The Special Meeting of the Board of Sewer Commissioners was held on Thursday, March 22, 2012, in Conference Room "A" of the Parsons Complex, 70 West River Street. Chairman Carroll called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Carroll, Vice-Chairman Donald Anderson,
Commissioner Lee Cooke, Commissioner Edmund
Collier and Commissioner Brad Hubler (7:15pm)

OTHERS PRESENT: Consultant Raymond Macaluso, of Westcott and Mapes, Inc., Mark

Davis of Westcott and Mapes, Inc. and James Cooper.

Superintendent of Wastewater

EXCUSED: None

Chairman Carroll instructed the attendees that they should keep the discussion to a minimum with no name calling, no accusations, and no accusations against anyone's company. This is a limited agenda and only the items on the agenda will be discussed. The first item to be discussed is the East Broadway Interceptor Project. Chairman Carroll deferred to Mr. Macaluso of Westcott and Mapes.

East Broadway Interceptor Replacement Project

Mr. Macaluso stated at the last Commission meeting his company approved a change order submitted by Coastline Construction for the reimbursement of the rental fees that they were charged by DEEP to use state property to stockpile supplies for the project. They presented the change order to Coastline, they didn't sign it they had concerns. Mark Davis can go through it for everyone.

Mark Davis – Project Engineer for Westcott and Mapes stated that the Change order was presented to the Commission at the February 2012 meeting and was voted on and approved by the Commission. Mr. Davis stated that they coordinated them to have a laydown area at the end of Silver ST but due to neighbor complaints this area was no longer available to them. There is very limited space down in that area. They used the cul-de-sac at the end of East Broadway. State of CT DEEP let them use this area. They looked at an empty lot and the park area. They were able to use part of the park. We thought it was reasonable to reimburse them for the rental of the park that the state charged them. The remobilization and demobilization is something we never pay for. Under the contract the City is not liable to pay for any of this. Under General Conditions in the contract it states in 28-23 Section 00700 General Conditions of the Contract states "Contractor shall provide at contractor's expense any additional land for temporary construction facilities and storage of materials. The City is not liable for providing storage land."

<u>Commissioner Cooke</u> stated we are not liable to procure land for storage of materials. We thought it reasonable to reimburse for rental of property.

<u>Mark Davis</u> responded that we did the same thing with Mark IV when they were doing the job down there.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> thanked Mark Davis for his overview of the change order request. He recognized Robert Campanaro of Coastline Construction to address the Commission.

Robert Campanaro of Coastline Construction – stated that at the last meeting he was told that he couldn't speak. He didn't want to belabor East Broadway Interceptor field office. He stated that their letter to the City spoke for itself. At the Pre-bid meeting he stated contractors were told the City would provide a space. Coastline set up the spot on Silver Street. They scraped off the top soil, put in stone and fabric and silt fence. But the minute they had a machine delivered the neighbors started. Coastline never got to use Silver St and it was a waste. Through meetings Coastline was told that Silver St was on them but that certainly the move into and out of the park was something that Westcott and Mapes would reconsider they get reimbursed for. Mr. Campanaro stated that he remembers everything that was said even though it never made it into the minutes and he is at the Commission's mercy.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> then continued on to the next item on the Agenda.

He asked for a motion to take the Indian River Interceptor Replacement Project off the table. It was tabled at the last meeting held on March 8, 2012. Vice Chairman Anderson made a motion to take the Indian River Project off the table. Commissioner Cooke seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Indian River Interceptor Replacement

Chairman Carroll deferred to Mr. Macaluso to recap what was discussed at the previous meeting.

Mr. Macaluso reported that the Chairman and Commissioner Cooke were not at the last meeting so they set up a special meeting to have all parties attend to discuss the Indian River Project. Mr. Macaluso deferred to Mark Davis of Westcott and Mapes to explain the particulars of the project.

