

Town of Trumbull

CONNECTICUT

TOWN HALL
(203) 452-5048



5866 MAIN STREET
TRUMBULL, CT 06611

MINUTES

Special Informational Workshop Session Wednesday, December 6, 2012 Booth Hill School

In Attendance:

First Selectman Timothy Herbst
John Marsilio, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Smeriglio, PE, Town Engineer
Joseph Solemene, Assistant WPCA Administrator
Karen Egri, WPCA Vice Chairman

First Selectman Herbst opened the special informational workshop session at 7:00 p.m.

OPENING COMMENTS:

The First Selectman welcomed and thanked the residents for coming. Copies of the informational packet that is also available on the Town's website were passed out. He apologized for not being at the public hearing because he had to be at another meeting and another public hearing on that night. This is the third of three informational sessions regarding Phase IV Contract 4 sewer installation and expansion project which is currently set to be completed in North Nichols. At yesterday's session we got a lot of questions that were generic to the entire project and specific to specific properties.

Staff members in attendance and WPCA Vice Chairman Egri were introduced and he acknowledged the presence of IWWC Commissioner Carmine DeFeo, Gregg Basbagill Town Council representative from District 1 and Golf Commission member Owen Evans. The session format will include a project summary, what is included in the assessments, what has been taken out of the assessments and then questions.

First Selectman Herbst asked how many residents here tonight were at the public hearing in 2002 when this project was originally proposed. There was a show of hands. The reason for bringing this up is because there are a lot of people that are upset and rightfully so. They have very large bills and many people were not expecting a sewer assessment of that size. He asked if that is correct and the response was affirmative. He said residents are asking why is it so high, what costs are factored into the assessment and how did we get to this point. First Selectman Herbst referenced information provided to residents at Public Hearings in 2002 for Projects 1 through 5 which included estimated assessments quoted at \$16,000.00 to \$18,000.00. He pointed out the estimated amounts were given with no cost escalators taken into consideration. He is aware that everyone is upset and everyone has the right to be upset with the assessments because the cost is higher than what was quoted in 2002.

HISTORY REGARDING JOG HILL PROJECT CONTRACT 3:

- The Jog Hill sewer project included about 730 homes and took place right before the North Nichols project.

- In the Spring of 2009 residents got their sewer assessment bills and were upset because their assessments were \$23,000.00 to \$26,000.00 after they had been told the assessments were going to be about \$16,000.00 to \$18,000.00. Residents were never told those figures were estimates.
- Public hearings were held, questions were asked and residents wanted to know why the assessments were so high?
- Escalating costs, two and a half million dollars in change orders and a three and a half million dollar sewer extension drove the cost of that project up. The Project was originally bid at \$15,000,000 and ended at \$21,000,000.

FIRST SELECTMAN TIMOTHY HERBST

SUMMARY: CONTRACT 4 NORTH NICHOLS PROJECT:

The Project went out to bid in the Spring of 2009 and low bid was Mark IV Construction. A bid application of roughly \$27,000,000 was submitted. The First Selectman highlighted the bond authorization process that went before the Board of Finance and Town Council in September, 2009. The traditional formula for establishing the assessment is 75% covered by the homeowner through the assessments and 25% covered by the Town from the general fund. There are approximately 850 houses in this contract and 75% of \$27,000,000 is \$20,250,000 divided by 850 homes equals an average assessment of \$23,800.00 before change orders, oversight costs and final paving. In September 2009 the Town knew assessments were going to be at least \$23,800.00 and an additional Public Hearing was never scheduled. The bond authorization went before the Board of Finance and Council and at no time did they review the bid documents, the bid specifications, the design documents or the contract documents. The bond authorization was approved and construction began about six weeks before he was elected First Selectman and about two and a half months before he took office. Because of what happened in the Jog Hill Project he wanted to cancel Contract 4 and not proceed. He directed his new Town attorneys to review the contract and to find a way to terminate it and stop the project because assessments would be \$25,000 to \$30,000. Based upon the language and the termination provisions in the contract the Town attorneys determined there were not adequate provisions that would allow termination of the contract out of convenience. There are provisions that are known as termination for convenience provisions that basically allow municipalities if they don't have the money or the resources to pull back. The contract's termination provisions basically said the only way we could terminate the contract was for cause if the contractor breached their duties under the contract. That was the only way out of the contract and if we tried to terminate the contract for any other reason the Town of Trumbull would be sued by the contractor for breach of contract and be subject to liquidated damages and a court could have ordered the project to proceed anyway. There was no way out of the contract and no way to terminate it.

At that point we had decisions to make. Do we allow the project to move forward like the last project with very little oversight, very little internal controls or do we make sure we have the proper oversight and controls in place to make sure the problems in Jog Hill did not repeat themselves in this project? John Marsilio was hired in February and one of the first things he said was we do not have adequate oversight on this project. A forensic audit of the previous project found there was not adequate oversight of the project. We brought in Tighe & Bond an independent third party engineer to basically provide oversight to every crew performing work in this project. They came in after 40 percent had already been completed. Not only did they provide oversight on the remaining 60 percent they went back and checked that 40 percent, camera tested and made the contractor go back and make repairs in the initial 40 percent.

The First Selectman commented that he has heard from residents that this project has gone on longer than they would have liked. As an example of delays by the contractor he described problems on Dogwood Lane relating to the contractor starting work there then stopping work on the road because they wanted additional money to complete the pipe installation around Dogwood Pond and the Town refusing to pay the additional money. The Town has faced the challenge of getting the project done free of defects while keeping the project as close to the bond authorization as possible. We are about 800 feet from total completion on Dogwood Pond. You received

a proposed assessment and the final assessment has not been set yet. We are having these meetings so we can hear your frustrations, your concerns and answer your questions.

RECAP:

- Assessments would have been on average \$23,800.00 in 2009;
- There should have been another public hearing allowing residents the opportunity to be heard;
- When residents were told assessments were going to be \$16,000.00 to \$18,000.00 in 2002 they were not told about price escalators;
- When we tried to terminate this contract we could not based upon the provisions in the contract;
- We took the action we deemed necessary and appropriate to make sure that what happened on Jog Hill didn't happen on this project and everything that was installed was free of defects.

