

WOODRIDGE LAKE SEWER DISTRICT
MINUTES SPECIAL MEETING
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2012

CALL TO ORDER: James Mersfelder Vice President of the Woodridge Lake Sewer District (WLS D) called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M. and read the call of the meeting. The minutes note that a copy of the call of the meeting along with a copy of the Resolutions for Taxpayer consideration were mailed to all WLS D property owners and Legal Notice for said meeting appeared in the October 14, 2012 Publication of the Republican American Newspaper.

ATTENDANCE: A list of 42 taxpayers eligible to vote at said meeting is on file with the minutes of this meeting. The list included Woodridge Lake Sewer District (WLS D) Board members, Jim Mersfelder, Joan Lang, James Hiltz and Robert Goldfeld, Planning Committee Chairman Kenneth Green and Finance Committee Chairman Richard Reis. Also present were Paul Dombrowski and Jay Sheehan Engineering Consultants from Woodward & Curran and Legal Counsel Bruce Chudwick from Shipman & Goodwin. WLS D President Ray Turri was unable to attend.

Jim Mersfelder noted that since the District's last WLS D last Public meeting which was held August 27, 2011 the Planning Committee has been very active working with the staff of the Sewer District, the Engineers of Woodward & Curran and the DEEP to go through the various steps outlined under the Scope of Work presented to the taxpayers approximately eighteen months ago. The progress has been slow but the progress made has been good and it is believed by the Board, the Planning Committee and the Engineers to be on the right track. This meeting is also intended to bring the Taxpayers up to date as to where the District is at this time and to frame the issues in a way that all can understand in terms of what needs to be accomplished through the Resolutions being presented to the taxpayers for consideration at this meeting. Jim Mersfelder noted that a lot of time had been spent by the Board, the Planning and Finance Committees in reviewing the work and believes that the accepting of these resolutions is in the best interest of the District in order to conform to the issues facing the District with the DEEP.

The Meeting was turned over to Ken Green Chairman of the Planning Committee to present a Slide Presentation. Under Slide one, Ken Green noted that other members serving on the Planning Committee who are Jim Mersfelder, Ray Turri, Bob Goldfeld, Chip Roraback, Richard Reis and WLS D Plant Manager Charles Ekstrom.

Slide two (Presentation Outline) The following items to be addressed under the presentation. They would be, Special Meeting Resolutions, Regulatory Status of District, Facilities Plan Update, Flows & Loadings Study, Groundwater Disposal System Evaluation and Inflow & Infiltration Study.

Slide three (Presentation Outline) would address the following: Collection System (SCADA) Study, Connecticut Clean Water Fund Loans, Impact on Taxpayers of Resolutions, Comments & Questions for Consultants, Comments & Questions for Legal Counsel, Vote on Resolution.

MINUTES WLSL SPECIAL MEETING
OCTOBER 27, 2012
PAGE 2 OF 13

Slide 4 (Special Meeting Resolutions) - would address the Re-appropriation of \$176,000, Approve additional expenditure of \$523,375 and Approve long term funding of \$983,000.

Slide 5 (Regulatory Status of District) - The following Regulatory Status binds the District as follows: The State has classified the District's water shed as AA, the highest standard for drinking water quality. That status puts severe restrictions on how the District operates. The District operates on a Groundwater Permit which requires the disposal of the wastewater into the ground rather than into surface water such as a stream such as Torrington and Litchfield do after treatment at their plants. The DEEP has stated that no new groundwater permits will be issued in this watershed. The District has been operating under a DEEP Consent Order since 1989 and with the limit of 100,000 gpd along with the following conditions to operate the facility, (1) Keep the water in the ground for 21 days before it reaches a watershed; (2) maintain a 3' separation between the ground water with the bottom of the discharge effluent distributed in the disposal beds; (3) No Breakout of water from the filter beds; and (4) Remove more Phosphorous and Nitrogen from the wastewater. DEEP holds all the cards and has statutory and regulatory powers to set water quality standards and to issue permits. The District has been told to fix its wastewater system to their satisfaction or build a pipeline to pipe the District's wastewater to Torrington. Ken Green explained that the WLSL Collection Facility is comprised of three parts. (1), A collection system with 16 miles of pipes, pump stations that connect all homes to the system, (2), a treatment plant that treats the wastewater to a high standard and (3), approximately 100 acres of disposal beds for disposal of the treated wastewater.

