QUESTIONS & ANSWERS FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION 09-14-22
DRAFT

Health of Lake and Drinking Water: Given the density of homes in Brookfield near Candlewood Lake, the intent of this project was to evaluate alternatives for maintaining or improving this precious water resource for generations to come.

Scope: The scope of the current planning study includes the peninsula, Candlewood Lake Club, some high-density areas along Candlewood Lake Road, and Dean and Pocono Roads.

Schedule: The project is currently in an alternatives evaluation and planning phase, and is being conducted with 55% grant from the CT DEEP Clean Water Fund. The schedule to complete the current planning phase is projected for Spring 2023. At that point the results will be presented to the public and may then be brought to referendum vote if recommended by the WPCA.

Cost Estimate: The initial estimate was based on conceptual level costs and preliminary layouts with available information at that time. The current study is collecting additional data and reviewing additional alternatives with consideration to the recently collected data. The cost estimates will be updated at the conclusion of the current planning phase.

Restoration: The quantity of restoration (i.e., full road reconstruction versus trench patch) will have an impact on the project costs and will be determined as the planning phase concludes. Disruption to any private property during construction will be required to be restored to its pre-construction condition.

Construction Means and Methods: Gravity sewer pipe and low-pressure force mains would be installed below the frost line. Construction documents will define the appropriate pipe bedding based on soil types. Trench shoring and dewatering is incidental to the pipe installation costs and will be included in opinions of probable cost. The contract documents will require contractors to maintain access to private residences, mail service, and water/septic service during the duration of construction. Contractors will be required to protect the public including traffic control and safely covering trenches during non-work hours. There are several installation methods that can reduce the disturbance to the community.

Septic Reuse: STEP/STEG is one alternative being evaluated. There are several alternatives being considered for this project that would eliminate existing septic tanks including: gravity sanitary sewer with community pumping stations, individual grinder pumps, and a combination of gravity sewer/community pump stations and grinder pumps.

Wastewater Treatment and Discharge Capacity: The study is reviewing multiple alternatives for the treatment and disposal of wastewater including discharge to Danbury or New Milford sewer systems and treatment facilities, as well as potentially constructing a treatment plant within Brookfield.

Pumping Stations: The quantity and locations of the proposed community pumping stations are being evaluated. Pumping stations in residential areas can be designed with odor control systems and an aesthetically pleasing architecture.

Final Design/Construction: These phases would only commence upon receiving a favorable referendum vote to proceed with the project. The project would likely be divided into multiple design and construction projects phased over several years.

Grant Funding: The WPCA will investigate all grant opportunities and will work to obtain as much grant funding as possible for the proposed sanitary sewer projects. For instance, the studies to date have received 55% grant funding from the CT DEEP Clean Water Fund.

COST

- Where did you get the unit costs in the estimates contained in Appendix B, Tables B-1 to B-3?
  Experience on unit costs in similar locales by Lombardo Associates. CDM Smith will have their own current estimates.
- Do the unit costs reflect actual conditions to be expected?
  The unit costs will be revised by CDM Smith based upon soil borings to identify depth to rock and depth to groundwater for the various sewer options and consideration of recent bid prices. As is well known, construction costs have changed dramatically recently due to Covid, supply chain issues, inflation, etc.
- What does the 30% for "Admin, Legal and Engin. Services" cover? Does it cover the cost of detailed engineering services? Does it cover a construction manager and field engineers?
  Yes.
- There will be a lot of engineering for each home. Where is that covered in the estimate?
  That is included in the 30% for "Admin, Legal and Engineering Services" All of these costs will be updated due to the factors stated above.
- Does engineering estimate reflect the fact that each residence needs to have its septic tank evaluated?
  Yes, it does. But only if the septic tank effluent collection system (STEP/STEG) option is selected. Septic tank testing consists of a hydrostatic leak test.
- Is the cost of township engineering personnel and other township personnel (such as police required for traffic control) to be charged to the project or provided by Brookfield at no cost?
  Charged to project - as stated on Table B-3 of the April 2020 Task 3 Wastewater Management Plan
- You state the estimate accuracy is +/-20%. Does this mean you (Lombardo) guarantee that the project will not increase more than 20%? Does this mean that the homeowners can sue you if the project overruns?
  We understand that the question refers to the Task 3 Wastewater Management Plan posted on the WPCA's website - Table 2-5, page 23. Actual costs are reflective of materials and construction cost at the time of construction. The estimates are estimates at the time of their preparation - which was before Covid and recent inflation. At that level of engineering planning, cost estimates are considered 20+/-% - as an industry standard - as these are planning estimates. The only entity that guarantees cost are the contractors based upon final design plans and specifications and economic conditions at the time of bidding.
- You state that the estimate is in 2020 dollars. Doesn't that mean the estimate is biased low because it both ignores the massive escalation in construction costs experienced since 2020, and it does not contain projected escalation to reflect actual schedule with completion in 2027 or beyond?
  We understand that the question refers to the Task 3 Wastewater Management Plan posted on the WPCA's website. The April 2020 Executive Summary

Newsletter that is contained in the Task 3 Wastewater Management Plan dated April 13, 2020 estimated 2025 cost assuming a 3% inflation rate / year - see pg 5. Final engineering cost estimates will be based on the final design. That work is underway.

- Based upon costs for the Peach Lake, NY, sewer project (30M$ for 480 homes, 170,000 GPD treatment plant, mechanical completion in 2013) and the Barnstable, MA, sewer project (1.4 B$, about 12,000 homes with wastewater treatment, currently underway), couldn't the expected growth in this estimate easily be at least 3 to 4 times the initial conceptual estimate for the Peninsula (which is currently 17.5M$ for collection, plus 5.5M$ for treatment if required)?
  The factors that favor a lower Peninsula per property cost than the cited examples are the high density of properties on the Peninsula and the planning efforts to reduce road restoration costs. Repaving roads will increase project costs significantly. These design variables are under active evaluation by the project engineering team and are subject to negotiation with the communities if more complete road beautification is desired.
- Isn't it likely that there will be some amount of blasting and dewatering? Is this in the estimate?
  The planning efforts focussed on keeping the sewer shallow to minimize blasting and dewatering. Soil borings during planning, and confirmed with recent more comprehensive drilling, confirm that blasting and dewatering should be minimal - for shallow sewers.
- What is the frost depth in Connecticut? **4 feet is used for design purposes**. With the installation of proper bedding material, what is the required depth of trenching? **Depends on technology selection and design.** Is there any allowance for trench shoring in the estimate? **Planning estimates assumed shallow sewer so shoring is expected to be minimal.**
- This project will require a significant amount of paving, which is an oil based material. Have you accounted for the significant increase in the price of petroleum materials?
  Previous estimates were prior to recent petroleum price increases. Current estimates being developed will reflect current economic conditions.
- What happens with driveways, does the estimate cover their complete restoration or just patching?
  Estimates have not been developed to that level of detail. The answer will need to be site-specific reflecting the degree of disruption.
- What happens with lawns, vegetation and hardscaping, does the estimate cover their complete restoration?
  Estimates include restoration to pre-existing conditions.
- Is the added cost of performing work on steep slopes and in shallow bedrock reflected in the estimate?
  Yes. Next estimates will be with the benefit of significantly more detailed geotechnical information recently collected and documented.
- Is the difficulty of accessing the septic tanks for many of these homes reflected in the estimate?