ASSESSMENTS:

COSTS BORNE BY THE TOWN AND NOT INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENTS:

- All Tighe & Bond costs have been removed from the assessments.
 - They are providing services to the entire Town.
- All road paving has been eliminated from assessments.
 - Paving was delayed because Tighe & Bond identified defects underground and we made the contractor go back and correct the defects before we commenced final paving.
 - The \$1,000,000 Shelton Road rehabilitation and repaving cost is a Town capital cost because the WPCA took the position from a policy stand point that everybody in Trumbull uses the roads.
- Chimney repairs
 - Much of that cost has been carved out of the assessment.

If this was not done the average assessment in Contract 4 would have been around \$32,000.00. The average assessment on this project is \$22,500.00 and you are being assessed on half a million dollars less than what you would have been assessed on 2009. In 2009 the bond authorization was for \$27,000,000 and now you are being assessed on roughly \$26,500,000.

He said many residents question why assessments are based on frontage instead of just dividing the total cost by the 850 homes. He explained the frontage formula has been in effect since the beginning of the sewer program in the 1970's and every project has used this formula. He does not agree with the formula but that is what is in place and if the WPCA changes the formula then residents in other projects can challenge the setting of the assessments. He discussed comparison assessment figures regarding Jog Hill and North Nichols projects. He noted this project's interest rate of 2.75 percent fixed for twenty years is the lowest interest rate of any sewer project since the inception of the sewer expansion program in Trumbull in the mid 1970's. For 175 foot frontage this project's quarterly payment is less than \$30.00 higher than Jog Hill's quarterly payment. Jog Hill = \$445.69 North Nichols = \$474.41.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:

- Mike Mendick, 49 Old Green Road. Regarding the frontage, why doesn't the letter we received mention 100 feet? It's broken up into 175, 150 and 125 is there a reason? Response: You can't look at the assessment as the cost of installing the sewer line in front of your house.
- Why doesn't it say 100? Response: The breakout in ranges is because you want to keep the assessments within a certain range of each other of the 80 and 125, 120 and 150. So if you're on a half acre and you have the frontage of 100 feet you fall into the 125 frontage. Additional questions and comments followed regarding the 100 feet. John Marsilio indicated we misunderstood the question. John Marsilio asked if his assessment says 125 feet and if his lot is half acre to one acre and the response was yes. Response: The first

element of the formula for the assessment is lot size. If it is under a half acre then the lowest amount of assessment would be 80 feet and the upper limit would be 125. Your lot being between a half acre and an acre the minimum assessment is 125 feet and the maximum assessment is 150 feet and on over an acre its 150 and 175 feet. If you look on page 3 you will see this formula.

- That is what I understood but why all of a sudden do they put 100 feet? Response: That is just an example to compare 2 projects with each other.
- Item number 1 Project Costs - what is in the project costs? They've done a lot of catch basin repairs is that in the Nichols part or is it for the Town? Response: For the Town that is part of the road cost.

- Pat Teto, 39 Longview Road. Her lot is a little more than an acre and the sewer is only 20 feet in front of her property. She understands about the linear and about the acreage, but isn't that unfair to people? She went to the very first project meeting before the projects started and at that time everything was linear and now because she lives on an acre that is thrown in. She thinks her lot is assessed at 162 so she is paying for 142 that is not even covered by a sewer and she can't understand that. The acre and a half has nothing to do with the sewer. She commented on living on a cul-de-sac.

Response from John Marsilio: You're right it had nothing to do with the sewer. It is just the formula that has been established in this town for 40 years. If you live on a cul-de-sac would it have been prudent to dig that line all the way across your frontage if you didn't need it? If we could come 20 feet onto your property and you could connect what would be the value of extending it? If we did that throughout this project the project would have cost much more. You have to divorce the length of the pipe across your frontage from this formula. There is no formula that is going to make everyone happy. The answer to the your question about the 20 feet is all you needed was 20 feet so that is all that was installed. There is no connection between that and the formula on how the assessments are done.

- Has the acreage always been in the formula? Response: Yes always.
 - On all of them? Response: Yes
 - And no one ever blocked that? It is totally unfair. Response: They should have.
- She said that she is not fighting the frontage she's fighting the unfairness of acreage because you don't use that and that's not part of the sewers. First Selectman Herbst's response included a description of what would result if the formula is changed for this project. If we don't honor what has been done in the past we open up the Town to litigation from people who weren't treated the same. We would have other people in all the other projects saying the WPCA acted arbitrarily and is acting unfairly and changing it for this project. That is the problem we run into. This also came up in contract 3 because those assessments were also high.

In prior projects when the assessments were \$14,000 or \$16,000 these types of questions weren't asked.

Mrs. Teto commented on prior information that was given to residents about earlier sewer projects, pricing of a penny per foot in previous contracts and being penalized for previous problems.

- Matt Damico, 38 Red Fox Lane. He is supposed to get a pump. If your property needs a grinder pump the minimum charge is \$3,500.00. What are the other potential costs? Response from Joe Solemene: The cost of the pump, the installation of the control panel and the labor to install all of that is rolled into the cost of this project. The project is compensating you for not being able to achieve a gravity flow. The \$3,500.00 is the cost to run the connecting line from your septic tank to your lateral connection and that charge is a cost that everyone else who connects has to assume out of pocket. You are able to include that \$3,500.00 into your assessment and pay it over the 20 years at this low interest rate.
- What are the other potential costs? Response: That's it. If you need a new septic tank or an electrical upgrade they are shown in your pump agreement and those are costs that are above the standard pump installation and are normally not needed.
- So from the septic tank to the lateral? Response: \$3,500.00 that everyone else pays out of pocket.
- What is the warranty on it? Response: One year