Slide 6 (Facilities Plan Update) On December 18, 2012 the Taxpayers of the Taxpayers approved the expenditures on a facilities plan which is a road map for the future operations of the treatment plant. The purpose of the plan was to layout how the District would operate in an environmentally and fiscally responsible way and identify the necessary improvements in the wastewater system. The plan contains all the tasks to move forward. The approved budget for the Facilities Plan \$563,000, 45% paid by the District with 55% Grant Funded by DEEP. A portion of the work that has been done was focused on finding and solving the Inflow and Infiltration rain and ground water into the collection system and testing the absorption capacity of the soils. Major tasks remaining to be done include evaluation of the necessary upgrades to the treatment plant and disposal beds and the Torrington pipeline alternative. The District has started the initial evaluation of the two alternatives and is expecting results on those tasks by the end of the year. Once the District has the preliminary cost for the alternatives, the District will consult with its advisers how best to evaluate and present the findings to the State DEEP. It remains the intention of the Planning Committee, the Board and all others involved to retain two viable alternatives and present the most economical and environmentally acceptable solution to the District Taxpayers.

Slide 7 (Flow & Pollutant Loading Study) – The Planning Committee reviewed in detail the Consultant’s study that applied the current and projected connections, flows and pollutant loadings for the District. Current connections were calculated at 677 with total wastewater flows averaging 105,000 gallons per day (“gpd”) over the past three years. That number was comprised of 50,000 gpd wastewater and 55,000 gpd of inflow & infiltration (I/I) into the collection system. The extensive study also showed a potential for 200 additional connections for a total of 877 inflow build out. Future wastewater flows from additional connections were estimated to be between 14,800 to 22,200 gpd or a potential future flow of 119,800 to 127,200 gpd of wastewater to treat and discharge. Based on the fact that Consent Order limits the District to only 100,000 gpd, the projected increase in flows makes the issue clear, the District must reduce the flows into the system to demonstrate to the DEEP that our existing plant and disposal beds are a viable alternative.

Slide 8 (Groundwater Disposal System Evaluation – Needed to continue the operation of the treatment plant facility in order to prove to the DEEP that our disposal beds are capable of absorbing the wastewater in volumes the District collects and treats. Noted was the work done in 2010/2011 to bring the beds back to proper operating condition. The beds were cleaned, valves and pipes were repaired where needed and four (4) beds were prepared for field testing of their absorption capacity. There were technical aspects that needed to be clarified and it took three months of negotiations with the DEEP to receive from the DEEP the guidelines for evaluation criteria for the new system. The results of the tests that were run this spring were encouraging. The results showed that our beds could conservatively absorb 101,000 gpd of wastewater under the agreed conditions and more than that under a balanced approach to the use of the disposal beds. It is expected that there will be some issues with the test results that will be challenged by the DEEP but the Board, Planning Committee, Consultants and Legal Counsel have a strong scientific basis for the conclusions. The District plans to submit the results of the disposal field plans to the DEEP once the cost evaluation of the two alternatives is completed, Early next year is the estimated time for the findings to be presented to the DEEP.

Slide 9 (Inflow & Infiltration Study – The study of the I/I showed the need to reduce the I/I. Whether the District continued operations under the current system or piping to Torrington it was determined that work to reduce I/I was an economical approach. The average daily flow of 105,000 gpd which can spike to over 300,000 gpd or more during heavy rain shows that there is a significant amount of I/I going into the system. The I/I work over the past year has estimated the magnitude of flows in the District sub-basins. Manhole inspection has resulted in a composite data base which allows for being able to target and focus on problem areas. Night time manhole and TV inspection of the Sewer lines has helped to determine flows when there

is little or no household activity. Decisions are made to determine where the most I/I can be removed at the lowest cost. Noted was the difficulty in removing the I/I from the system based on the fact that although there is a high rate of I/I relative to the amount of sanitary flows, there is a low level of I/I based on the 16 miles of pipe line. This is due to low density in relation to the low density waste water generation rate per household. The combination of factors makes I/I removal more challenging and more costly per gallon to remove.