<u>Mark Davis</u> reported that they discussed the 30 inch sewer and 12 inch gravity sewer eastbound up New Haven Avenue to around Morris Lane which picks up the discharge from the pump station and carries it up New Haven Avenue. Right now it is an 8 inch sewer that

they are upgrading to a 12 inch sewer for capacity. The original drawings that were bid on shows a 12 inch sewer going up New Haven Avenue from Pond Point Avenue and cuts across the parking lot in the Gromart's Plaza which is the State right of way, continuing up the shoulder in New Haven Avenue up to the pump station. The issue is the proximity of utilities in the road, the gas line, utility poles and water line. Part of the problem is the water line in this area is on top of the sewer line. Since then Westcott and Mapes found out that this water line isn't a factor as it is over more so we made our red line changes which we can do in the field when situations arise. We eliminated the conflict with the water line. This is very close, there is not a lot of room next to the gas line. The trench was shifted to get them more room. Mark stated that he understood there would be some extra costs but he has to justify it and it has to make sense. The gas line and utility poles haven't moved since the project was bid. The only difference is the 12 inch gas main and the abandoned gas main. Mark continued that they have found the live gas main is there but the abandon gas main is on the other side farther away and not an issue. Other things Mark wanted to note on here is that they called to support and protect the gas main because it is so close. It was designed close. There is an item in the contract to support and protect the gas main. It was called on the plans to be supported and protected. Utility pole also support and protect. It may need to be relocated because it is very close. Mark continued that they put on the plans to support and protect the water line too. Coastline suggested looking at constructing the sewer in the eastbound lane on New Haven Avenue. Mark stated that they looked at that in the original design process, but after talking to the State of CT DOT District III they learned that this road used to be concrete pavement. The problem is that we would need to cut the pavement and remove it. The concrete goes to the center of the road where there is a joint. You can't just cut it and leave a narrow strip, the State won't let you do that. You get different material and differential settling. What will most likely be required is to take the concrete out from the centerline out toward the gas line. The concrete is probably not over the gas line. We estimate it to be 8 inches thick. We would have to replace it with asphalt -Class 4 road base, eight inches thick then pavement over that. We didn't want the City to have to deal with that expense with rebuilding half the road. In the shoulder we don't have to deal with the concrete or building half the road. Just support and protect the utilities not as expensive.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> asked Mr. Davis if they would have to move just one pole and would that be extra.

Commissioner Cooke inquired if that would be extra

Mark Davis stated "No that would not be an extra because it falls under support and protect utilities. We felt this was less expensive. We indicated there was rock in this area on the plans. In the shoulder the rock should be out already. Near the gas line it would be removed by mechanical means which is more expensive than regular rock removal".

<u>Commissioner Hubler</u> inquired which is higher or lower. The sewer is lower than the gas and water mains. What is the space differential?

Mark Davis replied "Do you mean vertically? Do you mean the space between gas and sewer? The gas line is about 4 feet below the grade. The sewer line is 9 feet deep to the top of the pipe so there is about 5 feet difference vertically between the two." Mark handed out a summary of the project time line to the Commissioners. He stated that on May 23, 2011 the project was put out to bid. In June 2011 there was a mandatory pre-bid meeting that gives the contractors the opportunity to ask questions and look at the plans. All of the contractors were prequalified contractors. The Regional Water Authority was there. The bid opening was the end of June 2011. The Notice of Award was given to Coastline in the middle of July 2011. The Notice to Proceed was given to Coastline on August 12, 2011 and the preconstruction meeting was held on August 17, 2011. Coastline was there as was Bob Post of AT&T. There were 2 representatives from AT&T, three from SCGC, UI was there as was the Regional Water Authority and this never came up it being shifted or put somewhere else. In the middle of October we met on site. They were just wrapping up East Broadway Interceptor project. Bob Campanaro pointed out how tight it was. We said we would take a look at it. Before Thanksgiving they put the manhole in near Gulf Pond Pump Station. On January 13, 2012 we had an onsite meeting with AT&T, UI, and Regional Water Authority. The Regional Water Authority had a question; the gas company wasn't sure where the abandoned gas main was. We had everyone verify where all their utilities really were. It was found that the water line was in a different location. We now knew what we could do and tried to get Coastline more room to do the sewer. In the middle of February they started working in the road they had just come out of the easement on Shadyside Lane. The beginning of March 2012 we had a meeting that was orchestrated by Coastline and had all the utilities there. The gas company, AT&T, Regional Water and the City Engineering Bureau all took a look and talked about it. This portion of the project is very difficult.

