Pollution Control Authority, is authorized to sign the General Permit Registration Form for the Discharge of Vehicle Maintenance Wastewater with the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, in the name and on behalf of the Water Pollution Control Authority and to affix the Corporate Seal.

Mr. Bromson stated this is affiliated with the new truck wash and the DEEP requires this application, and the Chairman in his capacity needs to sign this and authorize the filing of the application to allow the truck wash to go on line in accordance with DEEP regulations.

Upon a **ROLL-CALL** vote being taken, the Chair declared **RESOLUTION #4687** adopted 10-0-0.

**RESOLUTION #4688** by Councilor Arnone, seconded by Councilor Falk.

WHEREAS, the 2018-2019 Sewer Service Fee Schedule that was attached to Resolution No. 6281 adopting the sewer usage fees for Fiscal year 2018-2019 contained several typographical errors; and

WHEREAS, the Water Pollution Control Authority wants to correct these errors and provide the corrected Sewer Service Fee Schedule information to residents on the Town website,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Enfield Water Pollution Control Authority hereby adopts the corrected Sewer Service Fee Schedule for Fiscal year 2018-2019, attached hereto as "Attachment A."

Mr. Bromson stated going forward they will be consistent with the philosophy of this Council and his office that there has to be communication and full disclosure and transparency. He noted they are doing press releases on all major announcements. He noted answers will be provided to all questions.

Mr. Wilcox stated there were a couple typographical errors on the original rate sheet, and one was that the summer discount rate was noted at 7%, and it has been 7.5% since they implemented it. He noted the other error had to do with the statutory minimum interest set by the State of Connecticut, which was listed as \$2.02, and the minimum is actually \$2.00, therefore, they needed to correct that. He noted for clarification purposes the ready-to-serve charge was supposed to be applied for all well users at the minimum meter size rate, and that was added for clarification.

Commissioner Deni questioned why Connecticut and Hazardville Water Companies are charging to read meters when well users don't have meters. He stated the Water Pollution Control Authority needs to be disbanded from the Town Council and have a regular commission that can monitor this on a monthly basis. He noted he does not have the time or the knowledge to do water pollution control.

Commissioner Szewczak stated she, Commissioners Arnone and Bosco sat on a subcommittee and looked at all these things, and there was a hesitance to go to a flat rate. She noted they looked at all the surrounding towns and what Enfield's rate would have been at the one mill, and a flat rate would have been around \$250 per year. She noted they do have to make sure they know who is connected to the sewers. She stated when sewer was included in the tax rate, people were paying close to \$200 per year, and a lot of people dropped from \$200 to \$54, and there was a huge gap. She noted they did allow deduct meters along with a 7.5% reduction in the summer to make it more fair, but instead they widened the gap of what was needed to run, maintain and do required improvements in water pollution control. She stated she would prefer a flat rate because it's simpler, the town can bill it, and they don't have to bother with the water company.

Mr. Bromson stated the new budget is coming up, and they will look at this, and the Finance Director can provide options, i.e., flat rate as well as other options. He noted the Council can hold another special meeting, and the public can speak again. He stated when the budget comes up, the Council will have plenty of time to consider any amendments. He invited the public to forward concerns or preferences such as a flat fee.

Chairman Ludwick suggested they have another special meeting in November.

Commissioner Bosco stated he will vote no because he voted no the first time because he didn't think it was right, and he will not vote yes until he knows it is right. He noted if Karen LaPlante is correct, and the Town charged people a fee when it wasn't applicable, he believes people may be owed money.

Mr. Wilcox stated that was a decision that he made. He explained when they bill for July, they are billing for usage in April, May and June. He noted the July amount and ready-to-serve charge was for the coming quarter.

As concerns Commissioner Deni's concern about meter charges, Mr. Wilcox explained it's based on the meter size or the size of the pipe coming into the house. He noted they are not charging for the meter, because the meter belongs to the water company, but the theory is that the size of the water pipe coming into the house often impacts the usage of the system itself – more water comes in and more water goes out and will be treated by the plant. He stated the referendum was to address costs concerning rebuilding the plant itself, which was built in the 1920's, and the \$36 million dollars was to address the actual cost of the plant, but they still need to put aside money for the lines in the streets, and those are also old lines and need to be replaced or repaired. He pointed out the ready-to-serve portion goes towards that portion.