Conclusions of the study prove that work on relining and joint repairs of some specific sections of pipe line can remove from approximately 4,000 to 9,000 gpd of I/I at a capital cost of \$272,000. It has also been determined that manhole repairs and reline work can remove 5,000 to 20,000 gpd of I/I at a capital cost of \$257,000 for a total cost for a total cost for I/I work of \$529,000. It is difficult to try to estimate where all the water is coming from. Considerable time and effort has already been made to try and locate the leaks in the system but there remains a wide range of gallons per day of I/I that can be removed for the \$529,000. Additional investigations into the sewer system will be made during high ground water levels during this fall and spring to ensure that we are going after the best sources of I/I for the Districts money.

Slide 10 (Collection System SCADA Study - What is the SCADA System and why do we need it? SCADA stands for supervisory control and data acquisition. A system designed to do two things, (1) to continuously monitor flows in each sub area throughout the system and (2) to improve reliability of pump station communications monitoring and alarming to reduce the potential for backups and overflows. Most important of all, all alternative solutions are centered into the quantity of flow placing a high priority on achieving a high level of I/I removal. Improved monitoring capability at pump stations will provide staff with information to monitor conditions of equipment liability, loss of power and potential sanitary overflows. The SCADA Study concluded that flow monitoring and pump station control is crucial for I/I issue. It was also concluded that centralized data collection at pump station communications were important for collection system monitoring and I/I management. It was concluded by the WLSD Board, Consultants, Planning and Finance committees that the \$454,000 cost for the SCADA System is a necessary investment for management that will reassure DEEP that the WLSD can manage the Districts flows within mandated limits.

Slide 11 Connecticut Clean Water Fund – The Clean Water Fund is a State Environmental Infrastructure assistance program. DEEP provides financial assistance to Municipalities for the planning, design and construction of wastewater collection and treatment projects through the Clean Water Fund Program. Communities are eligible for up to \$2.5 million dollars for fiscal year for the set-aside programs. There is \$13,000 set aside I/I related projects and \$9,000,000 for pump station projects each year for the next two years. The money is currently available in both reserve funds and the District has been notified by DEEP the District's loan application will be pre-approved DEEP for these expenditures once DEEP has received the District's updated

application forms early next week. Once construction starts, monies are available and can be accessed on a monthly basis which eliminates interim financing through outside lenders. At the end of construction, the disbursed funds are converted into a twenty year loan at 2%. The annual debt service cost of the loan would be \$60,000 including principal and interest.

Slide 12 (Impact on Taxpayers) – Ken Green noted that the Board, Planning Committee and all those involved are mindful that this is a major expenditure of taxpayer funds and a twenty (20) Year loan is a long term commitment. These project are major capital improvements to the system therefore merit a long term financial solution. Financing this expenditure by assessment of taxpayers is not a viable solution and there will be significant additional capital expenditures over the next few years as the District provides a long term solution to the Districts wastewater treatment and disposal needs. This funding provides advantageous terms to the District in results of annual debt service cost of \$60,000 which is approximately 7% of current annual taxpayer revenue. An additional 7% of charge to taxpayers will result in an additional \$64.00 per annum sewer bill for median taxpayer and \$210.00 per annum sewer bill for top decile taxpayer on the Districts taxpayer rolls.

