

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
Town of Trumbull
CONNECTICUT

TOWN HALL
(203) 452-5048



5866 MAIN STREET
TRUMBULL, CT 06611

MINUTES
Water Pollution Control Authority Meeting
Wednesday May 25, 2011

Members Present:

Jeanine Maietta Lynch, Chairman
Paul Kallmeyer, Vice Chairman
Laura Pulie
Ennio DeVita
Timothy Hampford (arrived 8:50)
Karen Egri, Alternate (voting until T. Hampford arrived)

Also Present:

Joseph Solemene, Assistant WPCA Administrator
Stephen M. Savarese, PE/LS, Town Engineer
Dennis Kokenos, Esq., Town Attorney
Fred Mascia, Tighe & Bond, Project Manager
Christine Kurtz, Wright-Pierce

Members Absent:

None

PUBLIC HEARING
MAY 25, 2011
SEWER USER RATE INCREASE

Pursuant to section 7-255 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Trumbull Water Pollution Control Authority hereby gives notice of a Public Hearing, Wednesday, May 25, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. in the Long Hill Room, Town Hall, 5866 Main Street, Trumbull, Connecticut. A 2.00% increase in the Sewage Treatment fee will be proposed.

Residential Sewage Treatment per CCF, currently \$4.272..... Proposed \$ 4.36
Industrial Sewage Treatment per CCF, currently \$4.649 Proposed \$ 4.74
Flat Rate (well water) Treatment per quarter, currently \$123.392 ... Proposed \$128.63

Unit Charge Increase:

Residential, currently \$23.83Proposed \$ 27.00 per unit
Industrial/Commercial, currently \$23.83Proposed \$ 27.50 per unit

The increase is necessary to offset the City of Bridgeport's proposed 1.88% increase in Sewage Treatment costs. The Trumbull WPCA is co-dependent with Bridgeport's West Side Treatment Plant for wastewater disposal and must pass on the increase it inherited when the Bridgeport WPCA approved a 1.88% increase in the consumption rate budget for Fiscal 2011-2012.

The new rates will be reflected on the next billing cycle mailed in **August**, covering the billing period through **September**.

Dated this 9th day of May 2011

Jeanine Maietta Lynch, Chairman
Trumbull Water Pollution Control Authority

Public Hearing.

Jeanine Maietta Lynch, Chairman, called the public hearing to order at 7:35 p.m. and read the public hearing notice, then invited public comment and requested a time limit of 5 minutes per speaker.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Pulie) to open the WPCA's public hearing scheduled for May 25, 2011 to discuss the sewer user rate increase at 7:35 p.m. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Tony D'Aquila, 29 Valley View Road

Addressed two questions to the Commission: 1) Where could he find WPCA's policies and regulations? Policies are part of meeting minutes and are the result of votes taken by the Commission. 2) Do they carry forward from Commission to Commission? They are carried forward until changed. He suggested they be put together in the Town Ordinance. He asked for and received an explanation of the unit charge and the proposed increase. He referenced the May 5th meeting minutes and commented on costs estimated and paid to Bridgeport. He also commented on actual and estimated costs and annual flow to Bridgeport and questioned how the Commission determines the estimated costs. The Chairman explained the process the Commission took in determining the budget. He also questioned the 15% discount Trumbull receives from Bridgeport and he said he went to Bridgeport's hearing and got that figure confirmed. The Commission told him the correct amount is 13.5%. It was explained that Bridgeport charges for every cc that goes into the house and we do not get a break for the water that goes into the soil or pools so the Commission decided to use an average for billing and the 13.5% is used up in the difference between the actual consumption and the average consumption. He questioned the billing policy and the Chairman informed me that the Commission is working on a new billing policy and it will take time to implement change. He also questioned the timing for the increase and the approval process was summarized.

The following are some of the topics Mr. D'Aquila commented on: availability of the Commission's policies, rules and regulations, unit charges, Bridgeport's and Trumbull's budgets, WPCA's budget, proposed increases, discount from Bridgeport, sewer use averaging and billing. He also suggested the Commission codify the policies it sets and follows. The Commission thanked Mr. D'Aquila for his comments.

There being no further comments from the public,

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (Pulie) to close the public hearing scheduled for May 25, 2011 to discuss the sewer user rate increase at 8:00 p.m. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chairman called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Trumbull WPCA for May 25, 2011 in the Long Hill Room at 8:00 p.m.

Due to the late hours of some Commission meetings the Commission discussed having a cut off time to review on a case by case basis the remaining agenda items and to decide whether to table or continue with the remaining agenda items.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (DeVita) to adopt a meeting cut off time policy to either adjourn or continue after 11:00 p.m. The Commission will take it on a case by case basis and decide to table items or schedule a second meeting. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Kallmeyer) to implement a policy to try, on a case by case basis, to limit the resident discussion part of their presentation to five minutes, if possible. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion took place regarding setting a time limit for resident's presentations and discussions.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Pulie) to go out of order and move up Agenda item number 8 any other business that may come before the Authority. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Commission also discussed and decided the final decision for Agenda items and additions to the Agenda will be made by the Chairman. The draft Agenda will be sent to the Chairman for approval. Implementing a one week cut off date was discussed.

