

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
Town of Trumbull
CONNECTICUT

TOWN HALL
(203) 452-5048



5866 MAIN STREET
TRUMBULL, CT 06611

APRIL 28, 2021
AGENDA

NOTICE is hereby given that the Water Pollution Control Authority of the Town of Trumbull, CT will hold a meeting on Wednesday, April 28, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. via videoconference.

Water Pollution Control Authority Regular Meeting

Apr 28, 2021 7:00 PM

<https://zoom.us/j/99795469162?pwd=eU54UC9IOUFIWkF0bUhKU3hzdGZsUT09>

Webinar ID: 997 9546 9162

Password: 593637

Join by telephone: (929) 205-6099 or (877) 853-5257 (Toll Free) / Webinar ID: 997 9546 9162

-
1. Call to Order
 2. Roll Call
 3. Approval of Minutes:
 - March 24, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes & April 8, 2021 Special Meeting Minutes
 4. New Business:
 - RFP #6402 Bid Evaluation – Kovacs Construction Corp.
 - Reservoir Avenue & Old Town Road Pump Station Award
 5. Old Business:
 - FY2022 Budget Update – BOF Level
 - Old Town and Reservoir Avenue Pump Stations Update
 - Beardsley Force Main Update
 - Alternate Flow
 6. Adjournment

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
Town of Trumbull
CONNECTICUT

TOWN HALL
(203) 452-5048



5866 MAIN STREET
TRUMBULL, CT 06611

**MARCH 24, 2021
MINUTES**

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Roll Call: The clerk called the roll and recorded it as follows:

Present: Richard Boggs, Chairman, Jon Greene, Vice-Chairman, Frank Regnery, Andrew Palo, Charles Berezin and Scott Thornton, alternate

Also

Present: William Maurer, Town Engineer/Sewer Administrator, Town Attorney James Nugent, and Christine Kurtz of Wright Pierce

Approval of Minutes: Moved by Palo, seconded by Regnery to approve February 24, 2021 meeting minutes as submitted.

VOTE: Motion CARRIED 4-0-2 (ABSTENTION: Greene and Berezin)

New Business:

- (MIU GP) General Permit for Discharges from Miscellaneous Industrial Users Ordinance
Mr. Maurer explained this is a permit the state handled but have given it to the municipalities to administer. This needs to be added to the ordinance under Chapter 19, it will be a new section, Division 5.

Ms. Kurtz explained the Miscellaneous Industrial Users are smaller commercial users (i.e. commercial pools, printing shops, car washes, oil grease separators, DPW). The municipalities are now required to administer the permit v. DEEP. It's a series of paperwork similar to other permits, depending on the discharge they have to fill out any number of attachments A through D or E. The dischargers are required to inform the people in the collection system and the treatment plant, if anything is exceeded, (flow quantity). The permit change has been in the works for approximately for a year, the schedule slowed due to COVID.

The proposed ordinance attached to the agenda puts in the language into the existing Chapter 19 of the Town Code, similar to what happened with F.O.G.

Mr. Maurer indicated there are not many Miscellaneous Industrial Users and the users already know about, it's a permit issued every five (5) years. Ms. Kurtz stated they have a requirement to report to the Town by April 29, 2021

Mr. Maurer confirmed the F.O.G ordinance is already in effect, the violation fees are being added to the ordinance.

Ms. Kurtz explained the users need to notify both Bridgeport and Trumbull. Mr. Maurer is in communications with Bridgeport to see what their program looks like to make sure our version doesn't need to accommodate theirs. Unless something different is learned from Bridgeport the attached ordinance would be the final version. It will be a coordinated effort with Bridgeport regarding the fines. Chapter 19, Section 108 is the F.O.G. portion. Division 5 is the MIU-GP new division.

Page 128 of the agenda packet has a table that identifies which notification form and attachments to be filled out based on what kind of discharger. The quantity of wastewater will drive that. There are approximately 12 known users of this type in town. The language in the ordinance came from the state, it was modified to the fact that they would have to work with both Bridgeport and Trumbull. Our code had a handful of parameters that dischargers were not allowed to exceed. In one of those the town was more stringent, in that case it was kept more stringent.

Mr. Maurer confirmed for Attorney Schopick emergency legislation would be necessary at the Council level since this is to be in effect April 29, 2021.

Moved by Palo, seconded by Regnery to approve (MIU GP) General Permit for Discharges from Miscellaneous Industrial Users Ordinance, (inclusive of the F.O.G. violation fees) as submitted.

VOTE: Motion CARRIED by unanimous consent.

- F.O.G. Ordinance Amendment – See MIU GP motion and vote above.
- Transfer \$2,017.57: From Maintenance/Repair Service Contract 20100000-578801 to Transportation-Vehicle Repair 20100000-567702

The vacall had an electronic control issue, the repair account ran short which is why the transfer is necessary, this will give the account a cushion until the end of the fiscal year.

Moved by Regnery, seconded by Palo to approve the transfer *From Maintenance/Repair Service Contract 20100000-578801 to Transportation-Vehicle Repair 20100000-567702* in the amount of \$2,017.57.

The clerk called the roll and recorded it as follows:

	Aye	Nay	Abstain
Richard Boggs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jon Greene	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Frank Regnery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Andrew Palo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Charles Berezin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scott Thornton, Alt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VOTE: Motion CARRIED unanimously.

- *Bridgeport City Council 03-15-2021 Meeting:*
Mr. Maurer explained the Bridgeport WPCA went for approval for \$395 million for treatment plant upgrades, it was a very disputed item and the City Council tabled it. Trumbull's Director of Public Works George Estrada spoke at their meeting. There is quite a bit of work Bridgeport has to do to improve their plant, it will cost more than \$395 million over the years, this is something to pay attention to. He has a meeting with Bridgeport WPCA General Manager tomorrow. The Chair stated it would be nice to get a handle on what the future holds with them.