Slide 13 Comments by & Questions for Consultants- Ken Green noted that Woodward & Curran has been the Consulting Firm throughout the project and Engineering Consultants Paul Dombrowski and Jay Sheehan have been involved with the project since its beginning and have worked closely with both the Planning Committee and the Board. Paul has attended all prior District taxpayer meeting. The meeting was turned over to Paul Dombrowski for comments and questions. In his opening comments, Paul Dombrowski stated that in his twenty-five years of doing what he does, he has not seen a Board or a working committee that has been more engaged and committed in trying to come up with a solution that will protect the interest of the District and when they were talking with Board or Committee members to be sure to thank them for their tremendous efforts and time that they put into the project. Paul Dombrowski stated that they have appreciated working with them, noting they have asked a lot of tough questions of the Engineers, holding them to high work standards. In expressing their thanks, the taxpayers gave a round of applause to the Board and Committee members.

Paul Dombrowski noted the two long term solutions presented by Ken Green. Neither of which will be easy or inexpensive. The projects laid out for the near term are projects that need to be done in either scenario, upgrading the treatment plant and disposal fields or piping to Torrington and the goal is trying to minimize the amount of water the District needs to treat and dispose of. It is something the DEEP is looking for the District to do and should be done if the District wants to maintain a viable treatment plant and disposal field system and piping to Torrington as well. If it were to be piped to Torrington, they would be looking to the District to properly manage and minimize the flows. These are projects that need to be addressed and are

being recommended by the Consultants of Woodward & Curran and vetted by the Planning Committee and the Board.

Questions from Taxpayers – (Richard Hickey 359 East Hyerdale Drive) Torrington and Litchfield are permitted to dump treated effluent into the River and the District is not. Since any treated effluent the District could pipe to Torrington would be dumped into the river, should the District be thinking about spending the \$983,000 to sue the DEEP. If it was pumped to Torrington, it would be dumped into the river, why can't the District get a permit to dump into a river? Secondly there is a District bonding expenditure of \$900,000 and there will be additional cost incurred, so what is the availability of funds for bonding the additional costs? Answer – Torrington and Litchfield have discharge permits to go right to a river, the District did try aggressively to go that route with the DEEP but to no avail. To go in that direction would mean creating a new surface water discharge and it is a requirement level going above DEEP to Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA') and EPA is not allowing new surface or ground water discharge into a stream of that AA Classification. Past history shows that there is no likely hood of success in trying to go that route. EPA has been challenged on this before, it has been brought to the EPA appeals Board in Washington and the rate of success in those challenges is zero. Question on Financing – it is difficult to say with any certainty what funding will be available for subsequent projects. Looking at the current situation, DEEP has multiple avenues to get money through their programs. There are other potential funding sources but as far as the DEEP program goes, the DEEP has a priority list for many of the projects which are inherently skewed toward the bigger communities making it difficult for small communities to get money through that avenue. The DEEP does however, have set aside programs for specific categories in which a certain amount or money is put into specific programs to help the entities that are in different political size and classification, to have an opportunity to access that money. In the near future, there will be funding available through what is called the Small Communities Set-Aside program. The program is a 25% Grant with 75% remainder being at a 2% loan and in all probability, if still available, the District would be pursuing that avenue in the future.

Question (Len Fasano, 468 E. Hyerdale Drive – Are the homes on the outside of the WLS D development along Beach St, Milton & Ives Road using the system? Question two, is what the Woodridge Lake users are putting down the drain contributing to the problem. Answer- The District service area is clearly outlined and is formally defined as a requirement of anything that is seen by the DEEP.

Question (Mary Louise April 74 Ives Road) - The information provided relative to the number of current connections shows 677 lots connected with a potential for 200 additional connections for a total of 866 possible connections. At the time of formation of the District it was estimated that there were approximately 700+ connections available connections to the sewer. Question,