8. Any other business that may come before the Authority.

Gary Bean, 163 Hilltop Circle was present on behalf of his in-laws, James and Judith Cummings, 11 Green Ridge Road who are requesting a new lateral. He passed out a brief history of the situation and what they are requesting. He stated the lateral was installed on the left side of the property and is in the wrong place compared to the map and said it should have been installed on the right side of the property. Mr. Bean informed the Commission that the property is for sale and they need a decision prior to closing. Commissioner DeVita said he wants to go and look at the property. Mr. Bean stated for the record that it is his contention that 1) the lateral that was installed is not installed according to plan; 2) that there was a part time inspector at the time and there were difficulties with the employee and some of the inspections that were done and there were a number of residents that were not happy or were upset with the placement of their laterals. He wanted to make sure he was on the record with the Commission acknowledging both points that the lateral was not installed according to plan and the person that would have done the inspection is no longer with the town and difficulties were experienced with that person's work. The Chairman confirmed that and said it was a town employee and it was not through Tighe & Bond. Further discussion of where the lateral is now, additional costs to relocate it, possibility of ledge, grade, terrain, alternate locations and options took place.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Egri) that the lateral be moved from its current location to an option to be determined with the advice of the assistant sewer administrator, Tighe & Bond and after putting those options in writing as to the potential costs for each option: Option A: to install a new lateral in the location that deems appropriate per Tighe & Bond and agreeable to the owner. Option B: To extend the existing lateral that was installed to the vicinity of the original location south of the driveway.

Discussion continued including the suggestion to tap the main and put in a new lateral. Commissioner Lynch withdrew her motion and Commissioner Egri withdrew her second.

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (Pulie) to connect a new lateral to the main in a place where the homeowner wants it at the project's expense. THREE IN FAVOR (Lynch, Pulie, Egri) ONE ABSTENTION (DeVita). ONE OPPOSED (Kallmeyer) MOTION CARRIED.

1. Minutes to previous meetings.

April 27, 2011 Minutes.

The following corrections and/or additions were requested:

Page 7, under Invoice Approval third sentence add a comma after almost “,”

Page 10, first paragraph after **Total** says “\$4,500.00” change to “\$4,500,000”; top of page after \$3,391,576 add “revised increase cost of project”

Page 9, under New Business second full paragraph says “original bid quantity of rock was 38,000 cubic yards while the original document was 76,000” take out “38,000 cubic yards while the original document” it will now read: “original bid quantity of rock was 76,000 cubic yards and then the bid was cancelled, etc.”

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Kallmeyer) to approve the meeting Minutes of April 27, 2011 as amended. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

May 5, 2011 Special Meeting Minutes.

Page 1, last sentence – Commissioner Kallmeyer wants the following noted for the record: “Commissioner Kallmeyer said averaging probably costs the town about \$500,000.00 a year” and what he should have said instead was “averaging probably costs all of the users an additional \$500,000.00 a year.”

Commissioner Hampford arrived at 8:50 and is now voting and Commissioner Egri is no longer voting.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Kallmeyer) to approve the meeting Minutes of May 5, 2011. Discussion. FOUR IN FAVOR (Lynch, Kallmeyer, Hampford, DeVita) ONE ABSTENTION (Pulie). MOTION CARRIED.

2. Tighe & Bond.

Progress Report. Fred Mascia said since the last Commission meeting the contractor has been working on the pump station and also on Teeter Rock Road, Turkey Meadow, Primrose, North Stowe, Red Fox and the also started the second part of the work on Huntington Road. He also noted the lateral at 92 Skyview has been completed. They have paved most of the exposed trenches, done restoration work and are doing repairs on North Street and Shelton Road. The Commission requested Tighe & Bond keep a record of its time for repair inspections.

Change Orders.

Change Order R51: dated April 26, 2011 in the amount of \$2,900.00 for storm manhole at Red Fox Lane. The manhole was paved over and was not shown on plans and it had to be removed and replaced.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Hampford) to approve change order R51 in the amount of \$2,900.00 for storm manhole at Red Fox Lane. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Change Order R52: dated May 10, 2011 in the amount of \$893.00 to remove concrete pavement in Shelton Road. Same price for the same previous item.

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (DeVita) to approve change order R52 in the amount of \$893.00 to remove concrete pavement in Shelton Road. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Change Order R53: dated May 13, 2011 for installation of TY on 93 Skyview Drive. Same price paid for the same item in the past.

MOTION made (Pulie) 2nd (Hampford) to approve change order R53 in the amount of \$575.00 for installation of TY on 93 Skyview Drive. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

TABLED to next meeting: Change orders R46, R48 and R49.

Review Tighe & Bond/Wright Pierce spreadsheets: the Commissioners reviewed the spreadsheets and there were no questions or comments.

3. Invoice Approval.

Mark IV Construction Co., Inc., Phase IV, Part B – Contract 4 – North Nichols Project, Application #21 dated May 16, 2011 in the amount of \$767,462.17.

The Commissioners reviewed the invoice and it was noted rock removal is at 94% and will soon approach 100% and when it gets to 125% it will be renegotiated. Discussion included catch basins, DEP, permits, specs, bonding, pipe testing and video and payment for pipe that has not been tested and videoed. The pump station is 80% complete and Fred said the wet well and force main are in and he described the work that has been done. Pipe is 76% complete and they only did 46% TV testing.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Kallmeyer) to approve Mark IV invoice 21 in the amount of \$767,462.17.

Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Wright-Pierce:

Clean water form funds.

Christine Kurtz from Wright-Pierce was present and submitted a Project Status Update.

She first addressed the I/I study, funding for the SSES phase which is the 55% grant, documentation that needs to be signed and form approvals.

Attorney Kokenos said he went through the Agreement and had a couple of issues. He started a discussion as to what is the Commission's expectations as far as getting the funding and if they didn't get the funding what exactly would the position be then. Discussion followed on what the Commission is facing,

Christine Kurtz explained this is the 2nd phase of the 3 phases of work that has to be done to accomplish the NOV's. She also explained about getting approval by the State and then getting reimbursed from the State when funds become available and the option of working on what the Commission could afford or budget and then wait for the rest to come in. She also explained why the paperwork needs to be in by June 30, 2011. Another issue Attorney Kokenos brought up was the overtime for the police and discussion followed. It does not appear that policy protection qualifies for the State reimbursement and Christine will follow up on that. Attorney Kokenos commented on Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement, Page 1, Section 1 – Scope of Services Section A which included: The SSES work outlined in the I/I study is to be done in phases and that the Engineer will perform each phase after receiving a Notice to Proceed by the client authorizing engineer to perform each phase of the work (Notice to proceed may be dependent on funding from the State of CT DEP). Attorney Kokenos said other than that everything else will be accepted as is. He is proposing to alter Section A and would like it to read: "(Notice to proceed at each phase may be dependent on funding from the State of CT DEP and the decision to proceed after funding confirmation shall be at the WPCA's sole and absolute discretion." Attorney Kokenos said if this is a funding issue he wants the Commission to be able to revisit it and look at it again. The Commission decided not to add any additional funds for police and if needed amend the agreement with the DEP at that time. Ms. Kurtz will have all pertinent forms signed.

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (Hampford) to approve Amendment No. 1 to Agreement Between Town of Trumbull Water Pollution Control Authority and Wright-Pierce for Engineering Consulting Services – Sewer System Evaluation Survey as modified by the Town Attorney. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Said Amendment shall be included and made part of these Minutes.

Authorize commencement of Phase 1.

A short discussion took place regarding funding and preparing for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

MOTION made (Hampford) 2nd (Pulie) to approve a notice to proceed for Wright-Pierce with Phase I and Phase II work of the SSES and contingent upon receipt of all signatures from the First Selectman and any other Town Officials that are needed and approval of clean water fund monies contingent upon the funds being available. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION made (Hampford) 2nd (Pulie) to approve a notice to proceed for Wright-Pierce with Phase I and Phase II work of the SSES and contingent upon receipt of all signatures from the First Selectman and any other Town Officials that are needed and approval of clean water fund monies contingent upon the funds being available. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Update Feasibility Study.

Kristine Kurtz said they heard from DEP on May 24, 2011 and she gave a brief synopsis on the three out fall locations. One where the river became tidal and the other above Bunnell's Pond and both those areas are impaired waters and there is a small segment below Bunnell's and that's the only place where an outfall will work.

That is an easy modification and will adjust the price a little bit. They will be going to the tidal waters and not Long Island Sound. They will redraft the document and resubmit it to the Board for review.

5. Old Business:

Increase in unit charge.

The Commission will take into consideration Mr. D'Aquila's comments on policies will keep a record when policies are set. Also addressing two points Mr. D'Aquila's made it is important that the Commission is trying to stop the subsidy for the irrigation system and will try to figure how to make handle the snow bird problem and those two issues will get solved with the new billing.

Residential Sewage Treatment per CCF - \$4.36; Industrial Sewage Treatment per CCF - \$4.74; Flat Rate (well water) Treatment per quarter - \$128.63. Unit Charge Increase: Residential - \$27.00 per unit; Industrial/Commercial - \$27.50 per unit, effective second quarter of fiscal year 2011-1012.

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (Pulie) to accept the new rates as published. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Note: Commissioner Egri voting and Commissioner DeVita not voting).

Billing procedures.

The commission summarized last month's discussions including currently billing in arrears and maybe changing it so billing will be actual usage with no averaging. A special meeting will be scheduled for billing procedures and leak policies. Attorney Kokenos reviewed Bridgeport's contract regarding leaks. We pay Bridgeport based on Aquarion's readings and Bridgeport is using Aquarion's meter to decide how much they're supposed to get paid. So the question is when an adjustment is made by Aquarion does it show up on the billing or on the meter reads and is it just a billing issue? Bridgeport is not notified that Aquarion had adjusted a bill down. We are getting penalized for something that is going into the ground and not into the system just like irrigation systems. Attorney Kokenos will do further review the contract and do more research prior to the special meeting and will provide an opinion for the June 22nd meeting. Another issue is whether this can be a credit in the year end true up. Irrigation systems, separate meters, adjustments and industrial/commercial sprinklers and averaging were addressed and will be discussed in more detail at the special meeting.

Purchase of State land – Hilltop Circle.