Commissioner Greene stated there is a report people can download on the Bpt. WPCA website. This money is just for the treatment plant, not the massive bill they are facing for separating the collection systems. There are \$100's of millions more in total. Bridgeport is under a consent order to upgrade the plants. Ms. Kurtz explained \$395 million is for only one of the plants, the total for both is over \$500 million. There is close to one billion dollars' worth of work in total. Trumbull represent 16% of that, which is \$160 million more than what Trumbull is already paying. Years ago, they used high gross numbers of \$110 or \$120 million as an estimate for Trumbull to build a new plant, it would easily be \$140 million now. That is one of the next things they plan to look at, updating those estimates. The Chair noted it is a comparable order of magnitude. Commissioner Regnery noted there are other options of building a plant, public-private partnerships and questioned if an exploratory committee should be formed to speak to those that offer those type of solutions.

Ms. Kurtz stated some of the exploratory work has been done:

- Feasibility Study to look at building a treatment plant. It was determined to be feasible.
- Alternatives – Going to Stratford and Fairfield were looked at. Ultimately, they recommend the best for Trumbull is a fair and equitable arrangement with Bridgeport.

If that can't be achieved to look at the other alternatives. At the time Stratford wasn't as interested so they focused on Fairfield and looked at the next level, what would need to be constructed and what the cost would be if they were to go to Fairfield. There were some conversations had. All of these things have to be updated.

The fair and equitable arrangement with Bridgeport is still the most cost effective for Trumbull knowing what we know now although 16% is not fair. The Commission

questioned how successful they had been to date with fair and equitable. Commissioner Greene and the Chair indicated that Trumbull is 16% of their flow but not 16% of their problem or processing.

Bridgeport is at the phase where they are trying to get approval from DEP and the various state agencies, if approved they will start the design process.

Trumbull's flow goes to the plant that needs the \$395 million. Commissioner Palo questioned what it would cost them to build a new plant. Ms. Kurtz stated they have a much larger flow in Bridgeport. Sometimes rehabs are more expensive than a new plant. Their flow number are maybe 30 million gallons per day and they want to upgrade to 200. Mr. Maurer confirmed this information, because of their combined sewers they don't want the over flow.

Commissioner Greene noted the distribution is off because their peaks are massive compared to their regular flow. Ms. Kurtz indicated Trumbull doesn't know if Bridgeport will need an interceptor, their long term control plan from 10+ years ago addressed the collection system primarily and now this is more treatment. The question is how much both of those still need to be constructed, is it half of what was projected before, is it just the treatment plant and none of what was projected in the long term control plan? It may be a piece of both, treatment and collection. That still has to be vetted out. It is unknown what treatment is being added.

Commissioner Berezin indicated he had read they were doing more so they didn't have to do anything on the collection system and take the additional capacity from the plant. Ms. Kurtz stated we still have to know if that was reported correctly. Commissioner Regnery questioned how well would a plant function if it goes down from 200 to 30, does that affect the operation of the sewer plant if the flows are different by 80%. Ms. Kurtz stated it is accommodated in the treatment processes and design to handle the full range of flows.

Attorney Schopick noted Trumbull's allocation is 4.2 million gallons per day that is a very small part of the total. Ms. Kurtz explained that is the flow but it's ambiguous in the IMA what that flow actually represents. An order of magnitude 4 million to 5 million gallons v. their current 30 million. It is unknown what kind of funding they will be getting or the percentage. The 395 million represents the project not necessarily the grant portion. Commissioner Regnery indicated the newspaper article said they expected over \$100,000 from the state.

Ms. Kurtz confirmed Bridgeport was projecting high numbers in rates, there have been similar projections with regard to past plans. It depends on how much funding which would impact their users, including Trumbull plus what we put out for our own collection system. The Chair stated the numbers put out included a longer-term projection that equated to an annualized percentage that was significantly lower than the shorter-term projections, it was almost as if they were front loading it. Mr. Maurer stated what they really meant to say was that it was actually 2.7% not the 1.7% of the today cost. The magnitude they were quoting was off.

The Chair stated he had figured an annualized inflation rate and it was significantly higher for the short term than it was for the longer term and didn't understand why they would put most of the pain in the first few years or if the numbers were accurate. Commissioner Regnery interpreted it as they would be spending more money in the future in capital improvements. Ms. Kurtz noted it is unknown if the numbers they give was the use now plus the capital minus the bonds coming off of it from old projects being paid for or just the capital. We have to get into more of the details of what is being proposed. The Chair stated nobody knows because there wasn't enough detail provided and thought it was strange they would present the numbers that way, it was alarming and the numbers were so extreme the way it was stated.

Mr. Maurer explained the current contract with Bridgeport is through 2026 with a three (3) year extension, no negotiation has started. This will affect us before the contract is up. The Chair explained we are still bound by the contract and tied to their rates, however if their rates move we will be affected by the increases just like all of their customers.

Commissioner Thornton questioned the numbers referred to earlier in the meeting, the 16%, and whether it should be less or more and who is negotiating that number on our behalf. Ms. Kurtz stated there had been previous attempts that Bridgeport didn't agree to which is why the current agreement is the way it is now. There is a decreasing percentage discount over eight (8) years. This is an ongoing process that has been happening by various steps over the years. Mr. Maurer stated we are contractually bound to the agreement in place now. Ms. Kurtz said they continue to look at the alternatives at the next level of detail. Mr. Maurer noted there is a notification clause and have the right to pull out of the contract. Attorney Schopick stated we are not obligated to send all of Trumbull's sewage to Bridgeport but for the sewage we send the rates are set pursuant to the contract.