In general, yes. The details of which will be part of design decisions currently underway. This only applies to the septic tank effluent option (STEP/STEG). Septic tank relocation is an option only if deemed desirable.

- Does engineering estimate reflect the fact that there will be tie-ins to different types of septic systems?
  The only tie-ins are either before the septic tank (traditional sewers) or after the septic tank (STEP/STEG option), not to the drainfield. There are very limited different septic tanks, none of which should be problematic.
- How do we prevent sewage backflow from street lines backing up into septic tanks and into homes? Is the backflow hardware and installation included in the estimate?
  A backup is very unlikely to occur for many technical reasons. Emergency power at pump stations will be provided.
- Have you considered the current labor availability problems in the estimate? **Estimates were made in 2020. Current estimates being developed will include this consideration - as reflected in recent bid prices.**
- Is the project based on the payment of Davis-Bacon prevailing wages? **Yes, but only if required by state/federal funding grant/loan programs.**
- Is the payment of prevailing wages required for the project? **Most likely yes, if funded through State grant/loan program**
- Over what period will the sewer installation capital charges be charged to individual homeowners? **Not yet determined. State loan program is usually a 20-year payout. Statute authorizes up to 30 years.**
- Is there any upper cap on what a homeowner can be charged?--**No assessment shall be made against any property in excess of the special benefit to accrue to such property.**
- Do the Undeveloped Properties get charged a fee based upon their GLV? Will they later pay a connection fee for tying into the sewer system?--**Yes. If undeveloped property improved during assessment payback period, it is given a supplemental benefit assessment. If improved after the assessment payback period it is assessed a capital cost recovery connection charge.**
- What are the alternatives for charging homeowners besides based on property value?--**The WPCA has always assessed properties based on grand list value. The WPCA has invited community representatives to develop and suggest an alternative to the typical WPCA methodology that still complies with the statutory requirements .**
- Have you considered what tax revenue streams can be directed to this project (sales tax, rental property taxes, boating fees, etc.)? Note that Barnstable did some of this. **No. Such types of funding is not currently authorized and would require legislation at the State level.**
- Who pays for septic tank upgrades, the project or individual homeowners? **TBD**
- Who pays for restoration of house lawns and driveways to original condition? **Contract documents will require restoration of disturbed areas to WPCA standards. .**
- Shouldn't a homeowner's charge be based upon number of bedrooms rather than % of GLV?--**The statute defines the criteria upon which an assessment may be based.**

The WPCA has invited community representatives to develop and suggest an alternative to the typical WPCA methodology that still complies with the statutory requirements .

- Alternatively, shouldn't a homeowner's charge be based upon their water use (say the last three years) as a more accurate assessment of their impact?-**The statute defines the criteria upon which an assessment may be based. Water use is not specifically listed as a criterion. The WPCA has invited community representatives to develop and suggest an alternative to the typical WPCA methodology that still complies with the statutory requirements .**
- Isn't using % of GLV deliberately designed to unfairly charge owners of lakefront property, many of whom are not eligible to vote?--**The statute defines the criteria upon which an assessment may be based. The WPCA has invited community representatives to develop and suggest an alternative to the typical WPCA methodology that still complies with the statutory requirements. Current methodology has been in use since the 1970s. There is no intention to penalize anyone.**
- Given that a number of residents are on fixed incomes, how many foreclosures do you anticipate if the connection bills are in the range of 50K$ or more? **Unknown at this time. The assessment will be the net cost of the project (after grants) divided by the total grand list value (GLV) which is $460,000,000 for the properties under study. The glv is 70% of the market value.**
- Where is the cost "fairness" formula to allocate how homeowners will be charged? Assessed value of homes has no relation to the cost to hook up sewers to each home, and sewers are a utility used similarly by all, not a luxury item. **The statute defines the criteria upon which an assessment may be based. The WPCA has invited community representatives to develop and suggest an alternative to the typical WPCA methodology that still complies with the statutory requirements .**
- Why are only the peninsula communities paying for this? **Generally, only benefitted properties may be assessed to recover project costs.**
- When will an updated and realistic project cost assessment be provided? The 2020 estimate is unrealistic after recent inflation and supply chain issues. How will this be distributed/divided to homeowners? Please be specific. **It is anticipated that the ongoing study will be complete sometime early 2023.**
- What is the cost estimate for "hookup" to the sewer line? Who will pay this cost? What assistance will be provided to impacted residents? **It is anticipated that the hookup cost will be included in the benefit assessment. But decisions will not be finalized until the current study is complete. The cost to property owners will be after grants are applied. There are elder deferment rules in place that mimic the Town tax deferment rules.**
- What are anticipated monthly/annual service fees to be charged to residents connected to the sewer line? **Current sewer usage fees are $500 per year per residence. Half is billed twice a year in June and December.**
- Why isn't the entire town paying for this project, yet they can vote on the

project? Please explain this rationale. Shouldn't the impacted homeowners be the only ones to have a voice? Alternatively, if the entire town can vote, shouldn't this financial burden be placed on all taxpayers in Brookfield?--**Town Charter requires any project over $1 million to go to a town referendum. WPCA has no authority to require taxpayer funding, although the Town acting through the Boards of Selectmen and Finance can offer to finance all or part of the project.** .

- The town overpromised and can't deliver sewers to all of the apartments being built...why is this the Peninsula's responsibility to now foot the bill. **The current allocation of sewer outlet capacity was established in approximately 1974, long before zoning changes that authorized construction of multifamily housing along the Federal Road corridor. More recent state mandates imposed on Danbury for phosphorus removal have potentially reduced Brookfield's authorized outlet capacity.**
  What are your previous project cost overruns?
  The BWPCA has never had sewer installation projects overrun beyond the approved funding levels. Project progress and costs are carefully monitored
- Even if they want a sewer plant now is not the time to build it. The supply chain and the economic state of America etc is more than doubling the cost. Is there a way to put this plan on hold for 3 years and revisit it when the costs of supplies should be less expensive? Don't you think it would get done cheaper? **If the project moves forward, the earliest construction could commence is likely 2 to 3 years from now.**
- What is the estimated annual cost for each property owner?--**Unknown at this time. All sewer users participate in capacity costs.**
- If the Shores is required to have Sewers installed by the demand of the WPCA, would the WPCA assume the cost to repave all the Candlewood Shores Roads to the highest standards rather than putting it on the backs of the residents over and above the cost to hook up to Sewers?--**Contract documents will require restoration of disturbed areas to WPCA standards. . The extent of road restoration is under active evaluation by the project engineering team and is subject to negotiation with the communities if more complete road reconstruction is desired.**
  Those details will be spelled out in the construction bid documents if and when the project moves forward.
- If we are demanded by the WPCA to hook up to Sewers in the future, why can't you charge us equally by number of homes rather than by the assessment of our homes? It is very unfair to the lakefront owners since they are assessed 4 to 5 times higher than a non-lake front owner. Your billing rates after hooked up are all the same rate for every house, therefore hook-up fees should be equally enforced as your equal billing rates.--**Currently the WPCA regulations calculate assessment based on grand list value. The WPCA is considering all options at this time.**
- If you are along the route do you have to hook-up immediately? **It will be to your advantage to hook up while the construction is in progress.**
- If you don't hook-up are you still charged because you are on the route? **Yes, that is the law.**