- It's my responsibility to maintain that pump from that point on correct? Response: Yes.
- David Quatrella, 50 Red Fox Lane. When is Red Fox Lane going to be able to hook up? Response from John Marsilio: There is about 700 feet more of pipe to complete this project. The project was 111,000 feet and we are down to 700 and it happens to be the toughest part of the project. We are anticipating we will complete this project in the next 30 to 45 days. If we can do that and if we can finalize all the testing it is my guess in 90 days we will be releasing virtually all of this project. You could probably plan for a Spring connection in late March or early April.
- Kurt Schneider, 2009 Huntington Turnpike. What was the frontage cost for phase 1 and phase 2? Response from Joe Solemene: I don't think we have that here but, if you call my office I will be happy to provide that.
- Explain how it jumped from \$138.02 per foot on the previous phase 3 project to \$162.62 for this last phase that we're involved with? This was done at a time when construction costs should have been at their lowest. So, where did that jump come from? Response from John Marsilio: He stated the First Selectman explained at the outset that there was a \$27,000,000 bond from the beginning and if you use the math and back out what the assessments would have been under the formula that we've always used, it always was \$162 a foot. Mark IV Construction happened to be the low bidder again on contract 4 and they had their bond and insurance in place and they met all the conditions of a proper bid. There were five bidders and they were over a million lower on the bid and they were awarded the contract. The \$162 a foot is not reflective of any aberration in this installation it was like that from the beginning. I don't know what the conditions or bids were on contract 3.
- Robert Hall, 10 Powder Mill Lane. He lives on the corner lot of Shelton Road and Powder Mill and he wants to make sure the shorter piece is being used. Response: Frank Smeriglio said he will look at the drawings and verify that what is on the assessment is the shorter length.
- Bob Edwards, 72 Primrose Drive. Comment: When this was first proposed he was new to the town and he did some calculations and it looked like the replacement cost of his septic system would have been about the equivalent of what is being proposed to run the sewer lines. It was roughly about 6 or 7 percent of the value of his house and right now it is running a little over 10 percent of the value of his house. The cost has escalated considerably. This is amortized over 20 years and that is too long and not feasible.
- When he sells the house what is his obligation? If he does not hook up what is the buyer's obligation because all of this takes away from the value of his house? Response: Frank Smeriglio said the assessment is a lien on the property. If you chose the 20 year option and you live there for 10 years the town does not require you to pay off the assessment upon the sale of the house. As far as not hooking in, you are able to apply for an extension of time to hook in and that is only valid while you own the house. Once you sell the house the new buyer would have to connect. Joe Solemene explained the WPCA made a provision and established the extension of time to connect for residents that were being liened an assessment, who lived in the house and didn't want to connect. There is an application, you fill it out, and there is a one time charge to the health department for a septic system inspection. Most of the septic systems are in order or people would not be applying. Once the waiver is granted you can stay on your septic system as long as you own your home and the septic system is operating within community standards. The only stipulation is once the house is sold the WPCA asks new residents to make arrangements to connect within 90 days.
- You said ask. Is it a requirement? Response: They are required to make arrangements to connect in 90 days.
- So that's a condition then? Response: That's the condition of the extension of time to connect.

- Question from the audience: Do you still have to pay your assessment? Response: You have to pay your assessment whether you connect or not.
- Kent Lewis, 22 Teeter Rock Road. If you sell the house the assessment lien on the property is in second position of the first mortgage now. So if I sell my house does it mean the new buyer can assume that at a second position so the town will subordinate to the first mortgage? If anybody refinances will the town subordinate to a new mortgage? It is his understanding in other phases you are not subordinated which means you have to pay it off if you refinance. Response from Frank Smeriglio: When the assessment is liened on the property it is in second position. When you refinance you would have to talk to the tax department but what would happen is we don't stay in second position we would end up going into first position.
- Which means basically you have to pay it off because if you go into first position no bank will allow itself to be in second position. Response: That may be a bank requirement. The lien will transfer from one property owner to the other but, then there is a second and first position issue that you may have with the bank. First Selectman Herbst said Frank addressed the town's position. There is also an issue with the lender. He relayed a dialog he had with a constituent about 3 months ago who lives in contract 3 and was trying to refinance and this issue came up. The bank did not want to proceed with the refinance given the problem of positioning of the assessment and the constituent contacted us and requested additional documentation which we provided and then the lender reversed the position and granted the refinance. Frank has addressed what the town does but what an individual lender might do is going to vary and the lender might require additional information to allow the refinance to happen.
- Additional questions and comments followed and First Selectman Herbst requested Mr. Lewis' contact information and will get back to him with a more thorough response.
- Resident: Can we all get that response? Response from First Selectman Herbst: Absolutely, we'll put that on the town website.
- Keith Rongey, 7 Woodcrest Avenue. He heard the Bridgeport Water Authority isn't capable of handling the sewage as more and more people connect which means at some point we're going to need a sewage treatment plant. Does that get covered by the state, the town, or is that a town wide assessment like the sewers were? Response from the First Selectman: Right now we are dealing with that very issue. Forty years ago when we started installing sewers in the Town of Trumbull the decision makers at the time made a collective decision and said we are going to expand the town's sewer program but we are not going to build a plant. Over time addition sewers have been added and we have a contractual agreement with the City of Bridgeport. Successive agreements have been negotiated over time, we've pumped our effluent to Bridgeport and have a fixed rate in the contract. We received a six month extension of the contract in July and we are in the process of determining available options to Trumbull. 1) My own perspective is, based upon the town's current financial position, after spending \$66,000,000 on a high school renovation and fifty plus million dollars between Jog Hill and North Nichols, I don't think the town is in the financial position to spend \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 building its own treatment plant. I just don't think the town can sustain that level of debt service. It will drive our property taxes up and it will compromise our bond rating. 2) Then we would need DEEP approval and that would take a lot of time to secure the necessary permits to construct the plant. I don't think securing those permits would be successful given that the state is encouraging regionalization. But assuming we were able to secure the permits and assuming we are willing to take on that debt service there is the third and most important question. 3) Where are we going to put a plant in the Town of Trumbull? I don't think any of you want to live next to a sewage treatment plant. So, that is the challenge that we face.

So the answer really becomes the solution which may have to be a regional one and there are three regional solutions: 1) We could renegotiate the contract and that is likely going to involve a rate increase and you are