Commissioner Regnery questioned whether the WPCA should be looking at this and looking at alternatives or is someone else doing that. Attorney Schopick explained the first selectman's office, Mr. Maurer and Wright Pierce are exploring the possibilities. Once there is greater insight as to what the options are it will certainly be a committee that includes members of the WPCA, BOF. There are many constituencies that are important. Ms. Kurtz stated they have done this in the past, and there are a handful of newer commissioners, they can give them an overview of what work has occurred to date and what the next planned steps are. Attorney Schopick stated Wright Pierce has been hired to do the evaluations but the timing is such that if Trumbull was going to build a plant it wouldn't be ready before the contract is up. Permitting is longest part of the project. Ms. Kurtz explained the discharge site will be the most important thing to get permitted by the state. Trumbull will discharge their wastewater to a different spot than Bridgeport. That will take time, sampling and understanding of how that would impact the watercourse. In the first feasibility study there were three (3) options but the state indicated they would only allow one (1) of them. It is downstream of the impoundment of Beardsley Zoo, and would be in Bridgeport. Much of this exploratory work was done during legal action occurring. It was part of mediation and arbitration. Ms. Kurtz explained there is political,

legal, environmental, engineering, and agenda answers to why 4 years ago they did not aggressively pursue this.

Commissioner Greene clarified the \$140 million would not be over 4 or 5 years, we are talking about numbers that would be bonded over decades, this is something as a town we need to take seriously, but it is not quite the catastrophe it sounds like. It is an imminent problem that will ultimately get worse, but it won't hit tomorrow with a doubling or tripling of bills. Commissioner Regnery explained in future value more than \$140 million when interest is added. You have to start somewhere, how much a plant cost, maybe \$160 million and the state would may cover 30%, and with the new infrastructure bills at the federal level, it may be a good time to be prepared to seek the money in grant. The money will be there.

Ms. Kurtz stated the commission/town has a five (5) year period ahead of them where they will have to come to a decision, if a fair and equitable agreement can't happen with Bridgeport. There is permitting, planning of discharge and design all of that would take five (5) years and then construction for three (3). It would be 7-8 years before Trumbull had a plant or infrastructure to go to Fairfield, if everyone agreed to things relatively quickly in the next year or so, which is not an easy task.

Attorney Schopick stated discussions are taking place. The first selectman has been convening various constituencies to have discussions, ultimately this would have to go to a referendum, and there are many steps that would have to happen. The alternatives are being explored. When negotiating another contract anything could be negotiated. Trumbull will not be out of the contract, but does have the right to extend it for another three (3) years, from that point of view the contract is in our favor. We can pull out and are not be obligated to send our sewage to the Bridgeport plant; if we were to have another treatment plant in place prior to that we would pull out prior to that. Whatever is done if we don't have another place to send our sewage DEEP wouldn't allow Trumbull to be cut off by Bridgeport. Bridgeport has taken a position for years that Trumbull isn't paying its fair share, that is where we are every time we have gotten into a lawsuit. Their position has been despite the fact they are inefficient Trumbull is a user like everyone else and we have to pay for their inefficiencies. Ms. Kurtz added Trumbull could say to Bridgeport, let us help with your large flows and leave Bridgeport that would be a positive. Attorney Schopick explained when the TBI (Trumbull Bridgeport Interceptor) was built Trumbull paid 50% of the local cost. Trumbull has participated in a great extent in the upgrades over the years.

Ms. Kurtz confirmed a reroute to Fairfield could be on a parallel timeframe, there is a lot of pipe to put in the ground to get to Fairfield and Fairfield would have to upgrade their plant.

Attorney Schopick explained in terms of more exploration there would be a need for representation from WPCA, the committee should be led by the first selectman.

Commissioner Thornton questioned whether the WPCA should make a recommendation on this because they see what is coming down the road. Attorney Schopick stated that

would not be inappropriate to put it on record that this needs to happen. Commissioner Greene noted he has had calls with the first selectman's office and they are well aware and suggested having a discussion with them before a vote and/or recommendation. Palo agreed that they should notify the first selectman of their consensus first, possibly through Mr. Maurer and put something out there officially. Attorney Schopick will bring that message back. Mr. Maurer has a meeting with the first selectman on Monday of next week on alternate flows. The commissioners agreed to put their consensus on the record. The Chair agreed but noted this is not something that has to happen this month or in the next six (6) months. Commissioner Greene noted he would be available to set a meeting up with the first selectman. Attorney Schopick suggested the Chair designate himself or someone else to be the representative. Commissioner Regnery stated the commission wants to be proactive and wants to know something is being done, and if they have an obligation as commissioners to make sure something is being considered and agreed someone should be designated as a representative to start initial discussions so they are in the loop, future discussions may have to be taken in executive session.

Ms. Kurtz explained the WPCA as a whole has not been not doing anything, and offered a workshop to give a back history. COVID has made this topic somewhat stagnant. Attorney Schopick stated no one new about the Bridgeport upgrade. Commissioner Greene will forward the Bridgeport Engineering Report to the clerk for distribution to the full commission.

The Chair likes the idea of getting everyone better informed on what has happened in the past and also having direct conversations with the first selectman's office, he would like himself and Commissioner Greene to represent the commission. (As long as they don't have three commissioners present it would not establish a quorum), and will share those discussions with the commission at a regular meeting during Executive Session. Commissioner Greene will discuss this with Mr. Maurer and then contact the first selectman's office to schedule the meeting. The Chair noted they wanted Mr. Maurer to be part of the meeting. Attorney Schopick clarified that the commission would not assume the discussion would be held in Executive Session it would depend on what the substance is of whether it would be appropriate for executive session.

Old Business:

FY2022 Budget Update:

Mr. Maurer met with the BOF last Tuesday. They agreed on everything and put back \$50,000 removed by the first selectman for the alternative flow line item. The budget will go to Town Council in April.

2021 CIP Capital Improvement Plan Bond Authorization Update :

Mr. Maurer reported everything included in the bond authorization was approved, including the Whitney Avenue pump station and the force main.

Old Town and Reservoir Avenue Pump Stations Update:

Mr. Maurer reported there was a pre-bid meeting, with at least ten (10) contactors present, which is significant. He didn't think there would be ten (10) bidders but there will be more than one (1). The bid opening is scheduled for tomorrow. It will be reviewed and then

brought to the WPCA. They are both tight sites and have obstacles, they did get a lot questions and they were all answered.