Upon a **ROLL-CALL** vote being taken, the Chair declared **RESOLUTION #4688** adopted 8-2-0, with Councilors Bosco and Deni voting against the resolution.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

There were no items under Miscellaneous.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION #4689** by Commissioner Falk, seconded by Commissioner Deni to adjourn.

Upon a **SHOW-OF-HANDS** vote being taken, the Chair declared **MOTION #4689** adopted 10-0-0, and the meeting stood adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne F. Olechnicki  
Town Clerk  
Clerk of the Council

Jeannette Lamontagne  
Secretary to the Council

**TOWN OF ENFIELD  
 WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY  
 SEWER SERVICE FEE SCHEDULE  
 Pursuant to §86-203(2)  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019**

**WATER USAGE BASED SEWER RATES**

- Billed water consumption ≤20,000 \$3.43 per 1,000 gallons
- Billed water consumption > 20,000 \$5.13 per 1,000 gallons

*A seasonal adjustment is made by reducing the daily consumption of potable water for the months of June, July, and August by 7.5%.*

**SEWER USAGE BASED RATES  
 (FOR SEWER USERS WITH SEWER METERS)**

- Significant users with sewer meters: charges will be computed by multiplying the quarterly volume of sewerage by \$5.13 per 1,000 and billed quarterly.

**PRIVATE WELL BASED RATES**

- Well Users will be charged quarterly based on the average consumption by user classification:  
 Residential and small non-residential 12,780 gallons per quarter for FY18/19  
 Commercial and industrial 90,000 gallons per quarter for FY18/19

The ready to serve fixed quarterly charge for well users will be based on the smallest meter size.

**DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS**

*Interest will be charged on delinquent accounts at the rate of 1-1/2% per month, with a minimum charge of \$2.00, as provided by statute. Appeals for such charges must be filed within 30 days after the mailing of the bills. NOTE: Sewer Fees are the responsibility of the property owner.*

**READY-TO-SERVE FIXED QUARTERLY CHARGE**

METER SIZE	SIZE FACTOR	CHARGE
5/8"	1.0	\$21.00
3/4"	1.5	\$31.50
1"	2.5	\$52.50
1-1/2"	5.0	\$105.00
2"	8.0	\$168.00
3"	15.0	\$315.00
4"	25.0	\$525.00
6"	50.0	\$1,050.00
8"	80.0	\$1,680.00

*The Ready-to-Serve Charge is established to provide for the fixed expenses of owning and maintain the water pollution system such as the physical plant, lift stations, pump stations, manholes, collection lines and piping. For customer billed on a monthly basis, the monthly fixed charged shall be one third of the values shown in the table above.*

---

**SEWER CONNECTION FEES**

\$3,000\* per EDU

\*Houses and commercial/Industrial buildings built prior to January 1, 2014 and were not connected to the Town of Enfield Sanitary Sewer System as of January 1, 2014 will be charged pursuant to the WPCA policy on Sewer Connections.

---

**OTHER FEES**

<b>Inspection Fee:</b>	\$100 per occurrence for any new construction, replacement, renovation or repair work during published business hours (\$300 per occurrence for nights, holidays, and weekends)
<b>Sewer Meter Reading Charge:</b>	\$50 per reading (quarterly) of non-Water Company meters
<b>Septage Disposal Permit:</b>	\$100 per year for each registered septage hauler
<b>Septage Disposal Fees:</b>	\$60 per 1,000 gallons based on full truck capacity of residential septage \$80 per 1,000 gallons based on full truck capacity of industrial/commercial septage \$10 per discharge for sewage from recreational vehicles (campers)
<b>FOG Inspection Fee:</b>	\$50 per inspection visit (no more than monthly)
<b>Industrial Groundwater Remediation Discharge:</b>	\$250 per quarter

**ENFIELD TOWN COUNCIL/WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2018**

A Special Meeting of the Enfield Town Council/Water Pollution Control Commission was called to order by Chairman Ludwick at 6:00 p.m.