where do the 200 additional connections come into the picture and is the original 700+ connections a correct number. Answer – There are currently 677 connections within the boundaries of the District, the 200 additional connections include some situations where lots, which are by current zoning regulations, can be subdivided and would allow for more than one connection. The current area of the District has not changed. It has never been expanded. The 877 connections is the ultimate potential, it could be less than that since some lots could be difficult to develop. There is nothing in the outlying area outside of the current boundaries of the District that can be hooked into the system. Jim Mersfelder explained in detail the extensive work done and the sources used by the Planning Committee and Engineers to form a data base which clarifies the current number of 677 connected lots and the potential for 200 additional connections. The Town Assessor's Office, Town Zoning Officer and the Sewer District connection permits issued for the last 30 years were viable sources for that information. Noted was the 8 acre parcel of land on the West side of Beach Street which is within the boundaries of the WLPOA subdivision, but not part of the subdivision. Said parcel through special zoning is eligible for high density housing which gives it the capability of having approximately 30 connections. Also noted were lots within the WLPOA subdivision known as membership lots. Those lots are in wetlands and for possible other reasons, are not considered buildable. After an extensive review of those lots the determination was made to remove those lots from the list of available lots. Any lots in question as to their being buildable were given a 50% buildable rating.

Question, (Michael Pitt WLPOA Lot 82) - The 8 acre parcel of land, is it purchasable? Answer, the land is currently held under a trust and the Town at one time had looked at the land as a possible site for a housing project but the Town is currently looking at another site within the Town. If the District were to purchase the land, the potential for an additional thirty connections could go away, but at this time, it is not a viable option.

Answer to Mr. Fasano's second question relative to other sources of excess water coming into the system from WLS D property owner's homes. Paul Dombrowski noted that what goes into the system is made of three components; (1) the sanitary wastewater; (2) any other activity on the property or within the house such as sump pumps or storm drains; and (3) things that happen to the lateral connections between the house connection and the main sewer line. Inspections have been done on approximately one-third of the WLS D properties looking for those sources and inspection showed not many of those problems to be found. Of the problems found, most had to do with the laterals cleanouts outside the house or leaking covers on pump chambers which are required for houses around the lake that are below gravity flow level. There are a series of eight pump stations around the lake that convey the wastewater to the treatment plant site on Brush Hill Road where it is treated and disinfected before it is discharged into the ground. There are three parts to the operation, a collection system, treatment system and disposal system. Under any scenario there is always wastewater

collection that must be treated and disposed of in a method approved by the DEEP. Items such as grease, rags or other foreign objects can be problematic and add to the cost, but do not have an impact on the capacity. Through the treatment process approximately 95 to 98% of the pollutants are removed prior to the discharge into the fields. The treatment plant and disposal site have been operating under a DEEP Consent order for the past 23 years and based on the limited amount the State will allow the District to discharge, the District is trying right to determine what is the less costly alternative to able to solve the overall problem. The need to minimize the amount of water the system has to deal with would be applicable to either scenario, upgrade to the plant and disposal fields or piping to Torrington.

Question (Bill Gaff 24 East Hyerdale) - What does SCADA stand for and who are they? Answer – SCADA is not a person, it is an acronym for “Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition”. It is a Communication and control system that in this case will monitor what is going on in the pump stations and serves a number of different functions. Mainly it will help to measure the I/I coming into the system on a long term basis. Currently, the District has a very limited ability to know what is going on. The system will allow for regular communication and monitoring of all pump stations which during a storm event will show where the excess water is coming in.

Question, (Richard Cohen 161 West Hyerdale) – First, Mr. Cohen thanked everybody involved for all their hard work on the project. His question, are the taxpayers being asked to fund a study or evaluation or to fund action? Secondly what are the parameters for success rate on the removal of 9,000 to 28,000 I/I gpd? Answer, the funding approval being sought is for the re-appropriation amount to complete he study that the District is already part way through. The more substantial amounts are as noted early in the slide presentation are to do design and construction of improvements to the system to line the pipes, fix the manholes and put in the monitoring and control system for the purpose of being able to know what is coming in, where it is coming in, how pump stations are working and if there is any spending problems. On the success rate, Paul Dombrowski noted that it is difficult to estimate, based on the fact that flow monitoring is done over certain periods of time and the weather and ground water level have a major bearing on the flow rates. Based on the difficulty to exactly predict the I/I number, the 9,000 was used as the low end with the 28,000 used as the high end. It was noted that past experience in working on other projects has shown the high and low end vary.