Beardsley Force Main Update:

Mr. Maurer reported they had gone to Stelson to mark potential test sites. They are not sure where the pipe is exactly, they will have to do borings to find it, the force main is between the state DOT fence at RT. 25 and the guardrail in Stelson. They tried to pick it up with the locator but there was too much interference with telephone poles, overhead wires, fences and guardrails, they couldn't get an exact location. There is an air release valve there and it is known where that is. They will try to locate the force main with less invasive ways to get their test pits tighter. They are hoping to get this done in April although it may be not until the end of April before they locate the force-main. They are moving forward with the design, he hasn't seen anything more since the last meeting. He hasn't discussed with Bridgeport yet, he wants something on paper to show them, they will bring it up at tomorrow's meeting with Bridgeport.

Commissioner Palo suggested adding Public Comment to the agenda. Attorney Schopick explained it is not a requirement but a number of boards and commissions do have public comment as well as the Town Council and BOF. The Town Council's and BOFs public comment is only on items on the agenda, in the WPCA's case it could be more. Under FOI rules the commission has the right to ask people when they speak to identify themselves with name and address and the right to limit the time for speaking. The parameters for public comment could be put on the next meeting agenda, if the commission wants to add to their agenda at this meeting a 2/3 vote is required to add an item to the agenda. Commissioner Palo stated when people have wanted to speak before they never denied them and wants to make it more official. Attorney Schopick explained in public comment you don't have to get into a dialogue or debate, it's to give them an opportunity to say what is important to them. It's helpful to have a time limit, it can always be extended. Commissioner Palo thinks the BOE is 2 minutes and BOF is 3 minutes. Attorney Schopick added the BOE doesn't necessarily let everyone who wants to speak speak, they make certain determinations as to whether it is appropriate which he doesn't agree with, if you are going to allow the public to speak it should be open to the public. The Commission would decide on the parameters, the public could speak about sewer related issues that are germane to WPCA, a lot boards do say public comment is based on what is on the specific meeting agenda. The Chair stated the commission's area of responsibility are largely technical, and spoke in favor of not engaging the public on the spot. Attorney Schopick stated there are certain constraints under FOI, any business conducted by the commission has to be related to the agenda, the public can speak but the commission can't take votes or make policy based on something brought up that wasn't on the agenda, it could be put on the agenda for a subsequent meeting. It would be appropriate to put on "Public Comment Parameters" on the agenda. The Chair stated this isn't all that different than what they have been doing, this could be on the next agenda. The general consensus was favorable. Discussion of placement of public comment on the agenda was discussed, whether it would be at beginning or end. To be determined at a late date.

Adjournment:

There being no further business to discuss and upon motion made by Palo, seconded by Regnery the Trumbull Water Pollution Control Authority adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret D. Mastroni, WPCA Clerk

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
Town of Trumbull
CONNECTICUT

TOWN HALL
(203) 452-5048



5866 MAIN STREET
TRUMBULL, CT 06611

APRIL 8, 2021
MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: The Vice-Chair called the special meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

The clerk called the roll and recorded to as follows:

PRESENT: Vice-Chairman Jon Greene, Andrew Palo and Frank Regnery

ABSENT: Chairman Richard Boggs, Charles Berezin and Scott Thornton

Old Business:

- Transfer \$2,017.57: From Maintenance/Repair Service Contract 20100000-578801 to Transportation-Vehicle Repair 20100000-567702 (WPCA Request - BOF Business)

Mr. Maurer corrected the agenda that this was a WPCA account. The account number is correct on the agenda.

BOF acted on the transfer and approved the transfer

- Alternative Flow Discussion - WPCA & Board of Finance

Mr. Estrada gave a brief overview approximately a year ago when he joined the Trumbull team First Selectman Tesoro had expressed concern over the agreements and relationships that were in place at that time. Her directive at the time was to explore all options available. To that end they are always monitoring both internally through the WPCA Commission and through externally primarily the Bridgeport WPCA to be sure the Trumbull ratepayers are being served. Currently multiple options are being served. You will see in a presentation, such as diversification of flow and independence. There have been no surprises from the recent information in the press. We have been aware there are consent orders, which Bridgeport must respond. Ultimately those infrastructure expenses would be shared by Trumbull rate payers. The only unknown has been the magnitude of constructions costs because Bridgeport has not forwarded a copy of the facility's plan submitted to DEEP. Until that plan is designed completely by Bridgeport we will not have an accurate estimate of the total costs are to be expected. This evening you will hear from William Maurer, WPCA Administrator/Town Engineer and Christine Kurtz our expert. The presentation is an extensive work product supported by data

including short and long-term action items as well as possibilities for future considerations by this body. This presentation is not a reaction to anything in the media but an overview of extensive work on going for over a year. Dialogue continues with DEEP, they are working with them to see if we qualify for potential grant funding which will ultimately important to offset any costs associated with our decisions. They did not come to the board for any decisions this is strictly an information session and they will available at any time in the future, if this body should request updates or any further information. Mr. Estrada suggested entering executive session based CGS 1-210b-7 to present engineering or feasibility estimates relative to the public supply construction costs.

BOF called for Executives Session based on CGS 1-210b-7 to present engineering or feasibility estimates relative to the public supply construction costs at 7:34 p.m. with the WPCA commissioners present at this meeting, BOF members present at this meeting, Public Works Director George Estrada, Town Engineer William Maurer , Town Attorneys Daniel Schopick and James Nugent, Christine Kurtz of Wright Pierce and First Selectman Vicki A. Tesoro.

Upon motion and second and by unanimous consent the BOF ENDED Executive Session at 8:54 p.m.

Adjournment There being no further business to discuss and upon motion made by Palo, seconded by Greene the WPCA adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret D. Mastroni, WPCA Clerk

Mr. William Maurer, PE
Town Engineer
Town of Trumbull
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, CT 06611

Arcadis U.S., Inc.
213 Court Street
Suite 700
Middletown
Connecticut 06457
Phone: 860 503 1500
Fax: 860 346 2853
www.arcadis.com

Date: April 14, 2021
Our Ref: 30003195
Subject: RFP #6402 Reservoir Ave & Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrade
Bid Evaluation

Dear Mr. Maurer,

As you are aware, the bid opening for RFP #6402 Reservoir Ave & Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrade was held on March 25, 2021 at Town Hall. Two bids were received as summarized in Attachment 1. The apparent low bidder is Kovacs Construction Corporation of Oxford, CT.