Present were Commissioners Cekala, Deni, Falk, Ludwick, Muller, Szewczak and Unghire. Commissioners Arnone, Cressotti and Davis were absent. Commissioner Bosco entered at 6:40 p.m. Also present were Town Manager, Christopher Bromson; Town Clerk, Suzanne Olechnicki; Acting Town Attorney, Maria Elsden; Director of Public Works, Donald Nunes and Director of Finance, John Wilcox.

**SPECIAL GUEST, WOODARD & CURRAN – PRESENTATION**

Present from Woodard & Curran were Jay Sheehan, Senior Vice President and Toby Fedder, Vice President

Mr. Sheehan spoke about the compliance timeline for WPCA.

- The WPCA collection system was built in 1938, and the last major upgrade was in 1995
- CT DEEP issued the fifth and last notice of violation (N.O.V.) on February 21, 2012. Such violations can result in a \$25,000/day fine for non-compliance. The list of deficiencies is extensive.
- In October 2012, the Town hired a consultant for a capital study and rate plan, and Woodard and Curran was selected through a competitive bid.
- The first deadline for N.O.V. was January 2014. By complying, Woodard & Curran wrote a report to DEEP to avoid a \$25,000 fine
- The next compliance deadline was May 2015, the fees were avoided
- In November 2015 the \$36 million-dollar referendum passed
- In November 2017, there was a deadline to do some construction improvements, but because the Town showed good faith by going to a rate system, the deadline was extended so that fines would not kick in
- Construction began June 2018 and improvements are expected to be completed July 2020, and DEEP would have a \$50,000 per day fine if improvements aren't completed by that date. Work is on schedule.

Mr. Fedder stated he was very involved with the completion of the rate study and presented it several times. He provided a timeline of the costs that the WPCA has incurred over the course of operations and where those funds have come from. He presented charts showing these figures. He stated in FY 2019, there is a big jump and commensurate with that jump, they knew they needed to restructure the way they were generating revenue. He stated they jumped from a \$4.8 million-dollar generation to nearly \$7 million dollars. He noted some of that was changed during the

budgetary process, but when they set rates in April, that was the figure they were targeting. He explained the switch was to bring in fixed charges that were applied on a quarterly basis to customers based on meter size, which is a very frequent practice in both water and waste water industries.

Mr. Fedder explained the difference between a tax and user fee. He noted a tax is basically a charge imposed by an authority, and its valued on income or property owned. The ad valorem is a tax levied upon real property, and that is what was used through 2013. He explained flat fees, fixed charges or volumetric charges can be defined as user fees. He noted a user fee is defined as a charge imposed on a customer, and it can be based on either fixed or volumetric characteristics. He pointed out the revisiting of the original rate study was used to help them identify a blend of charges and volumetric rates which would generate the volume of money needed every year.

Mr. Sheehan reviewed the history of the rate program. He noted on March 15, 2013, Woodard & Curran presented the WPCA with a recommendation for rates, and it was a full financial review of the utility. He noted they benchmarked Enfield against other utilities, and they looked at the capital improvement recommendations. He stated they recommended \$42 million dollars in capital, and in working with the steering committee, that figure was reduced to \$36 million dollars. He stated at that time, they recommended a flat user fee in lieu of Ad Valorem. He pointed out the Town Manager was very strong about equity, because it was believed it was not equitable to charge a single person in a home and a family in a home the same amount, therefore, Woodard & Curran adjusted the financial model and came up with a consumption-based system.