Question (Paul Brennan 177 West Hyerdale) – Mr. Brennan underlined the comments relative to thanking all the volunteers who have waded in to the project noting that he appreciated the time and intelligence that has been applied to the project. Two questions: (1) Mr. Cohen made reference to a comment he heard on NPR relative to the State owned wastewater treatment facilities that were overrun during the hurricane last year and the potential for them to be overrun during the predicted hurricane “Sandy” and questioned if the State owned systems are not adequate, why are the complaining about the WLS D? Question (2), when there can be back

yard water problems at Tyler Lake homes during summer parties, what is wrong with the State application to all of this? Answer – Paul Dombrowski noted that to his knowledge very few wastewater treatment facilities in the State are actually owned and operated by the State. They are mainly owned by municipalities, metropolitan districts or other small sewer districts. Treatment Facilities such as Hartford and Bridgeport have more of a potential to be over-run during major storms that the WLSO could have and the DEEP is aggressively pushing them to address those issues and toward that end, give them 50% grant money because they have systems combined systems where the system takes both wastewater and storm water before it reaches the treatment plant. State application of rules can vary with each scenario. It was noted that all up and down the east coast, the wastewater is discharged into salt water and not into drinking water areas.

Question (Dennis Roth 36 Dresden Ct) Question, How long does the District go down the path to upgrade the system? How long will it be before the District will have to spend money to resolve the solution of upgrading the plant and beds or piping to Torrington? Is everything the District will spend now, worthwhile under those two scenarios? Also, the District will be spending approximately \$1,000,000. Will it be by public bid or how will the work be awarded? Answers – First question, when? It is expected that the presentation to the DEEP of all testing results will be early in 2013. When the process is started, it is expected there will be some protracted time of negotiations. It is our own disposal field, it will be with just DEEP. If it includes Torrington, there will be three parties involved. In the past, Torrington has stated that they do not want to take Woodridge Lake wastewater. However, DEEP can tell them they have to take it. At this time, the estimated cost to pipe to Torrington ranges anywhere from five million to twenty million dollars. Question two-The answer is yes, under either scenario, either to minimize the I/I into the fields or minimizing the amount being pumped to Torrington, the cost of pumping, the cost of them accepting it and any potential ramifications the additional effluent will have on the Torrington system that would necessitate upgrade to the Torrington System. All are benefited by reducing the amount of water coming into the system. It is the responsibility of the District to have and maintain a good solid control system necessary to minimize the amount of I/I. Question 3, Funding? – The engineering firm of Woodward & Curran is currently doing the engineering portion; any cost for the construction process will go out for bid.

Question (Arlene Stuart WLPOA Lot 113) Why is the DEEP giving the District such a rough time if the effluent being discharged into the fields is 95% clean? Answer – The strict criteria is based on the fact that both the Bantam River and the ground water in this area are considered AA classification for surface water and GAA for ground water. It is the intention of DEEP to keep it available for future drinkable potable water supply and continues to place a high standard for discharge based on those classifications. If there were no Treatment Plant Facility here at this time, no plant would be allowed. Based on the fact that this is an existing facility, it is expected

that the District could be required to do better than the 95%. Noted were the systems being used around the country to recharge ground water for drinking water use. DEEP has guidelines for a new system on an undeveloped site, but no guidelines or criteria that addresses an existing facility and an existing site like ours.