already paying one of the highest rates in the State of Connecticut. 2) You could regionalize with Bridgeport and perhaps Monroe or just Bridgeport. Then the concern is going to be the cost of the debt service to upgrade Bridgeport's system because we have a separated system and in many areas Bridgeport does not have a separated system that separates storm water and sewer water. DEEP is going to require us to make those investments. So the question becomes how much of that debt service will Trumbull assume and what is the actual cost of doing that? 3) Finally, the only other communities you could regionalize with because this stuff pumps downhill is Stratford or Fairfield. Fairfield is in no position nor do they have an appetite to assume us as a liability when they have a system that's already made its needed investments and Stratford just upgraded their system and made a lot of investments in their infrastructure. So, there is no easy answer. Here's what I can tell and this is what we've said to the City of Bridgeport if we determine a regional authority is in our community's best interest. First of all our number 1 priority is any deal that we negotiate for the benefit of Trumbull needs to reflect rate relief. We must obtain reasonable rate stabilization and that is priority one. Priority 2 is we need to make sure that while Trumbull will pay its share of debt service that is directly correlated to its use we want to make sure we don't take on any obligations that put us in a bad financial position. So if it costs half a billion dollars lets say to upgrade the Bridgeport system I think the only way we're going to make it work for Trumbull and Trumbull tax payers and rate payers is to do what they did in New Haven when they negotiated that regional deal. The City of New Haven craved out 40 percent of its debt service and assumed that liability itself. That was a concession that was made to get the other neighboring suburban communities to buy into the regional authority so it wouldn't cost as much for those communities in a debt service. We would need to do something similar with the City of Bridgeport. Finally, I think for this regional deal to it work if it involves Bridgeport, Trumbull and Monroe I believe that Trumbull and Monroe need to have majority voting control of that regional WPCA. Given how things have been managed with the Bridgeport WPCA we want to make sure it is managed appropriately. We want to make sure there are appropriate checks and balances so one community does not have an advantage over the two. One of the things that we've thrown out there is Bridgeport four votes, Trumbull 3 votes, Monroe 2 votes. So, in that instance, not one community has a majority but Trumbull and Monroe combined would have a majority. These are some of the things we talk about when we negotiate a regionalized deal but, I agree with you we don't want our residents paying more than what they should and that is going to be a big sticky point for us as we move forward.

- Mike Mendick, 49 Old Green Road. If you sell your house the buyers have to install the system, correct? What if you transfer it to one of your family members? Response: It is a title transfer and the obligation would apply.
- Question for the First Selectman: A year ago you negotiated a lawsuit against Mark IV. Has there been any results on that yet? Response: Are you specifically asking about the litigation involving contract 3 the previous sewer project?
- Question: Wasn't it for 4. Response: No, there is no lawsuit for contract 4. We had to go to mediation and arbitration on contract 4 to enforce some of the bid pricing in an effort to keep the costs down on your project. Your project was mediation and arbitration the litigation involves contract 3. The litigation was brought in response to what was identified in the forensic audit and also the camera testing and field inspections that were performed by Tighe & Bond. As I indicated earlier Tighe & Bond, our third party contract administrators, have identified over 600 latent defects in contract 3 Jog Hill roughly \$9,000,000 worth of damages. We are going to have to make these repairs at some point. So if we did not exercise our rights to pursue a breach of contract claim, among other things contained in the complaint, and the statute of limitations ran out we would have been on the hook. So, we are going to do our very best through the judicial process to recover whatever money and to make these repairs. Getting back to the oversight and getting back to the mediation and arbitration in your project the reason why we've gone through the exercise of having the oversight and enforcing the bid unit pricing and going to mediation to enforce it is so the

residents who are sitting here do not go through what the residents of Jog Hill are going through and continue to go through.

- Scott Robinson, 373 Booth Hill Road. Are there any opportunities that might reduce the assessment at this point? It seems from your last answer that perhaps everything is getting offset presenting relief for the assessment as it is now or is it the bond is set and that's it. Response: The WPCA ultimately is going to set the assessments. That has not happened yet. So, what you got in the mail was not the final bill it was an estimate that was provided to you which affords all the opportunity to come out and express your frustrations to all of us before any assessment is set. In terms of lowering it further if its specifically related to what I just spoke about and hopefully the recovery of some monies through litigation, the first priority with anything that we recover in contract 3 litigation is to make repairs to the system in contract 3 and that is priority one. Reducing it any further I will be very honest with you if there was any other way we could have reduced these assessments we would have. As I said earlier had we not carved out Tighe & Bond and the paving among other things that are included in that packet these assessments would have been even higher than what they are now. They're high and I understand that and it is frustrating and upsetting, but I can tell you that we did everything that we could within reason to try to bring these down. I see it every day in town hall or when the town clerk shows me the foreclosures in this town and I see it when the tax collector shows me liens that have been placed because people can't afford their sewer use bills or their property or car taxes. So, believe me it pains me as much as it pains everyone here to see these assessments where they are and if I could have stopped this project from happening I would have. I did everything within my power to stop this project from happening the train had left the station the contract was in place and I wish we could have done things differently but, we were dealing with the hand that we were dealt.
- Resident: Is the litigation going to delay our project? Response: No, to their credit they are not allowing one project to affect the other. They want to be done with this project too. We are 800 feet away from the promised land and we will do final road repaving of the side streets in the Spring. We hit a lot of the main roads that was priority one because those are used the most by everybody in town. We would have liked to have paved some more roads before the end of the paving season but, we had hurricane Sandy which really set us back for a couple weeks. All these roads are going to have a 25 year useful life.
- Theresa Desisto, 83 Columbine Drive. Why should any of us pay an assessment when we were sold a bill of goods and did not get what we were sold? How do you figure any of us is responsible for paying the assessment when in 2002 not only were we given information for lineal foot but the whole mechanics of the sewer project has not come about? Changes were made without notification to the Nichols residents and we are where we are today but unfortunately we did not agree upon these terms. So why are we obligated to pay the assessment? If you go out and purchase a car and the day of delivery you find out it was upgraded, had a change of color you're not obligated to buy that car so why are we obligated to pay the assessment? Response from First Selectman Herbst. I might repeat some things I said earlier, but I want to answer your question. You have every right to be upset, all of you have every right to be upset because you don't tell people you're going to pay "x" in 2002 and then fast forward 7 years and the rules change and you don't have another public hearing. Everyone that came out to the first public hearing was upset with the assessments. Here's the point I am going to reiterate again, when the \$27,000,000 bond authorization was put before the board of finance in September of 2009 the Town of Trumbull knew before they put a shovel in the ground that in the very least you would be paying an assessment in excess of \$23,000.00 if you simply took the value of what was to be assessed and divided it into the number of homes. So, in 2002 what should have happened is there should have been another public hearing and everybody living in contract 4 should have had the opportunity to come out and know what the true costs of the project were going to be and voice their opinion. Unfortunately that didn't happen.