Mr. Sheehan explained how they moved from Ad Valorem. He noted Chapter 103 of the state code states sewer funding shall be kept separate from other kinds of funding in a municipality, but Enfield was not doing this which meant the plant wore down because for 40 or 50 years Enfield was not funding the plant the way a normal WPCA would fund a plant. He stated in order to capture CT DEEP funding for this project, which amounts to \$6 million dollars in grants and a 2% loan of about \$24 million dollars under the state revolving fund, a durable and dedicated revenue stream is required, and that's the reason a different type of funding system must happen.

He then reviewed the history of the rate program as follows:

- In January 2014, Finance started consumption-based billing.
- In September 2014, the WPCA amended the sewer fee schedule to reduce connection fees.
- In March 2015, WPCA approved a reduction for irrigation and pools, which resulted in more money taken out of the revenue they were trying to generate.
- In April 2015, the Council asked the Director of Finance to do a five-year quarterly update regarding revenues.
- In June 2017, Woodard & Curran was hired again to do a three-year financial audit, and in the Spring of 2018, they came back with a recommendation, and the WPCA stated there should be a bi-partisan subcommittee. Four subcommittee meetings were held. He pointed

out there were more than 16 meetings with the Town Council and WPCA since the rate issue came up.

Mr. Fedder clarified that these reductions were not Woodard & Curran's recommendations, but those were decisions taken independently. He explained why there was a delta between the \$5.3 million-dollar revenue generation that was in the original rate design and the \$4.8 million-dollar revenue that was occurring between 2014 and 2018. He noted they documented the performance, and in truth the rates were working except for the modifications done afterwards. He stated where they stand now at the end of Fiscal 2018 is that they still have about \$2.5 million dollars to repay to the General Fund, which is from the original \$3.6 million, and it was always intended that the revenue generation of the 2014 rate set would do that, but it was originally intended it would do it more quickly because it would have increased the revenues.

He stated it's believed current rates will generate around \$6.2 million dollars. He noted they looked at year-to-date financials, and the revenue generation of the program is working as expected. He explained the jump in revenue from \$4.8 million and \$6.2 is all associated with the fixed charges, which were instituted as part of the fiscal cycle.

Mr. Sheehan stated the subcommittee liked the combination of a volumetric rate increase and establishing a fixed charge.

Mr. Fedder stated they provided fiscal year numbers for the current fiscal cycle, next fiscal cycle and out to 2023 after the debt service is fully rolled onto the budget. He displayed and explained tables regarding volumetric charges and well-based customer charges.

Mr. Sheehan stated they are benchmarking the capital improvement cost to the plant. He noted \$36 million for a plant the size of Enfield's plant is very reasonable compared to Torrington's smaller plant, which is costing \$72 million dollars. He referred to a table showing all the comparable communities, which shows the annual monthly bill, and the 2014 to 2018 rate showed Enfield was one of the lowest of the comparable communities. He stated in order to be responsible in the volumetric rate for 2023, Enfield probably must increase its rate, which makes it a little above the mid-point.

Chairman Ludwick questioned whether this presentation will be on the Town's website, and Mr. Bromson responded it will be on the website tomorrow. He stated his belief this is a very good presentation of where they were and where they need to go. He feels the combination chosen was equitable and fair, and he believes the Council and Woodard & Curran acted appropriately. He noted three positions in the water treatment plan have been frozen. He pointed out the Town will have a brand new plant minus three maintenance people. He stated the Novak report recommended an increase in personnel. He emphasized the importance of adequate staff and resources to do proper maintenance. He stated they should address concerns in the upcoming budget.

Chairman Ludwick stated the Department of Corrections owes the Town \$2.3 million dollars. He requested an update as to when they're going to OPM. He then questioned whether Enfield's completed sewer plant would have the capacity to take on sewer needs from surrounding towns to generate additional revenue. Mr. Fedder stated there are economies of scale to be had in the wastewater business when it comes to regionalization. Mr. Bromson indicated that will be explored.

Mr. Sheehan stated during the facilities plan they did explore this idea. He noted they did look at Somers where they have a small plant. He noted if Somers requires an upgrade, they will want to do something different. He stated Enfield is very close to the Somers sewer line, therefore, it would be very easy to connect to them. He noted there are some sewer issues in Suffield, particularly the Congamond area, which is further away. He stated there are some opportunities.