Attorney Kokenos received the Warranty Deed and the closing package for the Hilltop Circle purchase with the State of Connecticut. The Commission voted in October, 2010 to purchase the property at Hilltop Circle for \$22,000.00 plus \$1,000.00 administration fees. He is requesting permission to sign the necessary papers for the State, including a release, and then submit a check request for payment.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Hampford) allowing Attorney Dennis Kokenos to sign appropriate paperwork to effectuate the purchase of the Hilltop Circle property from the State in the amount of \$23,000.00 and to authorize the funding for that to come out of the 59 account which has already been budgeted for. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion: Update by Paul Kallmeyer regarding status of town's audit of the 59 and 20 accounts.

He summarized the pre-proposal meeting and stated 2 auditor firms attended and the proposals are due May 26th. The proposal meeting went very well and there will be a second pre-proposal meeting. Commissioner Kallmeyer passed out a compilation of the 20 account, example field cards showing the \$500.00 charge and an accounting for the 59 account from when the Commission did the assessment on Jog Hill.

Update: SSEC.

Commission Hampford said they are discussing regionalization alternatives and they are currently in an education mode. Two members have resigned and they do not have replacements yet. He said the regionalization

discovery mode is getting attention from other towns including Stratford and New Haven. They are rebasing their study because it may involve additional choices that were not originally anticipated. Will be setting up tours of Bridgeport's West Side and Stratford's treatment plants.

Review and discussion regarding proposed F.O.G. Ordinance.

Steve Savarese and Attorney Kokenos highlighted the Proposed Fats, Oils and Grease Discharge Ordinance that Attorney Kokenos prepared. Currently the town has policies in place to handle backups when they happen and this will be a formalization of those policies into an ordinance which has to be in place by July 1st. Attorney Kokenos described a grease trap and explained what restaurants do with the oils and fats. He pointed out the biggest offenders are fast food chains and he said most restaurants do have a system in place. This ordinance only applies to restaurants connected to sewers. The burden will be put on the restaurants to maintain the paper work. Steve Savarese stated we are proposing inspections of the outside units would be by the WPCA and inside units would be the Trumbull Monroe Health District. Health Departments and Regional Health Districts in other areas are doing inspections. These inspections can be done during the Health District's yearly inspections. The WPCA can recommend the Town Council adopt the Ordinance but the Town has the obligation to inspect outside buildings and the Regional Health Department will be responsible to inspect the inside. Attorney Kokenos said once the Ordinance is adopted it will be put in the utility section of the Code.

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (Hampford) that the WPCA recommends the draft F.O.G. Discharge Ordinance to the Town Council for implementation. The WPCA also recommends that the responsibility to enforce the proposed F.O.G. Discharge Ordinance with respect to exterior food preparation establishments' grease traps to the jurisdiction of the WPCA and the responsibility for interior enforcement of the F.O.G. Discharge Ordinance of the food preparation establishments to be the jurisdiction of the Trumbull Monroe Health District. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Review and discussion regarding renewal of Tighe & Bond contract.

The contract with Tighe & Bond needs to be renewed as of July 6, 2011. Discussion included procedures for renewal, scope of work going forward, containing costs, possible ways to cut costs. It is noted for the record that Tighe & Bond has been on the job since July 6, 2010 even though the contract was dated October 28, 2010. Questions addressed to Fred Mascia included current number of inspectors and staff in the field, can the number be reduced, does each crew have an inspector, level of service and can the services be cut back? He stated the number is adjusted based on how many crews Mark IV has working. Mark IV has a crew doing sewer work, lateral work, paving and right now there is a full time Town inspector and 3 full time Tighe & Bond inspectors and that is supplemented with other people from the office if Mark IV has more activity going on. Steve Savarese stated he is satisfied with the services and he finds them very responsive and because of the level of service we are getting other Tighe & Bond was hired by the Town under other contracts for other activities. Discussions included what happened without constant inspections, the reasons why this system was put in place, the concept that inspectors are cheap insurance and comments from the public regarding using so many inspectors. Some of the services Tighe & Bond provides above and beyond street inspections include punch and completion list, doing all the testing required in the spec, enforcing the contract, drainage and catch basin inspections, repairs, interfacing with the public, dealing with complaints, and construction administration. A summary of some of the repairs that need to be done include collapsed chimneys, sags in pipe lines, broken TY's, air testing that did not pass, TV inspection shows debris in the pipe line, and over billing. Attorney Kokenos inquired about financing and Chairman Lynch recapped the bonding request that has been approved by the Board of Finance and the Finance sub-committee and is going before the Town Council on June 6, 2011. If it is approved all the bonding figures incorporate all Tighe & Bond's estimates going forward through the end of the entire project plus permanent paving through approximately July 2012. Attorney Kokenos explained the extension of the contract can be done through a written agreement and does not have to be a full contract. It can be an extension given to the engineer by the Town in writing and would be the same terms and conditions that the WPCA has already approved and it would state what is left and that

amount will be attributed to the extension. Fred Mascia stated the scope of services is the same it's an extension of time and extension of the fee. It was noted that nothing can be done until after Town Council's approval.

6. New Business:

Bob Van Stein, 133 North Stowe Road: wants to be removed from the sewer project.