- Ms. DeSisto commented on elected officials and volunteers.
Response continued: You're right you elect the leaders of the town and the elected leaders made a decision to bond that money. These are the people that you elected to the board of finance and the town council and you elected somebody to be the First Selectman and that person had an appointment authority to the WPCA. The people appointed to the WPCA approved those contracts and the person you elected First Selectman signed those contracts and the town attorneys appointed by that individual executed those contracts. So, when people do not do what you expect them to do you vote them out of office and if I don't do what you expect me to do then you vote me out of office. But what I'm telling you is this, we didn't negotiate the contract, we didn't sign the contract, none of us were in any position to affect that \$27,000,000 bond authorization in September of 2009. We played the hand we were dealt and we made every effort to try to stop that contract from proceeding because we knew that in 2 or 3 years we would be at a public hearing where you and all of your neighbors would be upset because the assessments are more than \$5,000.00 higher on average than what you were told in 2002. I wish that I could go back and change history. I wish I was the person in a position to sign that contract because I would not have signed it. I can tell you I would not have put a \$27,000,000 bond authorization before the board of finance and the town council at a time when the economy was in an economic down turn like we have not seen in our lifetime. Here is what I can tell you what we've done going forward, there's a Charter revision that passed in November 2011 and that Charter revision says, if there is any capital project in this town of \$15,000,000 or greater it now has to go before the voters by way of a public referendum. So no more board of finance and town council approving \$27,000,000 for a sewer project. Now you're going to vote on it and by you voting on it and reviewing it it's going to insure the kind of transparency and accountability that candidly you did not receive before we put in the oversight and you certainly did not receive on the Jog Hill project.
- In 2010 there was a town meeting that was televised with the board of finance. At that meeting a comment was made that was very upsetting to all of us who witnessed this televised meeting. The finance board inherited a shoebox full of money a substantial amount of money. The question was raised do we let the residents know about this surplus money that we inherited, do we put it towards the sewer project or do we say nothing and the committee voted to say nothing. This was televised on TV they were being filmed. So, I would like to where's the shoebox full of money and could they somehow dig it up and put it towards the expenses of the sewer project. Response from the First Selectman: I am not familiar with that meeting and that shoebox of money. If that exists I think it should be put towards lowering your assessments. I would like to know what month in 2010 that meeting was because I will request the tape from channel 17 tomorrow morning. To get back to your original question of why should we pay the assessment. If we don't start paying down the debt that you're elected officials voted to incur for this and many other projects then the Town of Trumbull will be defaulted on its financial obligations. So, in the future when we need to make necessary investments in road repaving or school renovations or we simply need to borrow money to allow the government to continue to function we compromised our financial position and we compromised our ability to borrow in the future. That is why we have to start paying these assessments and paying down the bonded debt that was incurred so we do not default on our financial obligations.
- However, the residents in town really have no choice but to sell because they can't afford it or have liens put on their house which in turn won't allow them to sell their property. But once again we feel the burden of poor judgment. Response: I don't disagree with you. This was a bad project. It shouldn't have happened, but it did.
- Resident: If anyone here chooses to take the extension and not hook up why do they still need to pay the assessment? I get cable there's cable wires running all around the Town of Trumbull if I chose not to get cable Charter doesn't come to me and say oh well listen you have wires running above your house so you're going to pay anyway. If anybody chooses not to hookup why are the residents of Trumbull then having to pay for something they are not using?

Response from John Marsilio: The best answer that I can give you is and I don't have an answer that I think will make you happy. Assessments are based on the cost of the project which caused the issuance of the bonds and those bonds are now outstanding and your assessment reflects 75 percent of that indebtedness. If we were to waive the payment of the assessment there would be a shortfall and addressing and paying for that indebtedness the homeowners assume by being part of this project.

- Resident: The three choices to pay the assessments are pay in full and pay the 30 grand, I can then make a yearly payment or a quarterly payment. I feel like I'm getting penalized if I decide not to hand over the Town of Trumbull 30 grand and then I'd have to give you the \$500 if I intend to make you a yearly payment. I feel like I'm being punished if I don't just turn around and give you 30 grand. What is the additional \$500.00?
Response: The additional \$500.00 is an amount that the WPCA commission started quite a while ago and was supposed to be a capital safety fund account. They recognized that in addition to the pure cost of this project that they had older portions of the system in the community that required rehabilitation. There's a major pump station that has to be repaired and there are a number of defects that have to be repaired and that was their decision to get ahead of the curve and establish a capital fund.
- Theresa Desisto, 83 Columbine Drive: But why for Nichols? You need to revise that and take that out of the whole thing. Response: That is a WPCA Commission issue and I think that could be looked at.
- Resident: Most of the people in this room are suffering financially and you have to work with us.
Response: The WPCA is going to look at that.
- Mr. Bevacqua, 30 Partridge Lane. I'm asking that you revisit the issue that was raised a little earlier of very small percentage of frontage. I received an assessment for the maximum of \$28,895.50. I live on a cul-de-sac and I have approximately 6 feet of frontage in front of my house at a cost of \$162.00 a square foot. For about \$970.00 you're asking me to pay \$28,895.50. You use the terms in your assessment of fair, reasonable, equitable this is not equitable. You have to examine the circumstances more carefully and you cannot simply contribute it to a formula. That's not fair to the citizens of the town. I want to pay my fair share of taxes I don't have a problem with that at all. I've been a servant of this town for many, many years and I love this town. However, you have to be sensitive to some of the problems that folks are facing such as what I'm saying here and I'm hopeful that when these assessments are ultimately levied they will take into consideration these circumstances where variances exist it's a legitimate concern here tonight. But, you're asking me to pay 100 percent of the maximum assessment when less than 3 percent of my frontage has got a sewer line in it. So, all I'm saying is you guys have an enormous responsibility and a tough job here and I wouldn't want to sit in your seat. You have to be prepared to respond to them in a reasonable and equitable manner in your assessment.
- Rudy Muriz, 50 Woodcrest Avenue. I also have a \$28,000.00 assessment and I don't have a stick of pipe that runs across the front of my property I have a manhole to tie into. I understand the point of it and I understand that it costs more to lay in one acre zoning than it does in a quarter acre. But, 48 years ago when my father bought the property all that was on that street were quarter acre homes. I don't have a problem paying what my next door neighbor does or the guy across the street but, to be assessed almost twice as much when there was no real cost to the town running down Woodcrest Avenue I just – it's a tough pill to swallow.
- John Mellish, 386 Shelton Road. I have a general question about the rationale of using frontage we already have in our property assessments for property tax. Could that assessment be used instead of this new thing of a frontage or could we use the acreage instead of it to calculate what each house could pay?