Commissioner Cooke stated that this is a lot of information to digest.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> thanked Mr. Davis for the overview of the project and asked if anyone from Coastline would like to address the Commission. Mr. Robert Campanaro of Coastline Construction Corp came forward to address the Commission.

Mr. Robert Campanaro of Coastline Construction stated he was sorry that they all had to be there that night and that he thought this should have been taken care of in the field. Mr. Campanaro gave the following presentation. He stated that they had that meeting on Tuesday, March 6th after several meetings with Mark Davis and asking for the pipeline to be shifted and at the end of the meeting Westcott and Mapes said they needed to talk amongst themselves and they would get back to me. That was on March 6th 2012. Mr. Campanaro stated he left for vacation on the morning of the March 8th, 2012. He continued on that apparently that evening Westcott and Mapes recommended to the Commission that they

strongly urged the Commission to vote that night to order Coastline to go with the original alignment plans and they told the Commission that Coastline wanted to shift the pipeline for contractor convenience because this change could cost the City around \$750,000, to 1 million dollars for contractor convenience. He stated that that was in the minutes of the March 8, 2012 meeting. When Mr. Campanaro found this out that night he jumped on the first plane and ended his vacation and came home. The first thing he did Monday morning was go to DOT and tell them he wanted to core drill in the road for test rock. They said okay you just need a contractor to bring in insurance and bond to take out a permit. That took one week to bring to fruition and yesterday Coastline got a permit from DOT and they drilled in the road (New Haven Ave) for rock. Mr. Campanaro continued on that as Mark Davis told the Commission, in their plans they show some rock at boring #6. Mr. Campanaro had plans for the project on an easel that he was showing the Commission as he spoke. He stated that the purple line shows borings that hit grade and some below. He stated they are going down deeper even in the same trench because they would have to remove bottom rock right below the high pressure gas main. Coastline has no faith in the borings that were done for this job. They have hit rock since the beginning - day one - in the easement from the pump station through the easement in Shadyside Lane below inverts, below inverts no refusal. They ripped out rock since the first shovel full. So the green line represents the test drilling that Coastline did at their own expense yesterday. They started at station 2+50 at the bottom of the hill where the pipeline goes through the parking lot in the state right of way and goes into the shoulder of the road. This green line represents test drills done every 50 ft all the way up the road and where Westcott and Mapes suspected there was rock he tightened up the pattern and drilled every 25 ft. He stated there were no refusals. They were 18-20 ft down and they said stop because the pipeline is only 10-14 feet down. He stated he peppered the entire street with boreholes and found not even a rock, so that is not an issue. He continued on that whether they are up against the curb or in the roadway it is not an issue. As for the concrete slab, the concrete slab is already gone where the abandoned gas trench is. You can see the abandoned gas trench. You have concrete slab from there to the centerline of the street and from the centerline to the other edge he suspects. The state had no problem with Coastline saw-cutting the concrete slab and it is already accounted for in the contract documents and detailed on the plans that were drawn by Westcott and Mapes. There are two details on the plans; one when you are in only asphalt and one when you are adjacent to the concrete slab. You saw-cut the slab instead of putting in 9 inches of asphalt you will have to put in 11 inches of asphalt where the concrete slab was and an additional two inches of asphalt. Mr. Campanaro said he spoke to the State DOT about half road vs. full road. The State told him they don't have a policy in place. The state just goes out and inspects the job when it is done. He continued on that his job under the City's specifications calls for coastline to overlay the road curb to curb and mill the state road curb to curb.

Commissioner Hubler asked Mr. Campanaro what mill the state road curb to curb was.