- What is the approximate assessment to each household for attachment to the sewer line. We have heard preliminary costs of anywhere from $50,000 to $150,000 per household.--**Unknown at this time. The assessment will be the net cost of the project (after grants) divided by the total Grand List Value (GLV) which is $460,000,000 for the properties under study. The glv is 70% of the market value.**
- Over what time period will any assessments need to be paid–**Benefit assessments shall be due and payable at such time as fixed by the authority. The authority may provide for the payment of benefit assessments in not more than 30 substantially equal annual installments, together with interest, all as provided for in section 7-253 of the CT General Statutes.**
- Since taxes abatements have been given to developers for 7 years, why not wait until that tax income comes in to fund this project versus burdening residents that can't afford it?--**This project is not being funded by Brookfield tax dollars.**
- When this project was done in Bethel, many residents' properties were foreclosed. At a time when Brookfield and community takes have increased from 22-50%, how do you think that the majority of residents can afford this? Have you taken into account the denigration of property values in our town?-- **The WPCA has no record of foreclosures in Bethel that are associated with sewer construction. Generally speaking, the availability of sewers has been considered an enhancement rather than a detraction to property values.**
- With the Huckleberry Elementary School so over budget, how can the town help fund this project?--**The town is not being asked to help fund the project.**
- Why do we need a sewer at such a great expense to the Residence of Candlewood Shores, when repairing the existing septic systems would be a fraction of the cost? **The project costs will be compared to costs associated with replacing existing septic systems, as well as the pros and cons of each alternative.**
- With cost overrides of roughly 3-4 times the initial proposal, how will this negatively impact this community? **If the net costs will result in an assessment over 10% of the GLV, this will give reason for pause. The engineers are aware of this limitation.**
- There are currently residents that are delinquent on their HOA Fee's and Water Bill, if this sewer system goes into place, this will greatly impact their property. What percentage do you anticipate facing foreclosure? **The WPCA anticipates that property owners will satisfy their payment obligations. The WPCA is very slow to foreclose. There have been two completed WPCA foreclosures since 1992, one in approximately 1994 and one in approximately 2020.**
- Who is the benefactor of the proposed sewer systems? **The property owners. There is no more septic system to maintain or replace ever.**
- How will the sewer system be paid for if implemented? **There is typically a construction loan, sometimes in the form of a Bond Anticipation Note. This will be up to the Town.**
- Historically how have water/sewer projects been paid for in Brookfield-for example the Laurel Hill Community, Candlewood Lake Road homes near Candlewood Lake Elementary School and/or RT 25 condominiums? Is the proposed funding plan for the WPCA sewer project similar in respect to the taxpayers/homeowners? **The WPCA has**

utilized a uniform method for financing sewer construction since the inception of the sewer system. While some construction has been financed in part by state or federal grants or loans, the local share has been funded through property assessments and or connection fees paid by the affected property owners. Where a public sewer has been extended by a private developer, the cost of that extension has been paid for by the developer on top of the required assessment and/or connection fee associated with the underlying infrastructure.

CAPACITY/TREATMENT PLANT

- How can this project proceed if there is no capacity in Brookfield and Danbury will not assign additional capacity to Brookfield? **This question is part of the current study as a part of the on-going Clean Water Fund grant. The question needs to be resolved.**
- Is it correct that Brookfield has imposed a sewer moratorium?--**The WPCA has adopted regulations to more effectively manage existing capacity by restricting the maximum amount of sewer capacity that may be utilized for any single new development. .**
- What is the status of negotiations with Danbury about accepting wastewater? What is the likelihood that you will find a sewer system that will accept the flow?--**Negotiations are ongoing at this time**.
- If the project is built with excess capacity, who pays for that? **Capacity charges are paid for by all Brookfield sewer users.**
- What is the possibility of a package wastewater treatment plant that just serves the Peninsula that is located on the Peninsula and discharges to the Lake? **It is an option.**
- We understand that the BWPCA has received 8 bids for a wastewater treatment plant. What was the capacity of the treatment system in the specifications, and what were the bids? **This is part of the study and not yet completed.**
- What is the exact location of the Sewage treatment plant?--**At this time a plant is not part of the project and no site(s) are selected.**
- Has the WPCA or the Town of Brookfield purchased the land for the future sewage treatment plant, and if so, how much was the purchase price and will this purchase increase taxes for every resident of Brookfield? **No**
- How much is the total budget for the construction cost for the Brookfield sewage treatment plant and will the total cost require a tax increase to every tax payer in Brookfield?--**It is unknown at this time whether or not Brookfield will build a sewage treatment plant.**
- Has the sewage treatment plant been approved to be built or is it dependent upon the approval of Sewers for the Candlewood Lake Study or is it dependent on a Town wide vote?--**Nothing has been approved at this time. A Brookfield treatment plant is one of a few options being considered at this time to address the capacity issues.**
- Is the Candlewood Lake Sewer project the justification for the new Sewage Plant, that is, Brookfield needs a new Sewage Plant in order to accommodate sewers for the Candlewood Peninsula?--**The necessity for a plant may be needed to accomodate**

any future development for Brookfield, not specifically for the Candlewood Peninsula.

- Why is WPCA continuing to do the Candlewood Sewer Study when there is nowhere to put the liquid Sewage until the Plant is approved and built?--**The study began prior to the capacity issues and we anticipate the capacity issues to be resolved prior to any decisions being made about this study.**
- Has the WPCA of Brookfield purchased the land for the future sewage treatment plant, and if so, how much was the purchase price and will this purchase increase taxes for every resident of Brookfield?--**No land has been purchased for a sewer treatment plant.**
- How much is the total budget for the building of the sewage treatment plant and will the total cost effect every taxpayer and increase taxes for every Brookfield resident? **Historically, sewer infrastructure and capacity costs are paid for by sewer users. The Town has not sponsored sewer infrastructure even though it benefits from commercial and industrial tax revenue made possible by sewers.**
- Has the sewage treatment plant been approved to be built or is it dependent upon the approval of Sewers for the Candlewood Lake Study or dependent of a Town wide vote? Why are you continuing to do the Candlewood Sewer Study when there is nowhere to put the liquid Sewage until the Plant is approved and built? **The WPCA has a general obligation to address water pollution issues and to plan for their remediation when appropriate.**
- What would be the additional approximate assessment to each household to cover the cost of a wastewater treatment plant in Brookfield, since it appears that Danbury will not be able to handle any additional amounts from Brookfield–**Unknown at this time.**
- Will every household in Brookfield have waste that will be treated at the Brookfield plant, and if so, will every household in Brookfield therefore share in the burden of the cost of the waste treatment plant–**No, the cost would be applied to only those benefitted by sewer.**
- With Danbury not able to take the additional sewage, what is the specific plan for which town will take it? How can you even consider a project without full details and planning on the above?--**We are currently working to address the capacity issues.**