Comments from the First Selectman: As Mr. Bevacqua pointed out reasonableness and fairness. If I had your kind of assessment I would be just as mad as you are right now. I would be just as upset just as mad. You're justified. To answer Mr. Mellish's question, for whatever reason 40 years the town made a policy decision to use this formula and they've used it on every survey project going forward. If we now say we're going to change that

formula for this project all of the other people that have been assessed under the old formula are going to raise the argument of reasonable fairness and how is that fair when this wasn't done for us. I'm just throwing that out there playing devil's advocate. That's what is going to happen and that is what the WPCA is going to hear. On top of that, I just want to point this out to the residents of contract 4 when you look at the total project cost and you look at the capital cost that is part of the total bonding some of that is assumed by the town traditionally 75% for the homeowner and 25% by the town. With the total amount that has been bonded 56% has been assumed by the homeowner and 44% by the town in this project and that is significant to point out. But, of that 44% a lot of it is costs benefiting the entire town and the WPCA has taken the position that should not be included in your assessments.

Comments from John Marsilio: There are many components of this project. For instance pump stations your flow may not require it, but it's in your assessment. There are cross country installations which cross no one's home and there are no homes when they go through those locations. They are project costs. When you design a system like this you try to minimize the construction. So, if Bill only needs 6 feet in front of his house for the lateral that's what they designed. That is why the formula for assessments does not contemplate that issue. What the length of pipe is in front of your house is not included. Years ago when they tried to make this fair, and I don't know of a different formula that would make anybody any happier, they felt that if there were a bunch of small lots and you ran a pipe down the street the cost of servicing each home would be less. As frontage grew and they had to take the line further consequently assessments would grow. That was what was contemplated. I hope you understand it wasn't meant to be penalized, it wasn't meant to adversely affect, they were good people who tried to make an honest formula that was fair. I didn't make it, this WPCA Commission didn't make that formula, I'm trying to relate to you what the thought process was and their effort for fairness and reasonableness. That's what they came up with and that's what has been used all along.

Resident: I wouldn't have an argument if I lived in Parkers Diary and everybody around me had the same acreage. I live amongst quarter acre lots. So, how is my assessment making my property more valuable than the guy next door? Response: Well it isn't.

- Matt Mihaly, 111 Booth Hill Road. With respect to the most recent argument, one could easily make the claim that actually if you have a 20 lot subdivision of quarter acre lots at the end of a mile long road built with one acre lots, that 20 parcel subdivision of smaller lots should bear more of the cost of running that line down that way because they're the ones benefiting most from that, when those of us that have larger lots actually have reserve capability. So, it's not benefiting me as much if I had larger lot its benefiting the person with the small lot more so. When you say you don't know of a formula that would work better than perhaps just say you haven't looked.
- With respect to the cost detail in the handout, towards the end of the project I noticed when I thought everything had been done that your work crews had returned to some areas and it looked like substantial work. Was that the replacement of chimneys? Response: Yes.
- I presume that is included in the line item replacement of various sewer components. Response: Yes.
- That apparent error is not being borne by the entire project contract? Response: Correct.
- I own a house at 33 Booth Hill Road and Mr. Solemene you will remember I called you because Mark IV had installed a lateral at that location as well as across the street at 32 Booth Hill Road when in fact those houses had already been hooked up to the sewer. You told me that was an error and that I would not be charged an assessment and that was not listed on the assessment. But I see in one of the questions here that there are several lateral locations that have been misplaced. Your sample question number 16 says various sewer laterals were not installed in the desired location. I presume those errors also will not be borne by the balance of residents in contract 4.

Response from John Marsilio: If you can give us specifics of where those instances occurred.

- I just gave you specific knowledge of 32 and 33 Booth Hill Road laterals – I don't know what the cost of installing a lateral is, but I presume those were some of the costs that are included in the amounts under the replacement of various components considered town obligations. That's one of your sample questions here that laterals are not placed in the correct location.
Response: Those aren't sample questions. Those were questions that we received at the first public hearing. We tried to answer those questions because at that point that's what people were interested in knowing. That's number one. Number two, if you want me to go and investigate where the costs of 32 and 33 Booth are I can do that.
 - Yes I would like you to do that. Response: As far as question 16 I don't know that location.
 - But my specific question is if additional laterals were placed in erroneous locations are those costs going to be borne by the town. Response: I don't know where those costs are sir, I don't know where they are now.
 - But there are additional ones apparently here right? Response: When we know where they are we'll make a determination of what column the costs go into.
 - Huntington Road was broken out separately can you explain why that is and why the entire contract has to bear it or can you just explain to me why that is a separate line item? Were there additional costs specific to that? Response: At the start of this contract Mark IV Construction took out a permit, posted a bond with the State of Connecticut. Are you talking about Huntington Road or Huntington Turnpike?
 - Huntington Road – it's a separate line item – why is that a separate line item?
Response from Frank Smeriglio: My intent of providing these line items is to show that Huntington Road sewers was a cost of the project.
Response from John Marsilio: That was the cost of running the sewer up Huntington Road and it was handled separately because that portion of the project was started first. That portion of the project was done to accommodate the repaving of Huntington Road. So that's where Mark IV started and those were the costs that were incurred to put sewers in front of all the people on Huntington Road.
 - If you chose to break it down as a separate line item and as a result this is the only fair way you know of doing the assessment then why don't you assess those people based on those specific costs?
Response: Because it's a project cost.
 - Why break it out separately?
Response: We didn't have to, but we wanted to be as transparent as we could as part of the project. You have one whole project 111,000 linear feet of pipe and a number of pump stations that was a piece of it.
 - Mr. Herbst, in reference to this is a formula that has been used for 40 years – you know what the definition of insanity is right? Doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome right? So, I don't accept that answer as appropriate.
- Random comments from residents.
- Matt Mihaly. In reading some of the blogs, there was some implication that the cost of Tighe & Bond would actually generate enough savings to cover their costs. Was that an appropriate statement that somebody made or do you feel that was erroneous?
Response from First Selectman Herbst: I made that statement.
 - So where are the savings from the Tighe & Bond fees on this breakout?
Response from John Marsilio: You'll see the savings in the gross cost of the project.
Response from First Selectman Herbst: I'll give you another example. You heard me talk earlier about Dogwood Pond being the most complicated aspect of the project and that we ran into an impasse very late in the project because they wanted additional money to perform the additional construction. You're asking to quantify where the savings is? I guarantee if you did not have that oversight on this project and if you did not have that oversight specifically as it relates to Dogwood Pond the town would have been in the business of giving addition change orders on the project like we did on the last project where there were two and a half million dollars.
 - But that's not a savings.