Mr. Campanaro responded that mill is to take some asphalt off the pavement with a milling machine and then by conveyor it is dumped into a dump truck. It roughens the road and takes out irregularities in the road and then you overlay the road on the milled surface with new asphalt curb to curb. In the contract there is enough money to overlay the entire roadway from Old Gate Lane up New Haven Avenue full width curb to curb. The road is 37 ft wide from Pond Point Avenue going to the right that is 4,000 square yards and going from Pond Point Avenue to the left to Old Gate Lane is 3,500 square yards which equals 7,600 square yards. If you wanted to overlay the area near Pop's Donuts 250 ft in the area where we aren't digging from Pond Point Ave up near Pops Donuts there is more than enough quantity in there; 9,650 yards built into our contract to make a long story short we come here tonight prepared to do this at no additional cost to the City he stated. That is why he flew home and spent nearly every waking hour preparing this for the Commission. Mr. Campanaro continued that he knew \$750,000 to One Million dollars was thrown out there last month to the Commissioners. He pointed to the original plan and stated that as Mark Davis said they encountered about 85 feet of water main conflict going up through the parking lot. Mr. Campanaro showed the Commissioners pictures of the parking lot. Because of that they revised the plans to try to save 85 feet of water main from being moved. Westcott and Mapes moved the first 250 feet of sewer line from its contract location and shifted it. They moved the manhole 20 ft back from where it was but the trouble is that at that location the manhole is stuck between the blue line on the plan which is the cast iron water main and the purple line on the plan which is an AT&T duct. The redesign put the sewer here and this circle represents the outside of the footing of the manhole and this AT&T duct has fiber optics and homeland security in it and so forth and it shows at 3.6 on the survey rod. AT&T is loaded with duct banks. He showed the distance between the utilities and the sewer line. Then he went back to the original sewer alignment and the original manhole location and said that if you come on a skew and move it 8 feet instead of on top of the manhole that is where the new alignment totally misses the water main and puts them on the roadside of the gas instead of on the gutter side of the gas. The orange lines are scaled drawings of where the center line is. The vellow lines on the road are shown and the green line represents where they would go with the sewer. Mr. Campanaro continued on to explain why he wants to move the sewer line. The original plan shows that in some places the lines for the gas, abandoned gas main, water main and AT&T become one. This plan is a 1 inch equals 40 feet scaled drawing so a little bit is a lot. He then showed the Commissioners pictures of the original alignment and some of the new alignment. The pictures were heading up to the tight pole and the existing sewer along the gas main. Westcott and Mapes in their red line drawing moved the sewer 2 ft to the south to try to get it away from the gas main so it was closer to the telephone poles. Mr. Campanaro stated that although he appreciates their efforts the white line represents the revised sewer line. The existing sewer line didn't move away very much by moving the manholes. telephone poles and sewer. The proposed sewer is 15 inches away from the edge of the

telephone pole. This was laid out by a surveyor. At station 3+25 it is only 2.2 feet from the gas main on the revised sewer. At station 3+25 again it is 3 ft from the gas, and at station 4+44 it is 2 feet 4 inches from the gas. At station 6+10 it is only 2 feet from the gas. This is 10 ft to 14.5 ft to invert on this roadway. This is a high pressure gas main all the way down. Mr. Campanaro addressed Commissioner Hubler and said that he asked previously about spacial spacing between the pipes. He pointed out 3 stations that he drew profiles of at station 3+25 it shows the sewer at 10.5 ft to invert and he drew the gas at 3 ft to the top and 4 ft to the bottom and the gas is 24 inches center to center with the sewer which gives Coastline 10 inches from the edge of the sewer pipe to the edge of the gas pipe not accounting for bells. All pipes have bells and spigots where they go together. He continued on that he would be bedding his shoring on the outside of our pay width area of 3 ft. He stated he has to give the engineer 3 inches of the pay width for their bedding for stone and fabric. It shows that his shoring and spreaders will be passing through the gas main. It would be very difficult. He said that if it were some other type of utility like drainage or some other king of conduit it would be one thing but this is dangerous. This is a high pressure steel gas main. He continued on that yes it was on the plans but until he did a Call Before You Dig and went out there and saw the markings he didn't realize how close it was. He stated he called Mark Davis immediately and told him they had to do something about this because he felt he literally couldn't dig. He handed out another cross section at station 6+10 and said it was in the photos. He handed out another one at station 6+10 showing that the water main, the gas main and the sewer main are all 18 inches apart where they would be down 9 feet to invert. He went on that that gives them 4 inches from the edge of the gas to the edge of the sewer pipe not counting for the bells on the pipes. He stated they would be under the gas. The gas main does not cooperate and go parallel with the sewer like in the picture. This is just a snapshot of the gas at station 6+10. The gas goes back and forth and meanders which makes it even worse. You can't have your shoring pass through the gas. He continued that someone can say the contractor is responsible to support the existing utilities, they do every day and they don't complain to the Commission. They are supporting a gas main right now on the job and they are supporting AT&T ducts too. They will be supporting a water main in a couple of days but when he sees a dangerous situation like this, it is a conflict; it is in their trench. He handed out another picture of the telephone pole with the sewer being 15 inches off the pole. The sewer pipe is 9.5 ft deep and they don't know the depth of the telephone pole but it is 8 inches off the sewer pipe. He continued it has been said to him to support the pole, use steel shoring. You can't drive sheeting underneath a pole that has wires on it, they are electric wires. You have to be 10 ft away. He continued how can Coastline stay 10 ft away and drive sheeting when he is only 8 inches off of it. He has spoken to Bob Post of AT&T and Westcott and Mapes has spoken to Bob Post and Bob said to him that even if they move the pole away Coastline would still have to support it. He continued that if the property line allowed him to move it a foot it wouldn't be enough so he told him don't bother. Why spend thousands of dollars to move the pole one foot when he is 8 inches away from it. The point he is trying to make is that this