GRANT FUNDING

- What priority has the DEEP assigned to funding sewer improvements on the Lake? Can you please provide an update on the securing of funds to alleviate costs to homeowners? What is being pursued (type and amount) and what is the likelihood that these will be obtained? Even if grants/funding is obtained, should homeowners still expect that a large portion of the estimated cost will be their responsibility? What percentage of cost should we as homeowners expect? **Discussions are ongoing. CT DEEP has sponsored past and present studies. At a minimum a 20% CWF grant is expected. Brookfield will press for additional funds to safeguard the largest lake in CT and its downstream water bodies.**

- What are the alternatives for funding the project? **The WPCA anticipates paying for this project through a combination of benefit assessments, and state Clean Water grants. Funding is likely to be through an appropriation approved at Town Meeting with authority to apply for all grants or loans that may be available in aid to the project.**
- What is the potential for grant money? **Uncertain. A grant application will be made at an appropriate time.**
- If we can't get grant money for this first project, what makes you think that the other 4 towns are going to address their septic issues, or want to address the issue of Lake sediments? **The Brookfield WPCA is limited to operating in Brookfield. It is recognized that this is a multi-jurisdictional issue. That makes things complicated.**
- What is status of Federal and State grant money to pay for sewage plant and sewers? **See responses above.**
- I have recently been reading about the State and Federal funding to the tune of $580 Million, is this something that the Town of Brookfield is going to try to get funding from? Much of what I have been reading is that this will only be spread amongst those that will be required to hook up to the sewer. Which, as a public utility, does not seem fair. https://portal.ct.gov/Office-of-the-Governor/News/Press-Releases/2022/08-2022/Governor-Lamont-Announces-Investment-for-the-Protection-of-Connecticut-Waters–**The WPCA will investigate all grant opportunities.**
- Will there be grants from the state to offset at least some of the assessments to each household–**The WPCA will investigate all grant opportunities.**
- Why was this project rejected from State funding/why are we at the bottom of the list?
- I expect the intent of the sewer installation is to promote/enhance good water quality in Candlewood Lake. Has a grant search to find funding from private, state or federal sources been completed and requested when found? **The WPCA will investigate all grant opportunities. If anyone has expertise in this area the WPCA will be glad for the volunteer assistance.**
- Has the Brookfield WPCA secured any grants or monies to offset the cost for residents who are being forced to connect to city sewer? **The past study and the current study is being funded in part by a 55% CT DEEP Clean Water grant.**

MAINTAINING SEPTICS WITH SEWERS

- For the 70-80% of homes that the consultant has found are suitable for effective septic systems, has WPCA and Health Dept considered as a less costly and invasive option instituting inspections guidelines to eliminate risks from failing septic systems, and providing 20 year funding for those homeowners who have to replace septics? **There was a state-mandated "Walkover" program from the 1980's but Brookfield has not completed its obligation under this program. It was sponsored by general tax dollars and got cut by the Board of Selectmen and Board of Finance long ago. The septic surveys show a high percentage are not code-compliant and have a significant record of problems. But even a properly working septic system**

delivers nutrients to the ground and eventually into the drinking water and the lake.

- Shouldn't WPCA verify actual age and condition of septic systems before making sweeping assumptions about age and condition of septic systems to justify sewers? **Yes, this was done**.**This issue was addressed/documented in the April 2020 Task 1 Report, Figure 2-11, page 36 on the WPCA website**
- Since this is a hybrid system, will there be any risks of failure/pollution if homeowners do not pump their tanks on a routine basis? How will the town monitor this?
  The final proposed sewer system type is under evaluation with consideration of new data on soils, unit costs, etc.
- Will homeowners who have new or relatively new septic systems which meet all the newest health & state requirements be able to opt out of connecting to the new municipal system, understanding they would still be liable for cost?
  The law requires that the formula assessment be equally applied.
  Why does the Peninsula need to be on a sewer system - liquid only or liquid and solids? The lake isn't materially affected by the septic systems - it is the runoff from the storm drains and lawns that seem to be the issue. Can that be addressed instead?
  The April 2020 Task 2 Needs Analysis Report addresses these issues on pages 31-35
- Since part of the issue is the age of many septic tanks in the area, and the proposed solution would keep those septic systems, has the WPCA considered the impact of simply enforcing/incentivising that septic tanks over a certain age be replaced?--**The WPCA does not have authority over septic tank maintenance.**
- Has the WPCA compared the cost of connecting residents to the town sewer system in a way that removes the need for septic tanks? I might be more receptive to that idea than to having to also continue to maintain a septic system.--**These options are currently being reviewed.**
- How is it possible that you can't answer if residents will still have to maintain their septic for solid waste? **The detailed sewer design is not complete. No decision has been made at this time as to the type of system recommended for any unit.**
- Also, why is this not going to be liquids and solids? If I'm going to have to hook up and pay somewhere in the 30k range for my home, I certainly would not be happy about having only "half" a sewer and needing to keep the other "half" on my property and pay not only monthly sewer fees, a large sum to connect to the sewer, but also to need to have my septic continually pumped in the future. This seems very counter intuitive.--**The detailed sewer design is not complete. No decision has been made at this time as to the type of system recommended. All options are currently under review.**
- I own a property in the Candlewood peninsula with a new septic system. If municipal sewer is extended into the peninsula, how will this affect those of us who have recently installed septic systems? Will we be forced to connect to the municipal system immediately or will there be a time period granted for residents with new systems? Say 10 to 15 years. **A decision has not been made.**

- Will both liquids and solids be included in the new sewer system– **No decision has been made at this time as to the type of system recommended. All options are currently under review.**
- Why are you considering fluids only (not solids) for total septic system elimination both from a cost usage and the science/risk of keeping solids only in the system?
  This is only one option and may not be favored. All options are being reviewed street-by-street.
- Rumor has it that the sewer plan is intended to carry septic liquids from the property and leave solids behind, requiring the property septic use to continue and be maintained. Is this accurate? **No decision has been made at this time as to the type of system recommended. All options are currently under review.**

TIMELINE

- Has the projected project schedule in Figure 6-1 of the Final Report been updated?
  -When will we have a detailed plan that includes, permitting, restoration plan, and schedule?
  -What does it currently look like with respect to key milestones (e.g., start of detailed engineering, field construction, town approvals, state approvals, permitting, grant applications)?
  Expect that these milestones will be updated after the current study is completed, probably early 2023.
- What permits from what agencies, federal, state, local and county, are required for this project? **The engineers are paying attention to this.**
- What public meetings will be required for this project? **Generally speaking, all meetings of the WPCA and other Town boards and commissions are public meetings. The WPCA is proceeding in accordance with Clean Water funding requirements, which require at least one public hearing before acceptance of the final engineering report. If state or federal grant programs require additional public hearings, the WPCA will comply with the grant requirements for public hearings. The ultimate project must be referred to the Planning Commission under Section 8-24 as well as to the Board of Selectmen. Before proceeding with construction, the WPCA is required to conduct a public hearing, to give affected property owners the right to comment on the construction plan. A public hearing may be held by the Town prior to authorizing an appropriation to fund the project. A public hearing is required before the WPCA imposes benefit assessments.**
- In what part of the year will the field work be performed? **TBD, but normally the schedule is up to the contractor.**
- Will field work be confined to the April to October period? **No**
- Won't it be difficult to rent housing rentals during the construction period when the roads are torn up and the home septics are out of commission?--**The construction will be managed to avoid unnecessary road closure. Existing septic systems will continue to be in use until a home is connected to the sewer line.**