Mr. Van Stein was not present and Joe Solemene stated he wanted to be here but he is not at the meeting. He wants to be removed from the contract because he doesn't like the fact that he is at the end of the line and his lateral can't be placed where he wants it. Discussion included similarities to 136 North Stowe's request at the last meeting and reasons why it can not be done.

MOTION made (Kallmeyer) 2nd (Hampford) to deny the request to have 133 North Stowe Road removed from the sewer project. Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

April billing statement from Ury & Moskow.

The Commission reviewed the billing statement.

Discussion: meeting policies.

Were addressed and discussed at the beginning of the meeting.

7. Executive Session.

- It is anticipated that the WPCA will vote to go into executive session to discuss with the Town Attorney strategy and negotiations with respect to pending litigation as defined by 1-200(6) and/or to discuss attorney client-privileged information as set forth by 1-210 relating to the following:
 - Esteves v. Town of Trumbull WPCA
 - Baker v. Town of Trumbull WPCA

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Hampford) to close the regularly scheduled meeting at 10:50 p.m. in order to go into Executive Session to discuss with the Town Attorney strategy and negotiations with respect to pending litigation as defined by 1-200(6) and/or to discuss attorney client-privileged information as set forth by 1-210 relating to the following:

- Esteves v. Town of Trumbull WPCA
- Baker v. Town of Trumbull WPCA.

In attendance at the executive session will be the full Commission members, Steve Savarese, Joe Solemene, Fred Mascia and Attorney Dennis Kokenos.

No Discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Kallmeyer) to close the executive session at 11:15 p.m. and state for the record that no vote was taken. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Pulie) to reopen the regularly scheduled meeting of the WPCA for May 25, 2011. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Pulie) to authorize Attorney Kokenos to obtain an appraisal for each property. One, not to exceed \$1,500.00, with respect to the property of Esteves v. Town of Trumbull WPCA and one, not to exceed \$1,500.00, with respect to the property of Baker v. Town of Trumbull WPCA. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Any other business that may come before the Authority.

Commissioner Kallmeyer asked for an update on discussions with Spath-Bjorklund concerning the design of South Nichols and Joe Solemene stated he e-mailed them last week, did not get a reply and will follow up.

Opening a conversation with Stratford regarding adjusting fees was again addressed and the Commission wanted to know how Robert Camillo, the developer on Hawley Lane, made out with Bridgeport and would like a follow up.

Mr. Barcham's letter will be discussed at the special meeting. Joe Solemene stated he had a couple of other things for the Commission and due to the late hour the Commission did not discuss them.

MOTION made (Lynch) 2nd (Hampford) to close the regularly scheduled meeting for May 25, 2011 at 11:20 p.m. No discussion. ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Submitted by,

Joyce Augustinsky

Clerk of the Commission

EXHIBIT A
FOR
AMENDMENT NO. 1

TO

AGREEMENT BETWEEN

TOWN OF TRUMBULL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY

AND

WRIGHT-PIERCE

FOR

ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES -
SEWER SYSTEM EVALUATION SURVEY

EXHIBIT A
FOR
AMENDMENT NO. 1
TO
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
TOWN OF TRUMBULL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
AND
WRIGHT-PIERCE
FOR
ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES - SEWER SYSTEM EVALUATION SURVEY

SECTION 1 - SCOPE OF SERVICES

DELETE Paragraph A of **Task III - Sewer System Evaluation Survey (SSES)** and REPLACE with the following new Paragraphs.

- A. ENGINEER shall conduct a Sewer System Evaluation Survey (SSES) of select areas within the drainage basins as having significant Infiltration and Inflow (I/I) and as identified as having the "Highest Priority" as identified in the I/I Study prepared by Wright-Pierce, dated January 2011.

The SSES work outlined in the I/I study will be performed in a phased manner; the "highest" priority areas will be accomplished in four phases, as outlined below. ENGINEER will perform each phase after receiving a Notice to Proceed by the CLIENT authorizing ENGINEER to perform each phase of work (Notice to Proceed at each phase may be dependent on funding from the State of CT DEP and the decision to proceed after funding confirmation shall be a the WPCA's sole absolute discretion.).

The four (4) phases of SSES work identified will consist of:

Phase 1: Evaluation of Beardsley and Reservoir Pump Stations

FY 11/12

The reliability of the Beardsley Pump Station and the Reservoir Pump Station facilities, and their ability to handle peak flows and eliminate the potential for future overflows, has been identified as the highest priority item to be evaluated. [Phases 2 through 4 will evaluate the sewer collection system for cost-effective rehabilitation required to reduce infiltration and inflow in the system in the near to long term.]