Arcadis has completed a bid evaluation for the above referenced project. This assessment consisted of reviewing the bid results provided by the Town of Trumbull and a limited review of the bid documents for Kovacs Construction Corporation (Kovacs). This evaluation focuses on the bid pricing and bidder's qualifications. This memorandum summarizes the results of our bid evaluation and represents our recommendations for award.

Our review included the Bid Form and Statement of Qualifications. Based on the information provided, we found that Kovacs has provided substantially complete information.

BID FORM

A lump sum price was established for the general construction of each pump station in the Base Bid. In addition to these lump sum prices, three (3) allowances associated with the general construction of Reservoir Ave Pump Station and two (2) allowances associated with the general construction of Old Town Road Pump Station were established. Furthermore, six (6) unit price items and three (3) bid alternatives are also included on the Bid Form.

Kovacs' total bid price for the lump sum, allowance items, unit prices, and alternates was \$3,180,065.00. The Engineer's Construction Cost Estimate (ECCE) for this project was \$3,045,000. The ECCE does not account for the additional traffic control allowances at each site (Bid Items 1D, 2C, and 4C). Overall, the ECCE is 4% lower than Kovacs' total bid price. When adjusting the ECCE for the (3) traffic control allowances, Kovacs' total bid price is approximately 3% higher than the adjusted ECCE.

We are of the opinion that the costs presented by Kovacs are reasonable. Possible areas for discrepancy between the adjusted ECCE and Kovacs bid price may include the complexity of the Reservoir Avenue Sewer Replacement (Bid Item 4A) and unit pricing for unit concrete items 3A through 3F.

Mr. William Maurer
Town of Trumbull
April 14, 2021

PROPOSED BASIS FOR AWARD

As noted in the Bid Documents, the Town has the option to eliminate any or all of the Bid Alternate Items. As this bid appears to be within the budgeted amount for the project, Arcadis recommends the following basis for award.

Item	Bid
Lump Sum for Reservoir Avenue	\$1,529,000.00
Lump Sum for Old Town Road	\$1,202,000.00
Allowances for Reservoir Avenue	\$14,250
Allowance for Old Town Road	\$13,250
Unit Price Items (3A to 3F)	\$16,565.00
Bid Alternates (4A, 4B, 4C)	\$405,000.00
TOTAL AWARD	\$3,180,065.00

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

As part of the bid evaluation, Arcadis conducted a survey of project references provided in their Bid Package. Kovacs has provided substantially complete information with regards to bidder's qualifications.

Reference Survey

A reference survey was conducted for Kovacs which consisted of interviewing the listed Owner and Engineer from four (4) previously completed projects. Completed reference surveys are provided in Attachment 2.

Overall, references have provided positive feedback. All references reported the quality of the final product to be excellent and that the Owners were very pleased. The references noted that Kovacs Construction's responsiveness to Owner and Engineer requests were exceptional, and that the Contractor team can be easily reached by telephone for communication when necessary. It was noted in the interviews that Tom Kovacs (President) can be found on site regularly acting as supervisor of his crews. Kovacs is exceptional at anticipating, responding, and providing solutions to issues in the field, avoiding many potentially time-consuming delays. It is also noteworthy that all references confirmed adequate safety programs were adhered to. In general, both Owners and Engineers provided positive responses regarding their experiences with Kovacs.

Mr. William Maurer
Town of Trumbull
April 14, 2021

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, based on the submitted bid and the overall positive feedback from references for similar work, Arcadis recommends that RFP #6402 Reservoir Ave & Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrade be awarded to Kovacs Construction Corporation.

Sincerely,
Arcadis U.S., Inc.



Alan Levy, PE
Senior Engineer

Email: alan.levy@arcadis.com
Direct Line: 860-503-1444
Mobile: 845-461-4188

CC. K. Bova, Town of Trumbull
V. McPherson, Arcadis

Enclosures:

Attachments

- 1 Copy of Bid Results
- 2 Completed Reference Surveys

ATTACHMENT 1
Copy of Bid Results

TOWN OF TRUMBULL - WPCA
 Reservoir Ave & Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrade
 BID Results
 RFP# 6402
 March 25th, 2021 at 2:00PM

TOWN OF TRUMBULL

WPCA-REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS RESERVOIR AVE & OLD TOWN ROAD PUMP STATION UPGRADE RFP # 6402 DUE: March 25th, 2021