- What is the sequencing of construction? Will the mains be installed first, then each house hooked up? Or, will a section of main be installed along with installation of the associated laterals to home septics? **Generally, construction sequencing is left to the contractor, although the WPCA may require a specific construction sequencing in the contract documents. Construction sequencing will be detailed later, if appropriate.**
- Will trenches be completely covered each day to prevent access by children and animals? **Yes, that is normally part of the contract.**
- Please describe in detail the timing of the steps and actions (such as votes, etc) that need to occur for the decision to implement sewers to be finalized by WPCA and Brookfield? **The WPCA can not answer at this time. It is also unable to answer for other Town boards and commissions having jurisdiction.**
- When do you anticipate having the sewer system started and completed **To be determined as we progress with the planning state.**
- What is the 5 and 10 year strategic plan for water systems and septics for the town of Brookfield taking into account current usage, capacity and future usage (population growth)? What is the projected roll out plan by community?--**Brookfield does not have a water system so it is not required to have a strategic plan for one. The WPCA is a separate entity from the town. It provides services to properties which have passed approval from Brookfield's land use boards. Since we act in response to their requirements, we do not create strategic plans other than for maintaining our fiduciary responsibility.**
- Why is this meeting being held after Labor Day, and on a Wednesday night when most of the weekend and summer residence would not be available? **The WPCA generally meets on Wednesday.**
- Will there be open meetings on weekends when more residents are available? **The WPCA generally meets on Wednesday.**
- Will there be an open disclosure of all testing and the benefits to all parties–**We serve under the freedom of information act and make all of our records available to the public.**

HEALTH OF LAKE AND DRINKING WATER

- What is water quality of lake? What is the DEEP classification of the lake? **There are reports on the DEEP website. Candlewood Lake Authority has been monitoring the lake for decades.**
- What has been the water quality trend over time? Hasn't it improved in recent years? **See Section 4 of the April 2020 Task 1 Report, pages 57 - 70**.
- What are contributing factors to lake pollution other than septics (e.g., releases from sediments, contaminated stormwater runoff, contaminated inflows, boating, business discharges)? **Those are the factors.**
- What is the percentage of waste that enters the lake from the following?

Septic Systems, Storm drain runoff, fertilizer. **Beyond the scope of the WPCA. See the Task 2 Report**
Have you attempted to quantify these? **Yes, a water balance was done for the Peninsula. See the report on line at brookfieldwpca.org/projects/candlewood-sewer-project-impact-on-water-supply/**

- How many pounds of P are released from Lake sediments per year? **Beyond the scope of the WPCA**
- How many septic systems are around the Lake in the five bordering towns and the area bordering New York? **This will require some research. It may be known by the HVA. There a five towns having residences on the lake**
- How many total septic systems are in the watershed area? **This will require some research. It may be known by the HVA. There a five towns having residences on the lake**
- Have you performed a comprehensive inventory of all septic systems?--**The WPCA is not responsible for septic systems.**
- When was the last algae bloom? **December 2021 per CLA.**
- How is the Lake refilled after the annual drawdown? **Spring rains and pump up from the Housatonic River.**
- If, per Task 2 Report, Page 68, Table 4.6, the incremental P and N concentrations due to Brookfield contributions are 2.4 and 113 µg/L (ppb), respectively, how can we say there is a major problem requiring Brookfield to "go it alone?" **Brookfield has about 25% of homes on the lake. Many of them in Brookfield are in a low-lying area on the peninsula.**
- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 5: Isn't your statement that "[n]itrate nitrogen levels in the Arrowhead and Candlewood Shores (CS) water supplies are very close to violating the US EPA drinking water standard of 10 parts per million (ppm) for nitrate- nitrogen" deliberately written in an inflammatory manner, given the sampling results are 25%below the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) established by EPA?
  For reference, historical data indicates that there have been violations of nitrate-N drinking water standard at Candlewood Shores.
- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 57, §4.1: You make the statement that "[a]pproximately 3 times more water is released from the lake for power generation per year than is pumped to the lake from the Housatonic River (Marsicano et al. 1995)." Is this data from a 27 year old study still valid? Did you verify this data with the utility? Does anyone test the water pumped into the lake for contaminants including but not limited to P and N?
  Beyond the scope of the WPCA
- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 57, §4.2: You state the Candlewood Lake watershed is 40.5 miles2 and it is part of the 1,948 miles2 Housatonic River watershed . Have you determined if there are any Superfund sites or other commercial/industrial sites of concern in either watershed area that might adversely affect Candlewood Lake water quality?
  No
- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 59: The water balance data in Table 4-1 is not clearly presented. The water balance, based on this data, looks like the following: Inflows: Net

Rainfall on Lake of 3.68 BG/Y plus Net Watershed Rainfall- runoff/groundwater to Lake of 12.01 BG/Y equals a total inflow of 15.69 BG/Y. This compares to an "Average Annual Net Lake Discharge (without consideration of discharge of pumped Housatonic Riverwater) of 15.69 BG/Y. How does the figure for "Estimated average Housatonic River water discharged to Lake" at 5.23 BG/Y, relate to the water balance figures above?
-And can you provide a more complete water balance with the following data:
Inflows:
Water pumped from Housatonic River
Water from point source tributaries
Rainfall on lake
Surface water runoff to Lake
Wastewater discharges to Lake from point sources Wastewater discharges to Lake from septics Non-wastewater groundwater flow to Lake
Outflows:
Evapotranspiration
Water pumped for annual Lake drawdown Water pumped for power generation Other consumptive uses
Other outflows
A complete lake analysis is beyond the scope of the Brookfield WPCA. For a water balance at the Peninsula. See brookfieldwpca.org/projects/candlewood-sewer-project-impact-on-water-supply/