Question (Dan Jeremko WLPOA Lot 655 – What methods are being used to plug the leaks and what has been the success rate based on the current I/I numbers and what has been the success rate over the past ten years in plugging the leaks? Answer – Jim Mersfelder noted that in the past, the District did spend money on I/I work and flow testing. Unfortunately follow up work was never done to the line the pipes where leaks were found. The need now is not to just know where the leaks are, but to do something about them. Question (2) – Why doesn't the District repair the known leaks now before doing any further investigative work and investing more money in trying to find other leaks if the District is not successfully repairing the known leaks. Answer - It is the intention to find where the major leaks are and be able to identify the leaks where the most amount of I/I could be coming into the system and repair those leaks first. There are sixteen miles of pipe and only a small portion of them has been inspected. The schedule for spring 2013 is to flow isolate the remaining pipe line, do TV inspection and pick the highest I/I probability to fix. Paul Dombrowski noted that based on the size of the system and the length of the pipes, the 55,000 gpd flow is relatively low so although the amount of I/I the District has is not extremely high for the amount of pipe the District has. it is very high compared to the actual wastewater the District generates on average.

Question (George Szyelowski 15 East Hyerdale) – What are the ramifications if the proposed resolutions do not pass today? Ken Green addressed the question stating as noted in the slide presentation that the District is operating under a Consent Order issued by the DEEP. Under the Consent Order the District is permitted to discharge 100,000 gpd and the current discharge is 105,000 gpd. The District is not currently in compliance with the Consent Order and it is necessary to plan for additional connections to the system. Two years ago, the DEEP wrote a letter to the District in which the DEEP threatened to refer the District to the office of the Attorney General for penalties if the District did not take the problem seriously. The penalties are \$25,000 per day if the District does not comply and if the District willfully violates the Court order, there are criminal penalties. Ken Green stated the District does not have any other options but to find the leaks as best we can, as smart as we can and plug them. The Board and Planning Committee tried as best they could to hold the engineers to the 9,000 to 28,000 gpd I/I range, knowing that the 28,000 gpd being the better goal to get under the 100,000 gpd and provide for potential future connections to the system.

Question –(George Szyelowski 15 East Hyerdale) - Assuming that the resolution passes, can the District concentrate on the two miles that have been inspected and leaks identified and use it as a primary place to start. Answer, being considered is to execute the work on the estimated

two miles already inspected with the hope that it will provide the 28,000 gpd number. If that goal is reached further I/I work could be put on hold. It was stated that the DEEP will challenge the District on the 100,000 gpd the District believes the beds conservatively support. Small scale bed testing that was done back in the 1990's of which a report said the beds could only be capable of taking 39,000 gpd was sent to the DEEP. One challenge the District is facing, is to refute that previous study.

Paul Dembrowski noted that the engineering work will be designed during the winter with the actual work being done in the spring and summer of 2013. There are some parts of the system that require further I/I investigation work and work will be shifted to those areas if significant I/I is found.

Question (Diane Fasano 468 East Hyerdale) - Clarification was sought relative to Slide 12 as it relates to the \$60,000 being 7% of the current taxpayer revenue as it relates to the \$64.00 per annum for the median taxpayer vs Slide 11 where based on the \$983,000 Loan for 20 years at 2% the Annual Debt Service would be \$60,000. Question, is the \$60,000 in addition to the \$64.00. Answer: if passed this loan will add 7% to the taxpayers bill for the coming and year and every subsequent year to do the work.

Question – (Michael Pitt WLPOA Lot 82) Is adding more filter beds a viable option? Answer: That option was addressed and due to the fact there is no land large enough in the immediate area and to pipe it to land beyond the District's 100 acres would be cost prohibitive. Based on the results of the recent testing of the fields, Ken Green noted that based on the balanced approach taken the engineers, Board and Planning Committee believe and can support that the fields are capable of taking 126,000 gpd. The District will provide data and work to get the DEEP to agree to the metrics on the tests.

Paul Dombrowski stated that the engineers believe that the 125,000 gpd is a defensible flow capacity of the system. It gives the District what they have, plus some leeway to the 100,000 gpd permit. The DEEP's stance of a disposal field in this watershed is that they do not want to increase the 100,000 gpd permitted flow. It is believed that the DEEP may have regulatory precedent on the matter. Getting below the 100,000 gpd is an important criterion for the District.

Question: Ed Warren (59 Paxton Court) - One of the first WL property owners stated that he understood that a vote was to be taken at this meeting and called the question.