Each of the pump stations will be evaluated through the following scope of work:

Project Kickoff Meeting / Data Collection: Meet with WPCA staff to specifically review the operation and maintenance of the pump stations and review performance issues and identify deficiencies. Collect available background information from the WPCA, including drawings, flow records, past reports and

1. evaluations, maintenance records, tax and wetland mapping and subsurface information.
2. Conduct an evaluation of the following components at each of the two pump station facilities:
 - 2.1 General observation of the structural integrity of existing structures; if observed deficient - actual physical testing may be required.
 - 2.2 Electrical equipment and instrumentation, including controls, panels, MCCs, service type, etc.
 - 2.3 Mechanical equipment, including pumps, piping and valves.
 - 2.4 HVAC System.
 - 2.5 Civil / site observations, including accessibility (driveway, fence, parking area, etc), privacy and public protection.
 - 2.6 Code compliance.
 - 2.7 Emergency generator and generator fuel supply.
 - 2.8 Condition of sewer infrastructure within the immediate vicinity of the pump stations.
3. Review existing flow data and project future flows for each station, including:
 - 3.1 Review and confirm future flow requirements associated with peak flows observed during the I/I study and anticipated future sewer connections.
 - 3.2 Collect and evaluate additional flow charts, pumps run times and totalizer values.
 - 3.3 Evaluate efficiencies of the existing pump sizes.
 - 3.4 Perform draw down test to confirm capacity of existing pumps as a basis to confirm current flows to the pump station.
4. Evaluate rehabilitation alternatives for each station, including:
 - 4.1 Design flow capacities (current & future; average and peak) and station size and configuration.
 - 4.2 Station dependability - mechanical reliability, standby power/pumping.
 - 4.3 Serviceability - equipment access, safety issues.
 - 4.4 Construction costs - materials, sequencing, excavation, dewatering, etc.
 - 4.5 Operation & Maintenance cost - long-term service costs, life expectancy.
 - 4.6 Civil/Site options - aesthetics, odors, noise, visual, neighborhood, access.
 - 4.7 Structure evaluations - upgrade or replacement.
 - 4.8 Standby power - generator type and associated aesthetics (noise attenuation).
5. Prepare and submit a preliminary design report, to include:
 - 5.1 Overall station condition assessment, including identification of pump station deficiencies.
 - 5.2 Comparison of viable alternatives for rehabilitation/replacement.
 - 5.3 Presentation of formal recommendations, including site improvements, structure, architecture (if required), mechanical, electrical, instrumentation and process improvements.

- 5.4 Evaluation of compliance with: current building codes; NEC clearances & access requirements; and classified & unclassified areas (NFPA 820).
 - 5.5 Preliminary engineer's opinion of probable construction costs and budget recommendations.
6. Submittals
- 6.1 Furnish a draft of the Report to, and review it with, the WPCA.
 - 6.2 Revise the Draft Report in response to WPCA's comments, as appropriate, and furnish final draft of the CT DEP for their review and comment.
 - 6.3 Produce Final Report for distribution to the WPCA and CT DEP.

Phase 2: Evaluation of Reservoir Avenue PS / Flow Meter #5 Sewer Sheds **FY 11/12**

This phase of work is associated with the Reservoir Avenue Pump Station (which includes Flow Meter #5 near the intersection of Leonard Place and Lounsbury Road) sewer sheds, which are believed to have significant I/I based on the results of the flow metering. Approximately 79,000 linear feet of gravity sewer has been estimated in these sewer sheds. Further evaluation of this area will help to locate potential I/I sources and will include:

1. Up to two night-time flow isolation events will be performed to help further refine areas of field work outlined herein for Phase 2 efforts. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control.
2. Perform inspection of select sewer manholes within the identified sewer segments during high groundwater conditions, catalog their condition (i.e. structural issues, defects, etc.) and make an estimate of I/I flow due to leaks or leaking covers. The CLIENT will provide one person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control. It is estimated that there will be approximately 380 manholes inspected within these sewer sheds.
3. ENGINEER shall coordinate TV inspection work. ENGINEER shall sub-contract the television inspection work and will provide one (1) person to periodically (once weekly) monitor the TV inspection work over the inspection period. The Sub-Contractor will provide DVDs of all TV inspection work to ENGINEER for further evaluation. For budgeting, it is assumed that a majority of the sewers in this area will be televised. [Note: Should additional observation efforts by ENGINEER be needed, or subsequent televised inspections of service laterals are recommended, additional amendments to this Contract will be required. All subsequent televised inspections or additional observations as set forth herein must be separately approved by the CLIENT prior to the ENGINEER commencing the work.]
4. Perform smoke testing of identified sections of the collection system during dry, low groundwater periods, to identify sources of inflow. ENGINEER will review the system prior to selecting areas to perform smoke testing. ENGINEER will provide informational literature to be published by the CLIENT in local news

media and/or placed on the internet. ENGINEER will prepare "door hangers" for distribution in the smoke testing areas prior to conducting the work. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort. ENGINEER will provide general assistance to the CLIENT, who will coordinate with local police, fire and rescue departments. It is anticipated that most of the sewers will be tested in these sewer sheds, which will require up to 15 days of smoke testing to be performed by a two-person person team. Observations made during the smoke-testing will be logged for further evaluation.