is all private property and he can't move the pole onto private property. AT&T can't hold the pole for them because they would have to put their truck on private property and they can't do that either. So that is why Mr. Campanaro is bringing this to the Sewer Commission's attention. He continued that it is great to put a note on a plan "Contractor Protect" so the way he is protecting the utilities is he is proposing to go up the side. If Westcott and Mapes were to put the manhole back at station 19+92 and simply let him aim it at the manhole on the opposite side of the gas main at the lane side it totally eliminates the water main conflict and eliminates this placement where they are asking me to put it he stated. (He points to areas on the plan) He continued that in the original contract document the manhole fits fine with standard shoring. He pointed to an area on the map and said this AT&T duct and the water main on the backside are another insurmountable task. He then did a recap of what he said tonight. One - rock is not an issue even where they suspected it would be, there was no rock. The soil coming out of the drill holes looked dry and looked decent. That is a good thing. He drilled down 18 to 20 feet and still no rock. He continued on that it wouldn't make a difference if he was in the edge of the road or in the lane if the dirt was bad it would be bad everywhere. There is an item for this in the contract so it is not an issue. He continued that he looked at all the items that come into play. If he moved the sewer line over, if he moved the sewer line over away from the curb and the edge of the road that saves all the devastation of the aprons and curbs so he went up the road at pay width and did the calculations. If a trench is 3 feet wide with a one foot cutback that is where he went from the centerline of the proposed pipe. If it went over the pay width that is where he went and whenever it encountered a bituminous curb he put it on a table and whenever it encountered a concrete curb, a walk or a concrete apron he put it in. He didn't put in the entire apron just the pay width which he stated is not practical but he wanted a true number. He continued that by moving the sewer away from the telephone poles, and away from everyone's private property he would save on an item by item bases \$16,000.00. He stated that we would save on the item for removing and replacing a catch basin which wouldn't have to be done if we moved the sewer away from the side of the road. That is a contract item that goes into the tally. They wouldn't need it. The savings to the City is \$16,000. By moving the pipe the costs to the city are that they would have to saw cut asphalt pavement under pipe but they don't get paid for that. They would have to saw cut one side of the concrete slab which would cost at contract item cost from station 2+53 to station 12+51 which is the entire length of 1,000 Ft (998 ft to be exact) at \$5.00 a foot equals \$4,990 the city would have to pay Coastline to cut the concrete slab and remove the slab. They looked at the slab at pay width plus the cutback that is 4 ft which equals 443 square yards at \$30.00 per square yards equals \$13,000 to take the slab out. The State has no problem with them saw cutting the structural concrete slab and replacing it with like kind. They have nothing to say about them going to center line or beyond. He stated he couldn't begin to comment on that. The next thing is if they move the sewer from the edge of the road the laterals on that south side get longer. If he moves the sewer by that amount over 6 ft or 8 ft he has to make 10 laterals 8 ft longer on average. This is field verified. Ten laterals @ 8 ft each at \$150.00 a foot would cost \$12,000. to lengthen the laterals on the south side 8 feet.