With the question being called for, there were no more questions taken from the floor. Ken Green as reported earlier in the meeting again noted that the Board and those working on the project needed support from first class legal counsel to help the District and after a legal

search, the Law Firm of Shipman & Goodwin, a leading law practice in Connecticut in environmental counseling and litigation was retained by the District to work with the District. Working with the District are Atty. John Wertman having the lead role in the District's discussions with DEEP and Atty. Bruce Chudwick leads the District on funding and financing matter and drafted the resolution presented at this meeting.

Bruce Chudwick was again introduced to the taxpayers who gave the following comments. First, Atty. Chudwick gave his congratulations to all the Planning Committee members and members of the Board noting that it was an amazingly dedicated Board that has done a great job. Atty. Chudwick noted legal counsel was present to help the District get through the legal process to make sure that everything is properly authorized in order to move forward, working with the Engineers of Woodward & Curran in submitting an application to DEEP to start taking down the Construction draw funding with an interim short term note funding obligation. The money is drawn on only as needed to get the projects done and the District does a long term financing to retire the short term note which will then become the 20 year payback loan at 2% which generates the estimated \$60,000 per year in debt service.

Noted by Atty. Chucwick were the two items put before a vote of the taxpayers at this meeting. The first is to re-appropriate \$176,000 from the Districts general fund to finish up the Facilities Plan. The second and the main vote is to appropriate additional funds to complete the I/I, pump station and SCADA work and to authorize bonding up to \$983,000 in order to do the work. Each item would be put up separately for a vote, with a motion and second on the motion and further discussion. It is up to the taxpayers and moderator how they would like to vote, the options being voice, show of hands or paper ballot.

The meeting was turned back to the Jim Mersfelder who asked the Clerk Joan Lang to read Item #1 on the call for the re-appropriation of \$ 176,000 which is attached to the minutes of this meeting. **A MOTION WAS MADE BY** Ed Warren seconded by Richard Reis to approve the following; To re-appropriate \$176,000 from the District's General Fund for the Facilities Plan Update and groundwater testing related to the District's wastewater treatment system. The appropriation, which was included in the fiscal year 2011-2012 Annual Budget, was not spent in that fiscal year, so it lapsed and was credited to the District's General Fund. Under discussion on the Motion Dan Jeremko stated that before a vote was taken to approve further spending that he believed the prudent thing to do was to fix the leaks that have already been identified to reduce the infiltration numbers and then consider possible alternatives to identify other leaks and at that point consider additional funding for the SCADA system. There was no further discussion on the motion. Jim Mersfelder noted that as moderator, he was comfortable with a hand vote and asked for a motion to approve a show of hand vote. **A MOTION WAS MADE BY** Al Shull, seconded by Fred Zuck that the vote be taken by a show of hands. No Discussion, **THE**

MOTION CARRIED with one no vote. The vote was called for the re-appropriation of the \$176,000. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Item #2 – Clerk Joan Lang was asked to read the summary of the resolution as it appeared on the call of the meeting. (Said summary of the resolution was read into the minutes and is on file with the minutes of this meeting) **A MOTION WAS MADE BY** Ed Warren seconded by Bob Goldfeld to approve said Resolution. Under discussion Legal Counsel Bruce Chudwick requested that the detailed Resolution that was provided to the taxpayers be incorporated into the motion and also into the minutes of this meeting. When going for funding, Bond Counsel will be looking for certified documents from the District. (Said detailed Resolution is attached and on file with the minutes of this meeting.) Under further discussion on the motion a taxpayer sought confirmation that Section 6 of the contracted and expected expenditures for the Project were included in the \$983,000 long-term funding. A response in the affirmative was given by Legal Counsel.

There was no further discussion on the motion. Moderator Jim Mersfelder called for a vote asking all in favor of the motion to raise their hand. **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

There was no further business to come before the meeting. Moderator Jim Mersfelder thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 10:40 A.M.

Respectively submitted,

WOODRIDGE LAKE SEWER DISTRICT

Joan M. Lang, Clerk