

City of Pomona
Special City Council Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 6, 2020
2:00 p.m., City Hall

Council in Attendance: Mayor Seneca, Councilmembers Kim Giffin, Dotson Bradbury, Richard Adler, Joe Zamora

Others in Attendance: Maiyee Lor, Craig Ronnebaum, Sam Johnson, Bruce Boettcher, Dean Wineinger

Meeting to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Items of Business

Sewer Project Update

Mayor Seneca offer the floor to BG Consultants. Sam Johnson introduce Bruce Boettcher and Craig Ronnebaum, all with BG Consultants. Mr. Boettcher is the design engineer on the project. He was here for the construction observation, and does all the checking on all pay applications for all the detail paperwork. He is also the one who post the CCTV review. A packet was handed out to governing body and city clerk. The big picture is there is some issue with the linear. Some defective work that was install. The purpose of the meeting it to get arms wrapped around the extent of it and how to move forward with the contractor.

Mr. Johnson found there is almost system wide issues with pinholes, blisters, and infiltration. He referenced to pages 1-2 in the packet. Mr. Johnson explained the main reason for it, is the contractor heated up the line too quickly and did not go through the proper installation practices, causing the blisters. Blisters and pinholes occurred by heating up the line too quickly, and there is water droplets that may be behind the linear. If heated up too quickly, and there is no place for the water to go, it can't get through.

Mr. Johnson explained the actually constructed material and product, they have a felt factory that they lay down and fold over and seam and push it down flat. They coat exterior with film and run with a long conveyor. They put vacuum hoses on linear, film, and suck in residue and it fill all the gaps. They run it on a conveyor belt and move location, creating a vacuum and just fills up pipe. The exterior film is there, so does not allow to go anywhere it wants. The exterior of the pipe shows in town, like the back of truck, is actually interior of pipe when it is a finished product. They will invert and fold it in. The residue actually migrates and pushes all the breaks where the clay pipe. The interior pipe is this film, it's primarily job is to make sure the residue don't peel. The blisters seen are necessarily a structure defect of the pipe, it's just that film pushed out. It is what cause that push out that concerns Mr. Johnson. That film can eventually go away, it is a separate layer and does not count for a structural component of pipe. What they are seeing is ground water coming through the pinholes. It's coming in, corrupting the pipe. The concerns: structural integrity, integrity of the lining, ground water coming up, ground water attaching deposits to the interior of the pipes basically creating deposits that are hard and cause issues with continuing maintenance. The main concerns, pinhole issues: does it affect the 50 year

life expectancy requirement? BG Consultants reviewed the details and summary and is in the position to qualify it as defected work. Mainly because of quality control sections in the specifications of the project. Mr. Johnson stated that a finished liner shall over the entire length of an insertion manholes or access points shall be free from visible defects such as foreign inclusion, clear of dry spots, pinholes, and delamination. Mr. Johnson asked council to review attachment of the packet, last three pages, starting on Section 14.3 [Defective Work]. He reads out sub-section A-D.

Mr. Johnson said the repair is not simple. It was not the original scope. The original scope was to trench and rehabilitation. Mr. Johnson gave council an example about dug up pipe. This is a systematic issue. It is not everywhere, but he think it is at least in 85% of the system. 1-2 spot along each segment. There is some issue to deal with in almost in all the system. That is not to say 85% of the system have issues and wanted to make sure that it is not 85% of the system that has problems. If there is defective work, engineer can call it out and made contractor aware there are issues. They had the first round of CCTV data and second round. After BG Consultants review the first round, they made them aware of issues.

The initial discussion was with Visu-Sewer to let them know there is blisters and pinholes. Their reasoning was the temperature allowed moisture during the process. They proposed to use a grouting product. In the data sheet, half way through, Visu-Sewer wrote a letter to BG Consultants: their recommended fix is to utilize a chemical. It will flow better than water and is specifically for this repair, listed on guarantee national website as a recommend process. Additional Visu-Sewer will offer two year warranty, above the one year warranty, BG Consultants televise for them to send several samples to see if there are structural issues.

After discussion, Craig and Mr. Johnson reached out to several industries, organizations, including the North Americas Sanitary Sewer Service Company and ask them about the issues. As industry professionals, what to suggest. These folks are contractors, consultants, material suppliers, equipment suppliers, and there was a range of recommendations and responses. BG Consultants included all those responses. For example, test all systems using particular product and get farther, represent that industry if go that route. BG Consultants wanted to make sure what the best moving forward long term is for the City.

Mr. Johnson shared that several options came up. Test the segments with electro scans technology. Another option is to install trenchless CIPP patches. Final options is chemical grouting, like the contractor proposed. Another option is to install a cured in placement pipe inside a cured in placement pipe and then the final option will be is basically saying we are not accepting this work or not paying for the work. This is not something BG Consultants see every day, otherwise, they will not use this product or technology. BG Consultants want the city to received third party experienced, non-bias recommendation on what to do.