				BIDDER'S NAME		BIDDER'S NAME	
				Kovacs Construction Corporation 321 Riggs Street Oxford, CT 06478		True Blue Environmental 5 Worthfield Rd Wallingford, CT 06492	
BID QUANTITIES				UNIT AMT	BID	UNIT AMT	BID
Item	Qty.	UNIT					
Item 1: General Construction of Reservoir Avenue Pump Station Upgrades							
1A Lump Sum for Reservoir Avenue Construction Upgrade	1	LS		\$1,529,000.00	\$1,529,000.00	\$1,643,386.00	\$1,643,386.00
1B Allowance for New Electrical Service at Reservoir Avenue	1	AL		\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
1C Allowance for New Gas Service at Reservoir Avenue	1	AL		\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
1D Allowance for Traffic Control	1	AL		\$6,250.00	\$6,250.00	\$6,250.00	\$6,250.00
Subtotal Item 1:					\$1,543,250.00		\$1,657,636.00
Item 2: General Construction of Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrades							
2A Lump Sum for Old Town Road Construction Upgrade	1	LS		\$1,202,000.00	\$1,202,000.00	\$1,371,528.00	\$1,371,528.00
2B Allowance for New Electric Service at Old Town Road	1	AL		\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00
2C Allowance for Traffic Control	1	AL		\$6,250.00	\$6,250.00	\$6,250.00	\$6,250.00
Subtotal Item 2:					\$1,215,250.00		\$1,384,778.00
Item 3: Unit Price Items							
3A Non-Structural Crack Repairs (Type 2)	20	LF		\$126.00	\$2,520.00	\$150.00	\$3,000.00
3B Structural Crack Repair (Type 3)	10	LF		\$195.00	\$1,950.00	\$175.00	\$1,750.00
3C Patching of voids without rebar repair to a depth of 4in or less	5	SF		\$373.00	\$1,865.00	\$125.00	\$625.00
3D Patching of voids with rebar repair to a depth of 4in or less	5	SF		\$453.00	\$2,265.00	\$225.00	\$1,125.00
3E Exposed Aggregate Repair (Type 4)	5	SF		\$393.00	\$1,965.00	\$225.00	\$1,125.00
3F Rock Excavation and Removal	20	CY		\$300.00	\$6,000.00	\$50.00	\$1,000.00
Subtotal Item 3					\$16,565.00		\$8,625.00
TOTAL LUMP SUM, ALLOWANCE, & UNIT PRICE BIDS					\$2,775,065.00		\$3,051,039.00
4A Bid Alt - Reservoir Avenue Sewer Replacement	1	LS		\$375,000.00	\$375,000.00	\$118,446.00	\$118,446.00
4B Bid Alt - Allowance for Unforeseen Conditions	1	AL		\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
4C Allowance for Traffic Control	1	AL		\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
TOTAL OF ALL BID ALTERNATIVES					\$405,000.00		\$148,446.00
TOTAL BASE BID CONSTRUCTION COST + BID ALTERNATIVES					\$3,180,065.00		\$3,199,485.00

ATTACHMENT 2

Completed Reference Surveys

Contractor Reference Check

Bid Review Subject Project: Town of Trumbull Reservoir Avenue and Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrades Bid #6402



Date / Time: 3.31.2021 / 3:50pm
Zeoli

Prepared By: A.

Spoke With: Richard Feminella

Of: Town of Greenwich

Phone No: (203) 622-7760

Questions:	Response:
1. Project Information:	
1a. What was the name and contract number?	Ballwood, Meadow, & Heusted Pump Station Replacements
1b. Describe the nature of the work performed.	Full rehabilitation of (3) wastewater pump stations, including tear down new wet well, new pumps, etc. Under this project the buildings were raised above the FEMA flood zone. Kovacs completed all site work, mechanical, electrical, and instrumentation.
1c. What was the project delivery method.	Design – Bid – Build
1d. Prime Contractor Name.	Kovacs Construction Co.
1e. Was work executed as part of a Joint Venture?	No
2. Schedule:	
2a. When was the project completed?	October 15, 2020
2b. Was the project completed on time? Were milestones met?	Yes
2c. Did the contractor provide a timely and acceptable baseline construction schedule and detailed schedule updates that were adhered to during the work?	Could use improvement, but did not hinder project
2d. If the schedule slipped, what measures were taken to recover lost time?	Yes
3. Budget	
3a. What was the initial Contract Bid Price of the project?	\$4,796,750.00
3b. Was the project within the budget?	Yes
3c. What was the final cost of the project and percent of change orders compared to the original contract amount?	
4. Changes	

<i>4a. Did the contractor justify and fairly negotiate change orders?</i>	Yes
<i>4b. Were the number and scope of claims fair and reasonable?</i>	Yes
5. Execution	
<i>5a. Did the contractor have any staffing issues? Did they provide adequate supervision and direction of the field staff?</i>	No
<i>5b. Who were the project manager and site superintendent? Did they exhibit a high degree of competence and organization?</i>	Tom Kovacs was the Project Manager and Mark was the Superintendent
<i>5c. What was the quality of the contractor's workmanship?</i>	Workmanship was great
<i>5d. What was the quality of the contractor's submittals? Were they submitted in a timely manner with a minimum of resubmittals?</i>	Yes
<i>5e. Did the contractor provide and adhere to an adequate safety program? Were there any safety issues on the project?</i>	Yes, no safety issues.
<i>5f. Did the contractor coordinate well with other contractors/ subcontractors?</i>	Yes, subcontractors were very well managed
<i>5g. What was the quality of the final product?</i>	All (3) pump stations turned out beautiful
6. Teamwork	
<i>6a. Was the contractor proactive in identifying and resolving issues?</i>	Yes, and always came to the table with solutions
<i>6b. Was the contractor generally responsive to the Owner's needs and Engineer's requests?</i>	Yes
<i>6c. Was the contractor a team player? Did he exhibit a positive and cooperative attitude?</i>	Yes, Kovacs even got along with the neighbors
<i>6d. Was the contractor efficient at managing sub-consultant activities?</i>	Yes
<i>6e. Any additional feedback about the ability of the contractor to work with subs or a JV partner?</i>	
7. Summary	
<i>7a. Please describe the overall experience in a few words.</i>	Kovacs is great to work with, demonstrates strong communication, and is able to really assist with problem solving unforeseen conditions.
<i>7b. Would you recommend the contractor for similar work?</i>	Yes, definitely recommend Kovacs and have nothing negative to say.