Response: First Selectman Herbst: That is a savings – let me finish. Excuse me Mr. Mihaly I let you finish let me finish. That is a savings because on the last project we did not have oversight and you had two and a half million dollars of undocumented change orders that were approved in the field by an inspector before the WPCA even reviewed them. At the end of the day those two and a half million dollars of change orders were paid for and borne by the residents of Jog Hill in their assessments. When you're saying to me quantify where the savings are, they performed value engineering services that reduced the cost of project. There are savings that they achieved by stepping in and making sure oversight was in place so we weren't in the business of having an open checkbook and giving a lot of change orders which has been the pattern for a long period of time.

- But isn't that the job of the town engineer?

Response: No.

- No, well then it seems like this is base line budgeting like the federal government is trying to do when you say I saved money because I didn't spend something I wasn't expected to spend. I respectfully disagree that that's a savings and yes, I would like if you made that statement to see documentation of where you think that savings came from. If that could be provided I would appreciate it.

Response from First Selectman Herbst: Absolutely and I'm just also going to say that there are quality control issues also with having oversight beyond cost savings. I can tell you that if the original blasting plan for Dogwood Pond had gone through before Tighe & Bond reviewed it and made changes the residents living around Dogwood Pond would be looking at a crater right now.

- I can't recall if the sign is specifically there but the price of the project on the sign at the end of Booth Hill Road is not what I believe is reflected in these documents. If the project is not complete and all the final costs are not known how can you give us an estimate of the assessment? Presumably there is not substantially much money left to be paid. What is the exact figure based on this formula and the total funds to be assessed?

Response from John Marsilio: I said earlier that there are 800 feet left maybe today down to 700 feet. The cost of 700 feet of sewer line that remains to be installed is \$65.00 a foot according to the unit prices in the contract which Mark IV has been honoring. So, there is less than \$15,000.00 of work contractually so we have extrapolated that and included that in this. You add up all the numbers on contract three you will get \$26,311,992.36 and that is the base of the assessment.

- So that's the figure we'll see in the reports? Response: The twenty six million dollar figure is what the assessments are based on. That is what is being assessed.
- Liz Dunn, 70 Skyview Drive. You had mentioned about the public hearing that should have happened. Is that a should have in terms of it would have been an ethical moral thing to do or were they legally obligated to hold a meeting? Response from First Selectman Herbst: It would have been the ethical and moral thing to do. Now they are legally obligated to put \$27,000,000 on the ballot and let you vote yes or no. They are legally required now under the Charter to do that so that something like this does not happen again.
- Jim Buckley, 2071 Huntington Turnpike. Mr. Herbst you had said the Town of Trumbull knew this in 2009. The Town of Trumbull made a bad decision in 2009. It says in the letter that the Town of Trumbull assumes 25 percent of the sanitary sewer related costs. I'm asking on behalf of everyone that the Town of Trumbull assume greater than 25 percent of those costs.
Response: In answer to your question they are.
- For the sanitary sewer or for all of it? I'm asking for more than 25 percent of the sanitary sewer costs.
Response: So you're saying that the 75 percent that's covering the sanitary sewer costs should be reduced to what number, if you were to suggest a number?
- Another 10 percent?
Response: Another 10 percent so 65 percent.

- John Mucci, 50 Primrose Drive. You talked about the assessment formula that's been in place and like you said it's not going to change but, it's something to think back on. His point of a smaller lot having a greater benefit is very true. A small lot can't necessarily replace a septic system a large lot can. I have 1.01 acres, I if I give you 4 four inches back I lose \$5,000.00 on my assessment, 20 percent. Five inches of frontage just five inches of my property. You say it's the fairest way I don't see how it's fair.
Response from John Marsilio: I said the people who developed it did it with the thought and spirit of making it fair and equitable. I didn't create this. I'm telling you how it's been done here in this Town. I don't agree with it.
- Comment from a resident: I don't really want to defend the formula but, I will. If you do take the formula of and it's been done in many other towns not just Trumbull, it is very typical to use a linear foot formula. If you calculate your terrain like you say the way that zoning works when you have a half acre or an acre you have a bigger smaller lot. The bigger the lot the larger house you can use. Some towns try to do a formula with the number of bathrooms, fixtures and in the end when you calculate over the average it still comes out similar to a linear foot on the street. So the formula is very consistent throughout the country. Sorry I had to explain.
- Paul Deregt, 27 Turkey Meadow Road. A follow up to what Tim Herbst said regarding if the people whose assessments were done over the years since it started had questions. You really didn't follow up with what the answers would be from the town if they had questions if the methodology of calculating the assessment changed to some of the things that Kent was talking about. You said all the other people whose assessments were done with the front foot basis would have questions. But you didn't say what the answers would be.
Response: What I said was if we change the formula now based upon the fact that all the other previous projects had followed that formula what could happen is that these people will now say wait a minute you are changing the formula after doing it this way on contracts 3, on 2, on 1, phase 4, phase 3, phase 2, phase 1 and now you're basically changing the formula for this project and then they could potentially challenge that.
- What could the outcome be? Response: If somebody filed a law suit against the Town of Trumbull claiming that it acted in an arbitrary or discriminatory manner I cannot predict what a judicial outcome will be. I can't predict what a court of law will do. I just saying it could happen.
- Keith Rongey, 7 Woodcrest Avenue. We are all in the Town of Trumbull, it's all coming out of the same checkbook. Whether you pay it as an assessment or whether you pay it as property tax it's coming out of the same pocket. So, it really doesn't matter how much Trumbull's going to take. They could fund 100 percent and then your property tax would go up. So, it's moot to discuss what you pay personally versus how much the town pays.
- Mary Hammer, 106 Booth Hill Road. If you have to have a grinder pump and it runs on electricity, do you need 200 amp service and when your power goes out does that mean you have no bathroom? Response from Frank Smeriglio: The grinder pump does not need a 200 amp service. In the grinder pump agreement there is a list of things you may or may not need and there are costs associated with that. If there is an issue with the electrical panel our contractor will come there and look at your panel and if you don't have room on your panel then you will need work to the panel and that is also listed. He briefly explained how the panel is used.
- If there is a storm and there is no power and you have a grinder pump then do you have no toilet?
Response: What happens is the grinder pump gets installed into your septic tank. He explained how the storage capability of the tank is used and how the grinder pump works with it. John Marsilio asked her to see him after the meeting.