5. Perform building inspections to identify sources of private inflow. Based on data from the I/I study and results from other completed SSES tasks, up to 385 houses or structures will be included in the building inspection effort; up to 3 attempts will be made to enter each building. ENGINEER shall prepare information bulletins for the CLIENT's use in local news media and/or for use on the internet.
6. Results of the night-time flow isolation work, smoke testing, TV inspection effort, manhole inspections and building inspections will be compiled and evaluated for identification of I/I sources.
7. Identify sewer rehabilitation methods for each identified I/I source and develop preliminary cost estimates to rehabilitate the necessary sections of the sewers.
8. Perform a cost-effective analysis to compare the cost to remove the identified I/I sources versus the cost to transport and treat the same flow.
9. Perform a report summarizing the SSES evaluation efforts in these sewer sheds. The report will include a prioritized listing of identified sources to be repaired, a total project cost estimate and an implementation plan.
10. Furnish a draft of the Report to, and review it with, the WPCA. Revise the Draft Report in response to WPCA's comments, as appropriate, and furnish final draft of the CT DEP for their review and comment. Produce Final Report for distribution to the WPCA and CT DEP.

It should be noted that Wright-Pierce has assumed that the above tasks will not require Police detail; should police detail be required, the associated costs will be handled directly by the Trumbull WPCA.

Phase 3: Evaluation of Flow Meter #2 / Fairchild Memorial Sewer Sheds

FY-12/13

This phase of work is associated with the Flow Meter #2 sewer shed (on White Plains Road near Brock Street) which is believed to have significant I/I based on the results of the flow metering. Furthermore, the sewer shed in proximity to Fairchild Memorial Park and the surrounding neighborhoods, including some areas in the City of Bridgeport, need further investigation. Approximately 140,000 linear feet of gravity sewer has been estimated in these sewer sheds. Further evaluation of this area will help to locate potential I/I sources and will include:

1. Up to two night-time flow isolation events will be performed to help further refine areas of field work outlined herein for Phase 2 efforts. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control.

2. Provide portable flow meters to be temporarily installed and used to perform up to Forty-four (44) meter weeks of flow metering. ENGINEER will identify how the sewer shed will be sub-divided and will work with the CLIENT to determine which manholes will be used to install the meters. Data will be collected and evaluated to determine where the following field activity should occur in this sewer shed. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control.
3. Perform inspection of select sewer manholes within the identified sewer segments during high groundwater conditions, catalog their condition (i.e. structural issues, defects, etc.) and make an estimate of I/I flow due to leaks or leaking covers. . The CLIENT will provide one person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control. It is estimated that there will be approximately 740 manholes inspected within these sewer sheds.
4. ENGINEER shall coordinate TV inspection work. ENGINEER shall sub-contract the television inspection work and will provide one (1) person to periodically (once weekly) monitor the TV inspection work over the inspection period. The Sub-Contractor will provide DVDs of all TV inspection work to ENGINEER for further evaluation. For budgeting, it is assumed that a half of the sewers in this area will be televised. [Note: Should additional observation efforts by ENGINEER be needed, or subsequent televised inspections of service laterals are recommended, additional amendments to this Contract will be required. All subsequent televised inspections or additional observations as set forth herein must be separately approved by the CLIENT prior to the ENGINEER commencing the work.]
5. Perform smoke testing of identified sections of the collection system during dry, low groundwater periods, to identify sources of inflow. ENGINEER will review the system prior to selecting areas to perform smoke testing. ENGINEER will provide informational literature to be published by the CLIENT in local news media and/or placed on the internet. ENGINEER will prepare "door hangers" for distribution in the smoke testing areas prior to conducting the work. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort. ENGINEER will provide general assistance to the CLIENT, who will coordinate with local police, fire and rescue departments. It is anticipated that approximately half of the sewers will be tested in these sewer sheds, which will require up to 15 days of smoke testing to be performed by a two-person person team. Observations made during the smoke-testing will be logged for further evaluation.
6. Perform building inspections to identify sources of private inflow. Based on data from the I/I study and results from other completed SSES tasks, up to 370 houses or structures will be included in the building inspection effort; up to 3 attempts will be made to enter each building. ENGINEER shall prepare information bulletins for the CLIENT's use in local news media and/or for use on the internet.
7. Results of the flow metering work, smoke testing, TV inspection effort, manhole inspections and building inspections will be compiled and evaluated for identification of I/I sources.
8. Identify sewer rehabilitation methods for each identified I/I source and develop preliminary cost estimates to rehabilitate the necessary sections of the sewers

9. Perform a cost-effective analysis to compare the cost to remove the identified I/I sources versus the cost to transport and treat the same flow.
10. Perform a report summarizing the SSES evaluation efforts in these sewer sheds. The report will include a prioritized listing of identified sources to be repaired, a total project cost estimate and an implementation plan.
11. Furnish a draft of the Report to, and review it with, the WPCA. Revise the Draft Report in response to WPCA's comments, as appropriate, and furnish final draft of the CT DEP for their review and comment. Produce Final Report for distribution to the WPCA and CT DEP.

It should be noted that Wright-Pierce has assumed that the above tasks will not require Police detail; should police detail be required, the associated costs will be handled directly by the Trumbull WPCA.