Contractor Reference Check

Bid Review Subject Project: Town of Trumbull Reservoir Avenue and Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrades Bid #6402



Date / Time: 3.31.2021 / 1:00pm

Prepared By: A. Zeoli

Spoke With: Gary Simard

Of: AECOM

Phone No: (860) 263-5786

Questions:	Response:
1. Project Information:	
<i>1a. What was the name and contract number?</i>	Ballwood, Meadow, & Heusted Pump Station Replacements
<i>1b. Describe the nature of the work performed.</i>	A challenging construction project which involved full rehabilitation of (3) wastewater pump stations
<i>1c. What was the project delivery method.</i>	Design – Bid – Build
<i>1d. Prime Contractor Name.</i>	Kovacs Construction Co.
<i>1e. Was work executed as part of a Joint Venture?</i>	No
2. Schedule:	
<i>2a. When was the project completed?</i>	October 15, 2020
<i>2b. Was the project completed on time? Were milestones met?</i>	A little late, only bidder, no issue with the schedule
<i>2c. Did the contractor provide a timely and acceptable baseline construction schedule and detailed schedule updates that were adhered to during the work?</i>	Not Kovacs' strongest point, but not an issue.
<i>2d. If the schedule slipped, what measures were taken to recover lost time?</i>	
3. Budget	
<i>3a. What was the initial Contract Bid Price of the project?</i>	\$4,796,750.00
<i>3b. Was the project within the budget?</i>	Yes, very minimal change orders on this project.
<i>3c. What was the final cost of the project and percent of change orders compared to the original contract amount?</i>	
4. Changes	
<i>4a. Did the contractor justify and fairly negotiate change orders?</i>	Yes

Reference Check

<p>4b. Were the number and scope of claims fair and reasonable?</p>	
<p>5. Execution</p>	
<p>5a. Did the contractor have any staffing issues? Did they provide adequate supervision and direction of the field staff?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5b. Who were the project manager and site superintendent? Did they exhibit a high degree of competence and organization?</p>	<p>Tom Kovacs was the Project Manager and Mark was the Superintendent</p>
<p>5c. What was the quality of the contractor's workmanship?</p>	<p>Very good</p>
<p>5d. What was the quality of the contractor's submittals? Were they submitted in a timely manner with a minimum of resubmittals?</p>	<p>No issues</p>
<p>5e. Did the contractor provide and adhere to an adequate safety program? Were there any safety issues on the project?</p>	<p>No issues</p>
<p>5f. Did the contractor coordinate well with other contractors/ subcontractors?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>5g. What was the quality of the final product?</p>	<p>Very good</p>
<p>6. Teamwork</p>	
<p>6a. Was the contractor proactive in identifying and resolving issues?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6b. Was the contractor generally responsive to the Owner's needs and Engineer's requests?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6c. Was the contractor a team player? Did he exhibit a positive and cooperative attitude?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6d. Was the contractor efficient at managing sub-consultant activities?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6e. Any additional feedback about the ability of the contractor to work with subs or a JV partner?</p>	
<p>7. Summary</p>	
<p>7a. Please describe the overall experience in a few words.</p>	<p>Very pleasurable.</p>
<p>7b. Would you recommend the contractor for similar work?</p>	<p>Kovacs is really one of the best Contractors around and does this type of work well.</p>

Contractor Reference Check

Bid Review Subject Project: Town of Trumbull Reservoir Avenue and Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrades Bid #6402



Date / Time: 3.31.2021 / 3:40pm

Prepared By: A. Zeoli

Spoke With: Orville Kelly

Of: South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority

Phone No: (203) 401-6712

Questions:	Response:
1. Project Information:	
1a. What was the name and contract number?	Brushy Plain Standpipe Demolition & Cherry Hill Pump Station Improvements
1b. Describe the nature of the work performed.	The project consisted of site work, tank removal, demolition, site restoration, pump and pipe replacement, buried piping outside, new PRV enclosure structure, electrical work, new generator, as well as replacing HVAC fans and electrical gears
1c. What was the project delivery method.	Design-Bid-Build
1d. Prime Contractor Name.	Kovacs Construction Co.
1e. Was work executed as part of a Joint Venture?	No
2. Schedule:	
2a. When was the project completed?	July 24, 2020
2b. Was the project completed on time? Were milestones met?	Yes
2c. Did the contractor provide a timely and acceptable baseline construction schedule and detailed schedule updates that were adhered to during the work?	Okay
2d. If the schedule slipped, what measures were taken to recover lost time?	
3. Budget	
3a. What was the initial Contract Bid Price of the project?	\$759,799.00
3b. Was the project within the budget?	Yes
3c. What was the final cost of the project and percent of change orders compared to the original contract amount?	Closer to \$1 million
4. Changes	
4a. Did the contractor justify and fairly negotiate change orders?	Yes, very reasonable

<p>4b. Were the number and scope of claims fair and reasonable?</p>	<p>70% of change orders generated by the owner and 30% unforeseen</p>
<p>5. Execution</p>	
<p>5a. Did the contractor have any staffing issues? Did they provide adequate supervision and direction of the field staff?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5b. Who were the project manager and site superintendent? Did they exhibit a high degree of competence and organization?</p>	<p>Tom Kovacs was the Project Manager and Mike Hall was the Superintendent</p>
<p>5c. What was the quality of the contractor's workmanship?</p>	<p>Great workmanship</p>
<p>5d. What was the quality of the contractor's submittals? Were they submitted in a timely manner with a minimum of resubmittals?</p>	<p>Good quality</p>
<p>5e. Did the contractor provide and adhere to an adequate safety program? Were there any safety issues on the project?</p>	<p>Good, no safety issues</p>
<p>5f. Did the contractor coordinate well with other contractors/ subcontractors?</p>	<p>A few issues occurred but Kovacs was very proactive and managed all situations well as the GC</p>
<p>5g. What was the quality of the final product?</p>	<p>Very good</p>
<p>6. Teamwork</p>	
<p>6a. Was the contractor proactive in identifying and resolving issues?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6b. Was the contractor generally responsive to the Owner's needs and Engineer's requests?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6c. Was the contractor a team player? Did he exhibit a positive and cooperative attitude?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6d. Was the contractor efficient at managing sub-consultant activities?</p>	<p>Yes, see above. 5f</p>
<p>6e. Any additional feedback about the ability of the contractor to work with subs or a JV partner?</p>	
<p>7. Summary</p>	
<p>7a. Please describe the overall experience in a few words.</p>	<p>Great communication and working relationship throughout the project</p>
<p>7b. Would you recommend the contractor for similar work?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Contractor Reference Check

Bid Review Subject Project: Town of Trumbull Reservoir Avenue and Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrades Bid #6402