- Regarding Task 1, Page 61, §4.3, "[p]er AER (2018), despite the water quality improvements detected from 1985 through 2012, Candlewood Lake, Squantz Pond, and other water bodies in Connecticut have experienced increased frequency and intensity of blue-green algae (also called cyanobacteria) blooms in recent years." Isn't it true that the amount of blue-green algae actually decreased in 2022? Do you have any objective data for years 2013-2022?
  Task 1 report presents all the data collected by Candlewood Lake Authority at the time of publication.
- Regarding Task 1 Report Pages 62 & 63, Table 4-4 & 4-4a, microcystin concentrations in summer of 2018, ranged from .44 ppb to .937 ppb. According to Table 4-4a, the US EPA Recommended Recreational Water Quality Criteria limit for Microcystins is 8 µg/L (ppb), so the 2018 sampling results were well below the EPA criteria. Isn't it inflammatory for you to state on Page 61, §4.3 "[a]lso, it is important to note that cyanobacteria can produce cyanotoxins which – at high concentrations – pose significant, even lethal, human and pet health risks" when the Candlewood results are well below the EPA criteria? **This was the case at Lake Hopatcong in NJ until cyanotoxins took over. That caused this largest lake in NJ to shut down. See the communications provided online.**
- Doesn't an examination of key analytical data indicate that Lake quality improved from 1985 to 2018? Using data from Task Report 1, Page 63, Figure 4-4 2012 – 2018, combined with the mean data contained in the cited Marsicano paper (An Historical Account of Water Quality Changes in Candlewood Lake), the chlorophyll-a was 11.5 µg/L (ppb) in 1983 (versus about 3 in 2018, a positive trend, as it corresponds to algae

formation), the epilimnetic total P about 19 µg/L (ppb) in 1983, essentially unchanged to 2018, and the hypolimnetic P about 65 µg/L (ppb) in 1983 (versus about 34 in 2018, a major improvement). **This opinion is generally not shared by the CLA. But they would be the ones to ask.**

- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 67, §4.4, Table 4-6 and Task 1 Report, Page 67, §4.4, Table 5-1, there is a reduction in the number of households from 1500 in Table 4-6 to 1346 in Table 5-1. Where did the 1500 come from, and why was it reduced to 1346? **Task 1 effort allowed a more exact count. There are more properties than households.**
- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 69, Figure 4-7 Relationship Between Total Rainfall in 5 Days Prior to Sampling and Lake TN & TP, can't the data also be interpreted to mean that the TN and TP is related to fertilizer contaminated runoff? **That could be partially true. But lawns sprinklered with lake water do not need to have fertilizer applied as there a sufficient nutrients in the water to produce green healthy grass.**
- Regarding Task 1 Report, Page 67, §4.4, "[w]astewater flows strongly suggest an annual average of 2 people per household." Where did this data come from? There were no calculations or supporting references to support this number.
- From Task 2 Report, Page 5, "[w]astewater nitrate and PFOA/PFOS discharges to the Peninsula water supply have resulted in unhealthy nitrate and PFOA/PFOS concentrations." Doesn't the report misrepresents the nitrate data as it is currently within US EPA MCLs? **There were nitrate-N violations in 2017.** As for PFOA/PFOS, Lombardo did not sample the septic systems for PFOA/PFOS, **that is an incorrect statement. Septic PFOA/PFOS data is presented on Task 2 Report, Table 2-4, page 18** and therefore, isn't there no objective data linking the PFOA/PFOS in drinking water wells to the septics?

- From Task 2 Report, Page 7, §B, "three septic system sites were selected for study. These were full-time residents." How many residents at each home? How many bedrooms in each home? How old are the septic systems? What is the water use at each home? What is the condition of the septic system at each home?
  Properties were typical properties on Peninsula
- Are three septic systems a proper statistical representation of the 1500 parcels in the study area? Was there statistical bias in their selection? **All septic systems on the Peninsula were documented to generate the statistics in the Task 1 Report.**
- There was no groundwater sampling performed on undeveloped lots, an issue that was raised in the August 22, 2019 BWPCA meeting. The response by consultant Lombardo was "they are budget constrained and field samples are expensive" (see meeting notes). Is this also the reason that there are no upgradient wells to check background levels? How many other corners on sampling, analysis and other necessary tasks were cut? Is that why only three septics were chosen? **This approach was determined to be sufficient by the scientific team involved.**
- Where did you get the Septic Tank Effluent Nutrient concentrations listed in task 2 Report, Table 5-1? Those numbers look like you rounded up the highest readings from 76 SLSD, which were the highest of the three septics. Doesn't that bias the entire

analysis on the high side? **Considering the range of expected / measured septic P concentrations confirms the analysis that septic is a significant contributor of Lake P levels to achieve preferred good water quality level.**

- Why did you use the 90%/50% attenuation/removal percentages listed in the Task 2 Report, Table 5-1, when the calculated rates from 76 SLSD and 74 NLSD were higher?This also serves to bias the calculated data on the high side.
- In the Task 2 Report, Table 5-1, you calculate the incremental P & N concentrations (in µg/L) of the Brookfield contribution of 1,346 households as 2.2 and 102, respectively. However, if you are only going to sewer 704 homes on the Peninsula, isn't the net reductions in the incremental contribution due to this proposed project only going to be 704/1346, or 1.15 in µg/L for P and 53.3 µg/L for N?
- In the Task 2 Report, Page 20, Table 2-5, do the analytical results represent grab samples taken from the waters of Candlewood Lake? If so, the results are below the minimum detection limits for SRP (<0.01) and 0.99 for NO3-N. Why wasn't the significance of these levels explained in the text?
- If the contribution of P from the 704 Peninsula septics is only between 1 and 2.2 µg/L (ppb), and the epilimnetic total P was about 19 µg/L in 2018, and the hypolimnetic P was about 34 µg/L in 2018, how can you possibly take the position that this will have any identifiable positive impact on Lake quality? Note that even the comments in Task 2, Page 31, §5.1.1, use non-committal language on predicting the impact of the sewers, and all acknowledge that the release of P from the sediments is the majority of the problem.
- In the Final Report, Appendix A: ¶1, you state "[t]he water quality of the Lake is at the "tipping point" after which its usefulness will decrease significantly." Isn't this hyperbole? Do you really mean that this project will substantially move the water quality from the "tipping point?"
- If this solution is implemented, and no other corrective actions are taken (such as treatment of sediments), will there be any noticeable improvement in objective and subjective indicators of Lake quality, including but not limited to clarity, algae formation, and concentrations of TP and TN? If there will be, how long will it take?
- With the massive amount of ground disturbance, won't the sewer installation create significant sediment runoff to the Lake? **The disturbance will be temporary and minimally invasive, not massive. State-of-the art construction measures will be used to mitigate runoff.**
- What is the basis for the WPCA's statements since 2018, and continuing to this day, that the water quality at the Lake is being negatively affected? **This is the subject of all the studies and the reasons behind the grant awards.**
- Why didn't WPCA conduct a similar plan as recommended by EPA and DEEP for remediating Lakes? We refer the WPCA to the CT DEEP website, Bantam Lake Watershed Projects. **This is not without controversy. It does not appear that efforts at Bantum Lake are successful to date. It is likely that the root cause of the deterioration is "human activity" including development at the perimeter, as it is at Candlewood.**