- Debora Saric, 87 Skyview Drive. Just had her grinder pump put in yesterday and she explained she asked the contractor what happens when you lose power and he told her you should be fine for a good month don't worry about it. It will just work in the septic like it normally does.
- Carmine DeFeo, 15 Woodcrest Avenue. The \$3,500.00 for the grinder pump is that regardless of the length of run to the lateral as well as if ledge is hit? Response from Joe Solemene: Yes, the cost was derived by an average of the expense. It would be \$3,500.00 no matter what they run into.
- Going to the paved road – you say 25 year life. I'm contemplating switching to gas which is run down my street. Are we going to be able to tie in to utilities after these roads get paved immediately if necessary or do we have to wait? There is a rumor going around that you can't do anything in the road for 5 years. Response: The rumor is incorrect.
- Going back to the repairs that have to be made – The problems that were found by Tighe & Bond and like the remediation that was done at Dogwood. You said they wanted to put a change order in for \$800,000 did the town pay any extra in change orders? Response: No change orders.
- As far as the regionalization especially my little section down there as you mentioned it flows downhill. Right now everything flows down to the corporate park and is pumped back up into Trumbull because you don't want to cross that line and go into Stratford. Why can't a portion of that be worked out with Stratford so that you can eliminate a pumping station which has added expense to the town. Just let it all flow downhill. Response from Frank Smeriglio: I am not familiar with being able to tie into Stratford or what their structure is and is not familiar with any of the negotiations that would have happened with Stratford. Response from First Selectman Herbst: This is being recorded so it's going to be brought to the WPCA's attention.
- He did not attend the first meeting and he heard that a comment was made that there are 850 families and less than 10 to 15 percent showed up so not a lot of people are unhappy with the situation. I say just the reverse of that. One in particular reason is St. Joseph's was holding parent conferences that night and I think a lot of parents would consider that more important than going to the sewers. You have to be a little more careful for when you make these meetings especially at a short notice like this because there are other meetings planned long in advance and you have to take that into account.
- Theresa Desisto, 83 Columbine Drive. I just want to request to the board that you give the Nichols residents the same consideration that you gave to the Pinewood Lake area residents. You know what I'm talking about so please give us the same consideration.
- George Dunn, 70 Skyview Drive. I have authorization to keep using my septic so why do I still have to pay a quarterly maintenance fee when I have to maintain my septic? I don't have to tie in and my system works fine so why pay maintenance when I have to pay maintenance on my system? Also, the \$500.00 why do I have to pay \$500.00 for something I have no intention of using in the near future? Response from John Marsilio: I think, I don't know, when this formula was created and when the \$500.00 was implemented and the \$27.00 on your quarterly payments was instituted they realized there are going to be repairs that the town has to do and perform on the existing system. The Beardsley pump station has to be completely reworked that's \$5,000,000, there's another pump station that we're going to have to rework in the south part of town that's \$3,000,000. There is what they call an I & I study going on right now that is examining the system that we put in 40 years ago because it's leaking. The stormwater or ground water that is leaking in there is going to Bridgeport. It's going through that valve there and you're paying a true-up on the actual usage that is going to Bridgeport that isn't sewage. We have that investigation going on right now it's being subsidized by DEEP. What is emerging is a capital program that the Town is going to have to face for the system. Somehow some way that is going to have to get paid. People in town who are hooked up are going to be

faced with a rate hike unless there is a capital account that is created to address perspective known needs. Someday you might hook up, someday your system may fail and you're going to hook up and when you do everyone who paid their rates would have contributed to the rehabilitation of this system and you would avail yourself of without paying anything.

- No, I paid my assessment for the last 20 years.
Response: You paid the assessment which is the actual cost of the sewer installation. In terms of the other ancillary elements of the system there is a maintenance fee on it. So someday when you connect in the spirit of fairness you should have been maintaining the whole system all along.
- No, if I'm not using it I shouldn't be paying for it. It's just absurd.
- Question from Tim Herbst: If your septic system at one point failed where would you connect?
- I wouldn't have a choice and then I would have to pay the fee.
- Question from Tim Herbst: If you buy a home that's new construction and you live in the home for 15 years and it requires maintenance you're going to make the necessary repairs to your home over time?
- My option. Nobody demands that I do it. That's my choice. This shouldn't be your choice to me. Your obligation.
- Theresa Desisto, 83 Columbine Drive. Why is Trumbull the only town that does charge a maintenance fee?
Response: They all charge but they put them in the rate. Rather than doing it up front they reflect it in your rate.
- George Dunn, 70 Skyview Drive If you're not using it you're not getting it in the rates back to that same point. Response: But when you do use it you're the beneficiary of everyone else who paid for those system improvements.
- Resident: On page 2 where you have the breakdown of the cost could we also see a breakdown of contract 3? Could we see the numbers in a comparison to our phase on page 2. Response: There's a similar breakdown. It's not exactly a line by line breakdown but, there is a similar breakout that was established. Frank Smeriglio suggested he come into the office and he will give him a copy.
- Rodney Seaman, 29 Teeter Rock Road. Did Tighe & Bond make any cost saving improvements to the project less the storm drains? Response from John Marsilio: I know there was approximately \$800,000 in value engineering early on in the project. We could break that out for you I don't have it with me here, but we can show you where the saving occurred. All this is available in the Town Engineer's office and we're happy to share with you. We obviously couldn't bring the file cabinets here today but we are happy to sit down with anyone and answer any questions that you have and we'll take as long as it takes to satisfy you as to what these items were and to answer any and all of your questions. That is where the answers reside in our files and some of them preceded all of us and if you come to our office we're happy to do that for you.
- Resident: There was previous talk about the \$500.00 fee is there any thoughts on financing that \$500.00.
Response from Tim Herbst: As I said earlier I think this \$500.00 fee is going to be thoroughly vetted and examined by the WPCA before the assessments are finally set. I don't want to speak for the WPCA but I think they are hearing these concerns and I think they are going to take some measure to address it.
- Resident: That \$500.00 was only assessed to the North Nichols not the entire projects? Response: It was always assessed. The maintenance fee is always assessed.
- So everybody got it? Response: Yes.

First Selectman Herbst asked if there were any more questions and offered to speak individually with anyone who wants to speak with him. He thanked everyone for coming and if there are any questions, comments or concerns please contact his office at 452-5005 or the WPCA at 452-5048.

Submitted by,

Joyce Augustinsky
Clerk