The laterals coming from the north side aren't an issue because you intercept them where you intercept them and they just come into the pipe. The next item is paving the laterals. In the contract there are 2 different paying items. One is a 6 inch base and the other is a 3 inch surface course. He has accounted for that. The totals are \$4,800.00 and \$2,400.00 and he put in for item 7E which is temporary patch for the laterals. If he is lengthening the laterals 8 feet he has to temporarily patch them which amounts to \$5,600.00. He continued on that if he moved the sewer over you wouldn't want the existing manhole covers where they are so in the contract there is an item for filling inverts with concrete for this purpose and then ripping the top off the manhole. There is an item for this purpose and it amounts to \$625.00. The detail that he gave the Commission for when he is in the concrete slab shows that he has to put 2 extra inches of asphalt in where the concrete was. There is an item in the contract for that; it is item 17H. Item 17H for putting extra 2 inches of asphalt patch is called shim course which is a misnomer because you don't shim with class 4 asphalt. This amounts to \$6,980.00 for the extra 2 inches of asphalt. He continued that there is too much quantity in that item so when they get to the pump station on Old Gate Lane you will have used 300 square yards of that and applied it there. But if the City was to pay Coastline it would be \$6,980.00. Next item is the rock excavation by mechanical means and that would amount to zero. There is no rock. It cost Coastline almost \$10,000 to do the test borings yesterday. Coastline did these tests at their own expense to prove there was no rock. The total cost to the city to move the sewer line to the lane and out of the shoulder would be \$50,700. with a deduction of \$16,000. would equal \$34,700.00. in additional cost to the City to move the sewer from the mishmash in the gutter of the road away from the telephone pole which is 8 inches off of the sewer; away from the gas main and go up the lane. Mr. Campanaro stated that his brother Lou Campanaro Sr. who is the owner and president of Coastline Construction said he would agree to absorb those items and do it for zero. He went on to say that he didn't feel they could be more cooperative than that. We couldn't be more fair than that he went on to say. He continued that it blew his mind when he heard that the Commission was told \$750,000 to one million dollars to relocate the sewer line into the lane. He left his family in Florida like the Beverly Hillbillies and came back here and put this study together for the Commission and he didn't feel he could be more honest than that. He stated they could avoid the water main conflict by simply putting the manhole back at station 19+92; change the alignment at manhole 2+53 which involves a gradual crossing of the gas main to get out on the other side of the gas main. There is plenty of room to work around the gas comfortably and the centerline, they can work like gentlemen, saw cut the road and do a nice job for the City. He continued on that this should have been able to be done on the hood of a car instead of having a special meeting. "Coastline will absorb these items I laid out for you", he stated.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> thanked Mr. Campanaro and asked if the Commission members had any questions.

<u>Commissioner Hubler</u> stated that the man the Commission has on the job tells them it is going to cost the City more money and this gentleman tells them the city will break even and it won't cost the City more what are they to believe. He wanted to know if he was missing something.

Mr. Campanaro of Coastline Construction replied "How do I get to one million dollars when I am telling you I will do it for free?"

Commissioner Hubler asked for a rebuttal from Mr. Macaluso.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> replied that the Commission relies on Westcott and Mapes Inc. as their consulting engineer. It is not a rebuttal but it is only fair to allow Westcott and Mapes to speak. Chairman Carroll turned the floor over to Mr. Macaluso.