- Did WPCA only focus on septic systems without evaluating other sources of P and N? **No. It is found that watering of lawn areas at the lakefront is done without P-containing fertilizers because the lake water has sufficient nutrients to produce trophy lawns.**
- Did WPCA consider the environmental impact of the massive digging needed for the sewers in the Peninsula roads, almost all of which are within few hundred feet of the Lake, and the potentially devastating erosion impact on the Lake? **Historically, the WPCA has not experienced unwarranted erosion impacts from sewer construction due to contractor compliance with required soil erosion control measures, including wetlands permit conditions when appropriate.**
- How does WPCA know that P and N in groundwater and in Lake come from septic systems, as opposed to coming from runoff, fertilizers, animal waste, erosion, Housatonic River, etc? **Since P is not coming from fertilizers, the primary source is septic systems. It is slow to move out of soils, but eventually is transported into the Lake. There is a significant amount of P locked up in the sentiment that is released during storm events. The best was to stop P buildup is to prevent it from getting to the Lake in the first place.**
- Is WPCA aware that PFAS is man made chemical found in nearly every body of water in the US, emanating from industrial dumping, not human waste? **Yes. This is a concern all over the US and worldwide.**
- Has the WPCA considered phosphate monitoring, filtering, and removal from the lake in addition to preventative measures? This would involve other stakeholders on the lake. **The WPCA is not aware that this is done anywhere in America.**
- From the information in the attachment, we are not polluting Candlewood Lake nor the Community groundwater, so once again Why Do We Need Sewers? **Community wells and the lake are significantly impacted by septic wastewater flow. See the Task 2 report especially Page 15**
- What were the deleterious results of the water/land testing along Candlewood Lake that led to the conclusion that sewers should be installed? **See the published reports. Also see the document and links at brookfieldwpca.org/pdf/ContaminationEvidenceFomSepticSystems.pdf**
- According to the studies published on your website, a main contributing factor to the pollution in Candlewood Lake is the use of fertilizers. Has there been any attempt to enforce a moratorium on the use of fertilizers for those in the Candlewood Lake Watershed area? **Yes. It is our understanding that it is not legal to use P fertilizers in the watershed.**
- This project is slated to affect approximately 1500 homes in Brookfield. The number of homes that are within the Candlewood Lake Watershed Area is in the 10's of thousands. What type of data does the Brookfield WPCA have to show these residents that completing this project will make any statistically significant changes in phosphorus levels in Candlewood Lake? **This stat is not correct. There are about 7,500 homes at the lake from all the surrounding towns. Brookfield has about 25% them.**

DEVELOPMENT

- We understand that Brookfield is out of capacity, and the WPCA needs the new Sewage Plant in order to allow continued commercial and residential development of Brookfield. The ones who will benefit are real estate developers, builders and commercial landowners, not existing residents, yet residents of Brookfield are being asked to pay for it. Shouldn't this be put to referendum of Brookfield voters? Or have real estate developers pay some share?--**Generally speaking, all property owners, including real estate developers, builders and commercial landowners, contribute to the cost of the municipal sewers, including the cost of outlet or treatment capacity. The WPCA offers no free ride. If vacant property is developed, then the owner of the property must pay (depending on timing) either a supplemental benefit assessment or a capital cost recovery connection fee. If this goes to referendum all eligible Brookfield residents will vote.**
- Has WPCA considered the impact on schools, roads and the Lake of overdevelopment of our community and surrounding area? **The Planning Commission and the Zoning Commission have authority over these issues**
- Sewers will allow many on the Peninsula to expand and overbuild, what policies will the town implement to prevent overbuilding if sewers are installed? **The Planning Commission and the Zoning Commission have authority over these issues**
- Where is the next affordable housing going, if we get sewers.
- Are the big developers kicking millions of dollars for the building of the Sewage Treatment Plant that are waiting upon the plant to be built so that they can develop their large housing projects? **No**

MISC

-What are the technical solutions available to address lake pollution other than the sewer system (e.g., advance onsite treatment at the septics, treatment of sediments in the lake)? Why were these not evaluated as alternatives?
-What about using iron and amendments in the Peninsula leach fields like you are recommending for non-Peninsula systems?
-What are the technical solutions available to address water supply (e.g., treatment at well head with activated carbon)?
-Per Task 2 Report, Page 4, §1, [t]he stated purpose "of the Wastewater Management Needs Report is to objectively define the wastewater improvement needs as accurately as possible based upon the cause of the Need – which enables the most precise, objective and transparent determination of the appropriate solution(s) and optimization of solution options cost-effectiveness." Furthermore, in the BWPCA minutes of August 22, 2019, "P. Lombardo said there are other solutions than conventional sewer and they are looking to find the right mixture of low- cost solutions." However, isn't it correct that the

Task 2 Report gives no consideration given to any alternative solutions besides sewers for the Peninsula homes?
-In Appendix A: ¶3 & 4, you address the insufficient space for code compliant septic system on 25% of the lots, and survey results indicating that 27% of septic owners reported maintenance problems. Before spending 23M$ on a sewer system, have we considered requiring homeowners to perform maintenance, and also look at the availability of innovative solutions (e.g., add-on biofilters) that can improve P and N treatment at the septic tank?
- Technically, what is the better system for the Peninsula? This was not discussed in the Task 3- Final Report. We would expect to see such a discussion of the pros and cons of each technical alternative as you would see in an RI/FS or an environmental impact assessment. The selected alternative seems to be based strictly on cost without regards to technical merits or long-term implications.
-§2.6 of the Task 3- Final Report states that the selected alternative minimizes operations and maintenance cost, but there was no O&M analysis in the Report- is one available that takes into account O&M of the collection system, the ongoing O&M on the septics, and the O&M on the wastewater treatment plant if one is required?
The previous studies by the WPCA and others point to the problem is the accumulation of human activity. Sewers discharge being a principal contributor for all of the above bullet items in this section, it is likely that sewers will be the lowest cost. The long-term solution.capital and O&M cost evaluations are part of the ongoing study.

- Who will be responsible for ongoing maintenance related to the septic systems?
- Can you give us an idea about the amount of disruption to the roadways and to individual houses?--**Not at this time.**
- Have you performed an environmental impact assessment as required by the state of Connecticut? **The WPCA is not aware of any requirement for an independent environmental impact assessment by the State of Connecticut**. **To the extent that one may be required, it would be conducted at the end of this current planning phase to address the impacts of the selected design.**
- How can you justify proceeding with this project without getting commitments from the other four towns, especially when your own pollutant impact calculations (see Task 2 Report, Table 5-1) states that the Brookfield study area only contributes 2.2 µg/L of incremental P to the Lake? **This issue was recognized by CT DEEP. The opinion was that Brookfield is the best place to start because 25% of the homes on the lake are low-lying. The lake covers multiple jurisdictions making the project complicated.**
- Where do we go to access all of the documentation relevant to this proposed project, including but not limited to letters, memos, reports, meeting notices and meeting minutes and past Candlewood Lake studies? Is there a single document depository or data file?--**All of the records are online at the WPCA website.**
- Has Brookfield considered a total ban on fertilizer use, or at least expanded restrictions? **No, fertilizers are not in common uses since watering with lake water provides sufficient nutrients for area lawns.**