Council and Mr. Johnson discussed possible third party option: engineer, contractor, or manufacture or someone who has longevity in the industry to give a non-bias opinion. BG Consultants recommends the contractor is ultimately responsible to identify and to come with a solution to fix it. BG Consultants, as representative, is to identify if it is defected.

Contractor's response is to clean the line, go above and beyond the additional requirement and do some television work. The full evaluation has not been turn in to the contractor yet. Trenchless technology is putting a pipe inside the existing system. Anything that does not required excavation is consider trenchless technology. Open trench technology is digging sewer line in. Trenchless technology would be rolling pipe on the inside or lining manholes.

Contractors has motivation for getting what needs to be done at the lowest price possible. The manufacture has a motivation to support their contractor who buys the material from them. The grouting manufacture will want to sell grout, so they agree this is a good idea as well. BG Consultants would like a third party, industry expert, and for the contractor pays for it. BG Consultants can evaluate a plan.

Mr. Boettcher shared the letters from Visu-Sewer and National pipelining does not feel to the full extent that it is reassuring and may lead into the legal ream. Mr. Boettcher wants more assurance from the manufacture who made the pipe. BG Consultants is seeing some defected pipe, and they do not normally seeing this amount or to this extend. BG Consultants is working on behalf of the city, and is saying this is above and beyond their expertise. Mr. Boettcher shared thoughts with council and wants to hear from product manufacture, they make it nationwide. There is typically one year performance bond after substantial completion. A policy to call on. They are going an additional two years. Mr. Boettcher recommend to bring city attorney into the discussion. This is significant dollars being talked about and need to make sure they are provided with good information to make a good decision.

Council suggest to go with another party, third party. Mayor Seneca is not happy at all. Mayor Seneca shared there has been issues in the past, the street project with the quality of the work. Mayor Seneca understand the insurance is held on performance bond, increase and guarantee extension. Mayor Seneca concern about the PRS, there will be some extremely unhappy people. Mayor Seneca want to know how to compromise the life of the system, expected 50 years. Mayor Seneca is concerned about the time compromise after all these issues, COVID-19 and winter. Mr. Boettcher asked Mayor Seneca to write them down for him. Mayor Seneca mentioned this is a lot of information to absorb and will make sure the absolute best decisions are made.

Council discuss the timeframe and completion of the project. BG Consultants have not accepted the work and have not sign substantial of completion. There still is 5% retaining of project. Council and BG Consultant's discussed the recommendation, of a third party to be paid by contractors. Council asked questions about the white tape. Mr. Johnson explained that the tape is seam tape and different than the film.

Mr. Boettcher said BG Consultants will be back multiple time. Council member Bradbury made a motion that the contractor, at his expense to hire a professional consultant who qualify, subject to the city's approval, to review the findings of BG Consultants Consultant's and provide a third party opinion related to the repair or replacement of the defected liner. Preliminary considerations should include, bulleted items 1-6 included: additional CCTV inspection required, evaluating the extent of "destructive testing" or digging up the installed liner for evaluation that is needed, installation of a new CIPP liner as a viable repair, installation of CIPP patches in

various locations as a viable repair, installation of Chemical Grout as a viable repair, complete replacement of the defective CIPP liner with new sewer main and any other bullet points that will be necessary.

Council member Adler asked if contractor will hire the third party. BG Consultants will evaluate their proposal. The contractor will be in control of their expenses and City can accept or reject the solution. There is a motion on the table. Seconded by Council member Adler. The vote carried 4/0.

Mr. Boettcher discuss the finances. Contractor to provide all cost. BG Consultants will come to the city and provide extension. Mr. Boettcher want the city to have decision with contractor and attorney upfront, so there are no surprises later. BG Consultants is there for City. There is nothing yet that needs to be done, this is to inform. BG Consultants will be back with another meeting to inform council.

Council confirmed with BG Consultants about scope and details. Mr. Johnson said the next move is to send a letter to contractor, contractor review the documents, and review the CCTV inspections. This work is defective and they need to come up with a plan, approved by a third party and in particular identify where to fix. If they identify the same exact location, then it is like designing the project all over again, which is the contractor's responsibility. BG Consultants will send the letter. There are conflicting information that is why BG Consultants is there. Council discussed that the ugliest term of event, they will be suing the contractor. BG Consultants have not done substantial completion, because they are not even done with the project yet. The performance bond process was discussed. Council and BG Consultants in discussion about engineering and contractual money.

Meeting Adjourn

Council member Bradbury moved to adjourn. This was seconded by Council member Adler and the vote carried 4/0. The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

ML



Mayor Marie Seneca