Phase 4: Evaluation of Flow Meter #1 and Flow Meter #3 Sewer Sheds

FY-13/14

This phase of work is associated with Flow Meter #1 (near the intersection of Lindberg Drive and Cottage Place) and Flow Meter #3 (on Norwood Terrace) sewer sheds which are believed to have significant I/I based on the results of the flow metering. Approximately 81,000 linear feet of gravity sewer has been estimated in these sewer sheds. Further evaluation of this area will help to locate potential I/I sources and will include:

1. Provide portable flow meters to be temporarily installed and used to perform of up to a total of sixty-nine (69) meter weeks of flow metering [40 meter weeks in Flow Meter #1 sewer shed and 29 meter-weeks in Flow Meter #3 sewer shed]. ENGINEER will identify how the sewer sheds will be sub-divided and will work with the CLIENT to determine which manholes will be used to install the meters. Data will be collected and evaluated to determine where the following field activity should occur in this sewer sheds. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control.
2. Perform inspection of select sewer manholes within the identified sewer segments during high groundwater conditions, catalog their condition (i.e. structural issues, defects, etc.) and make an estimate of I/I flow due to leaks or leaking covers. The CLIENT will provide one person to assist ENGINEER in this effort to locate and open manholes and for traffic control. It is estimated that there will be approximately 200 manholes inspected within these sewer sheds.
3. ENGINEER shall coordinate TV inspection work. ENGINEER shall sub-contract the television inspection work and will provide one (1) person to periodically (once weekly) monitor the TV inspection work over the inspection period. The Sub-Contractor will provide DVDs of all TV inspection work to ENGINEER for further evaluation. For budgeting, it is assumed that a half of the sewers in this area will be televised. [Note: Should additional observation efforts by ENGINEER be needed, or subsequent televised inspections of service laterals are recommended, additional amendments to this Contract will be required.

All

subsequent televised inspections or additional observations as set forth herein must be separately approved by the CLIENT prior to the ENGINEER commencing the work.]

4. Perform smoke testing of identified sections of the Flow Meter #1 sewer shed during dry, low groundwater periods, to identify sources of inflow. ENGINEER will review the system prior to selecting areas to perform smoke testing. The ENGINEER will provide informational literature to be published by the CLIENT in local news media and/or placed on the internet. ENGINEER will prepare "door hangers" for distribution in the smoke testing areas prior to conducting the work. The CLIENT shall provide one (1) person to assist ENGINEER in this effort. ENGINEER will provide general assistance to the CLIENT, who will coordinate with local police, fire and rescue departments. It is anticipated that approximately half of the sewers in the Flow Meter #1 sewer shed will be tested and that up to 5 days of smoke testing will be performed by a two-person person team. Observations made during the smoke-testing will be logged for further evaluation.
5. Perform building inspections to identify sources of private inflow. Based on data from the I/I study and results from other completed SSES tasks, up to 280 houses or structures will be included in the building inspection effort; up to 3 attempts will be made to enter each building. ENGINEER shall prepare information bulletins for the CLIENT's use in local news media and/or for use on the internet.
6. Results of the flow metering, smoke testing, TV inspection effort, manhole inspections and building inspections will be compiled and evaluated for identification of I/I sources.
7. Identify sewer rehabilitation methods for each identified I/I source and develop preliminary cost estimates to rehabilitate the necessary sections of the sewers.
8. Perform a cost-effective analysis to compare the cost to remove the identified I/I sources versus the cost to transport and treat the same flow.
9. Perform a report summarizing the SSES evaluation efforts in these sewer sheds. The report will include a prioritized listing of identified sources to be repaired, a total project cost estimate and an implementation plan.
10. Furnish a draft of the Report to, and review it with, the WPCA. Revise the Draft Report in response to WPCA's comments, as appropriate, and furnish final draft of the CT DEP for their review and comment. Produce Final Report for distribution to the WPCA and CT DEP.

It should be noted that Wright-Pierce has assumed that the above tasks will not require Police detail; should police detail be required, the associated costs will be handled directly by the Trumbull WPCA.

SECTION 2 - COMPENSATION

DELETE the third paragraph under "**I. Payments to ENGINEER**" in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:

For the services outlined in **SECTION 1 - SCOPE OF SERVICES, Task III - Sewer System Evaluation Survey (SSES)**, an amount based on ENGINEER'S Direct Labor Costs times a factor of 2.6754, plus Reimbursable Expenses and charges for Consultants' services, plus a fixed fee per Phase, as outlined below. Total estimated compensation for each Phase is summarized below and as outlined in Exhibit B of this Amendment No.1. Each phase will be initiated when authorized by CLIENT.

Town of Trumbull, WPCA

SSES Work

Summary of Compensation By Phase

Phase	Description of Study Area	Fiscal Year ¹	Total Estimated Compensation ²
1	Evaluation of Beardsley and Reservoir Pump Stations	2011/2012	\$35,000
2	Evaluation of Reservoir Avenue PS / Flow Meter #5 Sewer Sheds	2011/2012	\$283,000
3	Evaluation of Flow Meter #2 / Fairchild Memorial Sewer Sheds	2012/2013	\$310,000
4	Evaluation of Flow Meter #1 and Flow Meter #3 Sewer Sheds	2013/2014	\$211,000
Total Estimated Compensation (for all phases of SSES)			\$839,000

Notes:

1. Work to be performed after receiving Notice to Proceed from CLIENT and may be dependent on obtaining funding from CT DEP.
2. All compensation is represented in 2010 dollars; ENGINEER may request adjustment from CLIENT in total dollar amounts or Scope of Work prior to receiving Notice to Proceed from CLIENT and/or prior to implementing the work.