- Per Final Report, Page 27, §5, the design basis for the Peninsula sewer system is 150,000 gallons per day (GPD) for 704 properties. Does this allow for expected summer weekend peaks? **Yes** Do you have any data about actual peak water usage? **Usage should be typical of residential connections. The septic survey found that most of the homes are used year-round.**
- What about eventual service to the currently undeveloped properties? **Yes**
- Can you confirm that the 4 Non-SFR properties on the Peninsula are not included in the proposed project scope (see Final Report, Page 16, Table 2-2)? Why are they not included? If included, would they pay on GLV or required capacity (the concern being that the restaurant design discharge flow is 6,000 GPD)?
- Have you evaluated constructability issues, such as sequencing of trenching, keeping roads open, assigning laydown areas, addressing homeowner access to individual homes, keeping trenches safe from children and pets? **Access and safety will be key requirements of contractors.**
- Why are you placing the burden of remediating the Lake on a small group of Brookfield homeowners when doing this area alone will not solve the problem?
- Has the Brookfield Town Attorney or other counsel opined that the WPCA's authority to file a water pollution plan for Brookfield gives the WPCA authority or jurisdiction regarding the water quality of Candlewood Lake? **Authority to construct wastewater treatment infrastructure is well covered by State Statute and applies to all 169 CT Towns. Brookfield is one of 8 jurisdictions that have responsibility for the Lake.**
- Has the WPCA filed a water pollution plan?--**Yes, it was adopted on August 22, 2012, and amended on August 27, 2014 and August 27, 2021.**
- Where are the results from the boring study?--**As planned they will be shared at the public meeting on Sept. 14 2022.**
- Where is the water line location map that was promised to Candlewood Shores?--**As planned it will be shared at the public meeting on sept 14 2022.**
- Where are the latest results from "entero-pathogenic E. Coli" that is done by the Town of Brookfield? **The studies have shown that the source of E. COLI is from human waste, not Canada Geese.**
- CSTD wants the specifications, images and exact location of where they would be installing the pump station; and would CSTD be relinquishing their right to the property it is situated on? And can you please provide an update on the proposed locations and type of pump stations that will be used? **The exact locations will be part of the on-going study and is the subject of discussion.**
- Who will be responsible for maintaining the pump station, replacing filters, etc?--**WPCA would be responsible for the maintenance of Municipal pump stations.**
- We understand no other lake communities are even considering sewers, why is Brookfield only Town that is considering this? **A WPCA is chartered to deal with pollution problems. Brookfield has taken the lead on this for Candlewood lake to avoid the type of calamity that happened in NJ and elsewhere.**
- Are you aware of failing septic systems? If so, would it be less expensive, less intrusive, less burdensome, and much more resource efficient to require repair of the failing systems? If so, can we devise a procedure to enforce repair compliance, and perhaps

make loans available as needed? Could we ask local PE's to help design the repairs at a very reasonable cost to help the situation?
-And has WPCA considered alternatives that are less costly to Brookfield residents, such as requiring homeowners to register their septic systems, requiring regular inspections and requiring pumpers to log dates/times of pumps within a portal? **The suggested program is already mandated. But repairing septic systems does not alleviate the problem. now that even a properly designed and functioning septic system still delivers Phosphorus and Nitrogen into the surrounding soil.**

- Who feels sewers are necessary? Why do they feel sewers are necessary?
  -How does the sewers benefit us?
  -It seems clear that the main benefit is not to the residents of Candlewood Shores, therefore who is this sewer benefiting?
  -How will this sewer hookup benefit Brookfield residents and homeowners within the peninsula communities? And are there reasons behind doing this project other than lake pollution? **Yes, Benefits include clean potable water supply, safer swimming, clearer lake, higher property values, a permanent solution to septic issues.**
- What negative attributes should all affected communities be aware of? (for instance, there will be a smell near any pump station)
  -And who does benefit from having a sewer plant, smelly pump stations in our yards and the possibility of power failures etc.?
  -And In the past 5 years we have had 2 major power failures lasting at least a week each time. Will the recommended sewer service work without power?
  There are some above ground structures but they can be designed with aesthetically pleasing architecture and with odor control systems. Pump stations are monitored so they do not overflow in the event of power outages. Portable or permanent generators are used to keep systems functional.
- The overall infrastructure of Candlewood Shores should all be incorporated into the package regarding the streets, sewers, water mains, etc. once they start ripping up the streets. We don't want to do the sewers now and the water mains later, shouldn't it all be incorporated into one package if the sewer plan goes through?--**The Candlewood Shores board is responsible for comprehensive planning for that tax district. It has been aware since 2017 that the sewer lines would best be installed to coincide with the water mains they must replace.**
- Has the WPCA considered the effect of lawn fertilizers and animal feces on the lake in comparison to septic systems? **Yes.**
- Are there any regulations/resolutions/incentives for this in the pipeline as well? Soil testing? **No, not to our knowledge.**
- Has the WPCA considered diverting liquid through more economical means (i.e. urine diverting toilets that turn urine into fertilizer, rain gardens,...)? **No. That would require approvals and perhaps more land and cost.**
- Has the WPCA considered how having a less intrusive, less expensive solution for Brookfield residents might influence other towns on the lake to take similar action, therefore having a greater impact? And for each of these considerations, what is the evidence that an expensive sewer system, providing no unique and immediate benefits

to the small fraction of residents paying for it, is the most economical and most impactful decision?
Sewers are a long term permanent solution accepted as the lowest cost alternative in the US and worldwide.

- Parts of the Candlewood Lake Club are in Brookfield, others are in New Milford, will the NM residents be included?-- **No. New Milford leaders would need to reach out to the Brookfield WPCA to discuss.**
- Please explain where the legal authority to record a lien on my home comes from. I read Chapter 103, Sec. 7-249 of the state code but would like you to tell me if that is the answer, but to please also expand on that since it only refers to "assessment of benefits" and it's not at all clear what that means.--**See Conn. Gen. Stat., Sections 7-250 ("it shall file a copy thereof in the office of the clerk of the municipality" and 7-253 .**
- WPCA is in charge of the testing and the sewer treatment plants. How is this not a conflict of interest? **Planning for sewer infrastructure and operating that infrastructure once constructed are functions specifically delegated to the WPCA by state statute and are not deemed a conflict of interest. A WPCA in CT is a non-profit entity in the town with finances separated. In Brookfield the WPCA is on its own. All commissioners are volunteers.**
- Has any other town surrounding Candlewood Lake made any recent attempts to convert homes in the Candlewood Lake Watershed area to city sewer? **Yes, Danbury did a project some years ago to connect low lying homes to the sewer system. They also connected a trailer park in Lake Kenosia with dramatic lake improvement results.**
- The reports published on the WPCA website say that Candlewood Lake is an economic asset to the city of Brookfield. If this is the case, why is the total amount of this project placed on the residents of these homes and not the entire town? **It is the owners of Peninsula properties that will have the greatest benefit. Historically, it is the sewer users that assume the infrastructure costs.**
- Has any environmental studies been completed for all of the locations where there are planned pump stations? **This is part of the current study.**
- What type of transparency is provided to the residents of Brookfield to make sure that those who are deciding on contracts do not have any financial, personal, or professional connections with those who receive contracts for this project? **WPCA members are required to comply with Brookfield's ethics ordinance. If Clean Water funding is obtained, the State ethics requirements are likely to be added to the contract documents and thereby imposed on the successful bidder. Engineer has been selected through a competitive selection process in accordance with Clean Water Fund requirements; and WPCA construction contracts of this nature are awarded through a competitive and public bidding process.**
- Who is responsible for the maintenance of the system? **The homeowner is typically responsible for the pipes on the property. The BWPCA will handle the maintenance for the entire system as part of the user fees.**