Mr. Macaluso of Westcott and Mapes Inc. stated that when they did the conceptual design Coastline said they had a different opinion than us but when we talked to the State of CT District III on Pond Lily they told us to reconstruct the whole road. Mr. Campanaro did not give you anything in writing from the DOT. He stated he was not saying it wasn't true but he would like to see it in writing from the DOT. The core drillings Coastline took could have gone right

through the rock and that is why you got samples that said there was no rock. What happens when you do hit rock? There is an item in the contract for removal of rock by mechanical means. Is it going to really be that price? Unforeseen Conditions which is an item for unsuitable material. We have no idea what DOT has underground. It could be unsuitable material, we don't know. Mr. Macaluso asked Mr. Davis if the figures that Mr. Campanaro presented tonight to the Commissioners ever came up before. Mr. Davis responded "no". Mr. Macaluso stated that they have not seen this before; that this was the first time they were hearing this. He continued on that Westcott and Mapes works for the City and look out for their best interest. We try to work with them and these numbers never came up. I need to discuss this with my Engineers Mark Davis and Joe Rescanski who came up with those numbers. Their bid is 3.1 million. We will recommend that if they stick to their bid price with no extras we can probably come to an agreement. We all want this project done. We could negotiate that. We are not discriminating against Coastline or any other contractor. If they are so sure it won't cost more this may be a way to negotiate this. We are looking at our contract, it is our bible. They bid on the project and had the plans. Mark explained the time line. It is a difficult job. We want to work with them. There is a line item and if they are in agreement to do the job for a lump sum price for the total amount we can talk about it and agree to it. I'm not sure of that.

<u>Commissioner Cooke</u> stated that the quickest and easiest way would be for Westcott and Mapes to sit down with Coastline and work these numbers and if everyone is happy and the numbers jive then everyone is happy.

Mr. Macaluso responded that he didn't want to have to come back before the Commission 4 months from now with a change order for X amount of dollars and have the Commission question where he was at this meeting. He continued that he respects Coastline and what they are talking about but he wants to see it go forward. They are a qualified contractor with the city. We will look at the numbers but I think he is simplifying it. The next meeting is in two weeks and we will look at it and get back to the Commission.

<u>Commissioner Cooke</u> inquired if this would leave the City liable if we allowed them to change the concept on this project. The City had it designed and it went out to bid and now we go back and change it for the betterment of the City. Are we more liable?

Mr. Macaluso responded they came up with the design and we will review their design to avoid liability, but who is going to pay our costs to review it. We signed off on the design and proposal. We are the consultants to the City and we hold the liability. We should have the right to review their design or we could design it ourselves that is another option. Coastline is saying they can do this they have all the borings but again they were drilling and they probably went right through the rock. They just cored it. Mr. Campanaro is right the boring contractor we used has been put on notice for saying there is no rock where there is rock. There may be a situation where we are going after them later. We want to look at it.

Mr. Davis stated that he came up with building half of the road as DOT requires and he is not convinced if they are leaving a few feet on the side that that won't have to come out too.

Mr. Macaluso stated that he wanted Coastline to get it in writing from the DOT that they won't have to rebuild the road and they can leave strips. His engineers are concerned that the DOT will tell them that they have to take it all out which would be a larger area than designed. The rock excavation has changed since we bid this project. We have found rock where they said there wasn't any. It was called hard pan soil. I have the jars full of dirt but it was rock. We have used these boring guys before. I am concerned that these soils have the same blow counts and that we will find rock there too. If you go down the road you could find more rock and it could be large quantities. Is the City going to be liable? This is causing big concerns to me.

Lou Campanaro Sr, Owner and President of Coastline Construction stated that he has been in business for 50 years and he takes exception. He stated that he paid a lot of money to drill these holes and that when you set a drill up in dirt it falls right through but when you hit rock that drill has to start drilling because it is there. He continued that he has blasted a long time. It took 2 to 2.5 hours to drill 25 holes. It fell right through. This is why he spent the money. He couldn't come before the Commission without the facts. There is no rock. He continued that he went through hoops to get this done. There is no rock where they are proposing to put the sewer main. It will be safe and you won't hurt anyone. If you put it

where Westcott and Mapes propose to someone will get killed. It is a safety hazard. He continued that his machines are big and it has to sit on the center of that trench. He asked how he was to excavate next to that gas main. He could rip it out. The telephone poles are there too with electrical and they can't support it.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> stated that he is not in disagreement with them but that they need to get with Westcott and Mapes and get documentation of everything that they proposed at this meeting with a letter from the DOT that they agree with what Coastline has proposed this evening for everything then Bob was sure the Commission could agree but they can't vote on something without Westcott and Mapes looking at it first. There is too much information that needs to be checked.