As concerns what the State of Connecticut owes the Town under the D.O.C. agreement, Mr. Bromson stated they have talked to Fuss & O'Neill, and they will be reporting to him in the morning to find out when and how it will go onto the State Bonding Commission for action. He then referred to a good article in the Connecticut Mirror concerning the PILOT program. He explained PILOT is payment-in-lieu-of-taxes. He noted Enfield has large state facilities in Enfield, and Enfield can't tax them, and it was unfair. He stated many years ago, they came up with PILOT, whereby the State will reimburse the town for impacts their presence has on the town. He noted that article talked about that broken promise because that PILOT funding is continuously decreasing, therefore, there's been a shift to property taxes causing the town to cover the shortfall.

Chairman Ludwick commended Woodard & Curran for a great presentation, which shows how they've arrived at this point. He stated having this on the Town's website will be helpful for the public.

Commissioner Szewczak suggested the sewer bill have a statement informing people this presentation is available on the Town's website.

Commissioner Falk stated when Woodard & Curran came up with their original estimate for revenue, they took into account people are using more water because when they took it out, it hurt the estimate. He questioned why that wasn't taken into account in the first place. Mr. Fedder stated communities are allowed to adopt policies as they see fit, and Woodard and Curran wasn't instructed to include it in the rate study. He noted when there's an attempt to get a projection of a revenue stream, they used the one weighing device they had, which were the water meter readings for three years from Hazardville Water and Connecticut Water. Commissioner Falk stated his belief Woodard & Curran made a false assumption. Mr. Fedder stated he's not sure that's an accurate characterization. He noted many communities in Connecticut don't adjust for summer consumption, and that's a selection made by the community. He went on to note in the 2018 study, that was taken into account. He stated in the original study completed in 2013, they had no basis to understand what sort of adjustment would be made. He stated in order to raise revenue for a

certain amount, there are a set of rates that will do so with a given set of policies. He noted after the initial rates were set, some of the policies were changed.

Mr. Sheehan stated when they did the original rate, they did not take water consumption at 100% because they factored in a reduction in water use based on a sewer program. He noted the deduct meters resulted in a much bigger decrease than was ever anticipated.

Commissioner Deni stated if they go to a flat rate, will money be saved in the sense that they will eliminate the billing company, plus they won't be paying the water companies to monitor meters. Mr. Fedder stated yes, money would be saved. He noted the figures he provided today are basically provided for residential and non-residential, therefore, they assumed all non-residential customers would continue to be billed under the current practices as recommended in the 2018 study, but significant administration money would be saved for residential customers.

Mr. Sheehan stated the billing is a couple hundred thousand dollars per year. Mr. Bromson stated they can ask the Director of Finance to look at this for the next meeting.

Commissioner Deni requested this presentation be made in the form of a hard copy for people to pick up at Town Hall. Mr. Bromson stated that can be provided at the information desk at Town Hall as well as at the Senior Center, and if there's a request to place it in other locations, that can be done.

Chairman Ludwick invited comments from the public.

Karen LaPlante, 166 North Maple Street

Referring to inequitable sewer use charges, she urged the WPCA to remove the ready-to-serve fee from the well users bills. She pointed out well users can do nothing to lower their rates while metered customers are only billed for the water they use so they can conserve water to lower their bills. She noted there's evidence not everyone is being billed for sewer use.

Jared DeNardis, 4 Center Circle

Stated he's a professional at another wastewater treatment plant in another town. He stated his belief Enfield should have a separate WPCA beyond just a subcommittee. He stated his belief this would be beneficial to the town.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION #4690** by Commissioner Falk, seconded by Commissioner Deni to adjourn.

Upon a **SHOW-OF-HANDS** vote being taken, the Chair declared **MOTION #4690** adopted 9-0-0, and the meeting stood adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Suzanne F. Olechnicki, Town Clerk  
Special Meeting

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeannette Lamontagne, Secretary to the Council  
11/19/2018

Page 1 of 5