Date / Time: 4.2.2021 / 9:15am

Prepared By: A. Zeoli

Spoke With: Mark Foiss

Of: Aquarion Water

Phone No: (203) 395-4604

Questions:	Response:
1. Project Information:	
1a. What was the name and contract number?	Newtown South Pumping Station
1b. Describe the nature of the work performed.	The project built a new water pump station where Kovacs handled the sitework, brought water main from street and into the building, built the foundation, built the new above ground facility, furnished a new gas and electric service, and handled the mechanical, electrical, and SCADA work
1c. What was the project delivery method.	
1d. Prime Contractor Name.	Kovacs Construction Co.
1e. Was work executed as part of a Joint Venture?	No
2. Schedule:	
2a. When was the project completed?	May 20, 2019
2b. Was the project completed on time? Were milestones met?	Yes
2c. Did the contractor provide a timely and acceptable baseline construction schedule and detailed schedule updates that were adhered to during the work?	
2d. If the schedule slipped, what measures were taken to recover lost time?	
3. Budget	
3a. What was the initial Contract Bid Price of the project?	\$1,431,100.00
3b. Was the project within the budget?	Yes
3c. What was the final cost of the project and percent of change orders compared to the original contract amount?	
4. Changes	
4a. Did the contractor justify and fairly negotiate change orders?	Yes, always reasonable

Reference Check

<p>4b. Were the number and scope of claims fair and reasonable?</p>	
<p>5. Execution</p>	
<p>5a. Did the contractor have any staffing issues? Did they provide adequate supervision and direction of the field staff?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5b. Who were the project manager and site superintendent? Did they exhibit a high degree of competence and organization?</p>	<p>Project Manager was Tom Kovacs and the Superintendent was Brian</p>
<p>5c. What was the quality of the contractor's workmanship?</p>	<p>Great</p>
<p>5d. What was the quality of the contractor's submittals? Were they submitted in a timely manner with a minimum of resubmittals?</p>	
<p>5e. Did the contractor provide and adhere to an adequate safety program? Were there any safety issues on the project?</p>	
<p>5f. Did the contractor coordinate well with other contractors/ subcontractors?</p>	<p>Great</p>
<p>5g. What was the quality of the final product?</p>	<p>Great</p>
<p>6. Teamwork</p>	
<p>6a. Was the contractor proactive in identifying and resolving issues?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6b. Was the contractor generally responsive to the Owner's needs and Engineer's requests?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6c. Was the contractor a team player? Did he exhibit a positive and cooperative attitude?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6d. Was the contractor efficient at managing sub-consultant activities?</p>	<p>Utilized several subcontractors, managed well</p>
<p>6e. Any additional feedback about the ability of the contractor to work with subs or a JV partner?</p>	
<p>7. Summary</p>	
<p>7a. Please describe the overall experience in a few words.</p>	<p>Very great</p>
<p>7b. Would you recommend the contractor for similar work?</p>	<p>Yes, only have good things to say.</p>

Contractor Reference Check

Bid Review Subject Project: Town of Trumbull Reservoir Avenue and Old Town Road Pump Station Upgrades Bid #6402



Date / Time: 4.2.2021 / 9:30am

Prepared By: A. Zeoli

Spoke With: David Lombardo

Of: Tata & Howard

Phone No: (203) 228-9942

Questions:	Response:
1. Project Information:	
1a. What was the name and contract number?	Newtown South Pumping Station
1b. Describe the nature of the work performed.	The project constructed a potable water pump station. Kovacs poured the foundation, built structure, installed new VFD driven pumps, piping, instrumentation, electrical including a new generator, and made final connection to water main in the street
1c. What was the project delivery method.	
1d. Prime Contractor Name.	Kovacs Construction Co.
1e. Was work executed as part of a Joint Venture?	
2. Schedule:	
2a. When was the project completed?	May 20, 2019
2b. Was the project completed on time? Were milestones met?	Yes
2c. Did the contractor provide a timely and acceptable baseline construction schedule and detailed schedule updates that were adhered to during the work?	
2d. If the schedule slipped, what measures were taken to recover lost time?	
3. Budget	
3a. What was the initial Contract Bid Price of the project?	\$1,431,100.00
3b. Was the project within the budget?	Yes
3c. What was the final cost of the project and percent of change orders compared to the original contract amount?	
4. Changes	
4a. Did the contractor justify and fairly negotiate change orders?	Yes, very reasonable, Kovacs understands the nature of construction.

Reference Check

<i>4b. Were the number and scope of claims fair and reasonable?</i>	
5. Execution	
<i>5a. Did the contractor have any staffing issues? Did they provide adequate supervision and direction of the field staff?</i>	No
<i>5b. Who were the project manager and site superintendent? Did they exhibit a high degree of competence and organization?</i>	Tom Kovacs was the Project Manager and Brian was the Superintendent
<i>5c. What was the quality of the contractor's workmanship?</i>	Great
<i>5d. What was the quality of the contractor's submittals? Were they submitted in a timely manner with a minimum of resubmittals?</i>	Yes
<i>5e. Did the contractor provide and adhere to an adequate safety program? Were there any safety issues on the project?</i>	Yes, no issues
<i>5f. Did the contractor coordinate well with other contractors/ subcontractors?</i>	Yes
<i>5g. What was the quality of the final product?</i>	Excellent
6. Teamwork	
<i>6a. Was the contractor proactive in identifying and resolving issues?</i>	
<i>6b. Was the contractor generally responsive to the Owner's needs and Engineer's requests?</i>	Kovacs was always on top of everything. They arrived at all bi-weekly progress meetings present and prepared
<i>6c. Was the contractor a team player? Did he exhibit a positive and cooperative attitude?</i>	Yes
<i>6d. Was the contractor efficient at managing sub-consultant activities?</i>	Yes
<i>6e. Any additional feedback about the ability of the contractor to work with subs or a JV partner?</i>	
7. Summary	
<i>7a. Please describe the overall experience in a few words.</i>	Very good, have worked with Kovacs for a very long time and have a great working relationship
<i>7b. Would you recommend the contractor for similar work?</i>	Yes