<u>Lou Campanaro Sr.</u> responded that he didn't come to this meeting hypothetically. His brother Bob is a one man band.

Mr. Macaluso asked Mr. Campanaro if he was guaranteeing that there is no rock out there.

<u>Lou Campanaro Sr.</u> responded "yes I am guaranteeing that there is no rock in that trench and if I hit rock I will eat it

Mr. Macaluso responded "okay".

Lou Campanaro Sr. stated "I am willing to go on record".

Mr. Macaluso responded "you are on record. The problem is we are getting conflicting information from utility companies and DOT so for the Commission to make a decision about this, we for all parties concerned, need to come to an agreement and bring it to the Commission in two weeks. It had to come to this because my professionals think one way and you think another. We work for this Commission and we have to review it. We cannot make the decision. I don't come up with arbitrary decisions to spend more money. There will not be any extras to do this job. If you agree we can work something out."

Mr. Robert Campanaro of Coastline responded that the problem is unsuitable soils. If he is digging in the shoulder of the road or in the lane of the road it would be the same unsuitable soil and there is a line item in the contract for that. If the dirt is bad here then it is the same over there.

Mr. Macaluso responded that it would be more quantity.

Mr. Campanaro responded "how so Ray?"

Mr. Macaluso responded that he needs to talk with the DOT.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> asked if anyone on the Commission had any more questions. None were asked. Chairman Carroll then stated that Mr. Macaluso and Coastline should meet with DOT and everyone else involved and come back to the Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Macaluso told them he needed letters from DOT and would come back to the Commission at the next meeting on April 5, 2012 and bring whatever it is.

Mr. Robert Campanaro stated that he just wanted to have an open dialog. Mr. Macaluso replied that he needed every "I" dotted and every "T" crossed. There will be a public hearing on the 5th of April at 7 pm and the regular meeting will be held at 7:30 pm on April 5, 2012.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> stated that he just wanted to explain to everyone why they couldn't discuss this at the last meeting. He explained that because he was not able to be there and neither was Commissioner Cooke it wouldn't be fair to have this decision fall on the other three Commissioners and it wouldn't be fair to himself and Commissioner Cooke either because they wouldn't be able to vote on it and it is a major decision. He asked that everyone come to some agreement that would be acceptable to everyone and handle this situation like gentlemen. The chairman then stated that they need to table this matter to the next meeting when they have some documentation. He asked for a motion to table.

Commissioner Hubler made a motion to table this matter until the next meeting on April 5, 2012. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Anderson. Being no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> then stated that they needed to go back to the first item on the agenda – The East Broadway Interceptor Replacement Project. The discussion was for the cost to the contractor for moving their equipment and storage area being changed. The engineers agree they should be compensated for the rental fees they were charged to put their equipment on the State property. He asked Mr. Macaluso if that was correct.

Mr. Macaluso responded that yes it was correct.

Chairman Carroll asked for the figures.

Mr. Macaluso stated that the disputed figure was \$7,573.96 as Westcott and Mapes had previously approved a change order for over \$6,000.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> inquired if the \$7,573.96 is what Westcott and Mapes reduced their request for the demobilization and mobilization costs.

Mr. Macaluso responded yes. If there is a compromise because of Silver ST and the DEEP and there are no other unknowns we can make an agreement and close out this project.

Commissioner Hubler inquired if he could ask for documentation on what we are not paying.

Mr. Macaluso reminded Mr. Hubler that he voted for it. He voted to not pay it.

Commissioner Hubler stated "no I didn't".

Mr. Macaluso stated that he would offer to split the difference and close out the project. The amount would be \$3,786.98 to Coastline.

Mr. Robert Campanaro replied that is fine. Let's put this to bed.

<u>Chairman Carroll</u> stated that on the recommendation of Mr. Macaluso the Commission would agree to split the difference of the original request and close out this project. He asked for a motion to that effect.

Commissioner Cooke made a motion to split the difference of the original request and the approved change order and pay Coastline that amount. Vice Chairman Anderson seconded the motion. Being no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Carroll asked for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Cooke made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 pm. Commissioner Hubler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 8:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Lynch

Recording Secretary Sewer Commission