

**CITY OF NORWALK
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
OF
THE COMMON COUNCIL
JULY 7, 2009**

ATTENDANCE: Laurel Lindstrom, Acting Chair; Andrew Conroy; Carvin Hilliard; Douglas Hempstead; Fred Bondi (7:50 p.m.)

STAFF: Hal Alvord, Director; Richard Linnartz, Principal Engineer

OTHERS: Larry Ruttenberg; Amanda Brown, Ana Duleep, Nicholas Kydes, Steven Serasis, Norwalk Common Council

Ms. Lindstrom, acting chair called the meeting to order at 7:38 p.m. Committee members and Council members were introduced.

Public Participation Portion

1. Public input.

Mr. Larry Ruttenberg, Buckingham Place was here to address item number two on the project update. He requested an update on the Buckingham Lockwood project.

Mr. David Park, Strawberry Hill Avenue spoke in favor of the East Avenue improvement project. He said that the improvements will improve pedestrian safety and keep traffic off of the residential side streets. Mr. Park said that speeding and traffic accidents on Strawberry Hill Avenue are in a league of their own and cannot be compared to East Avenue. He said that this area of East Avenue is used to get to a number of destinations, including I-95, the East Norwalk Railroad Station and the Churches. Mr. Park said that this project is for the good of the entire City of Norwalk and should not be held up due to a few vocal residents. He said that he will place his faith on those with the education.

Mr. Richard McGregor, Norwalk said that when he had to drive the 60 ft. Norwalk Showmobile it was very difficult to drive through residential neighborhoods. He feels that everyone wants to keep the small town character, but Norwalk is growing. There is a problem when the Boat Show is in town. He suggested that people come up with a compromise. For safety issues hopes that the project goes through. Mr. McGregor requested the installation of a traffic light at Fort Point Street and East Avenue. He added that as far as speeding, it happens everywhere.

Mr. Gordon Tully, adjunct member Eastern Norwalk Neighborhood Association said that it is important to distinguish the difference between widening the bridge and the road. It would be a disaster to delay the bridge project, because the project has State funding. He

said that he is 100% in favor of the bridge project. The remaining part of the widening project is conjectural. He said that traffic backs up because of the bottlenecks on exit 16. Mr. Tully said that widening the road will have very little impact on traffic. In addition, people will speed if there are four lanes of traffic. Mr. Tully said that the issue of having a five ft sidewalk is undesirable. The ENNA has had an extensive exchange of e-mails showing no connection between the two projects. The widening of East Avenue should be looked at as a separate project. Mr. Tully said that he did not recall any well publicized public hearings.

Mr. Winthrop Baum, President East Norwalk Business Association said that their members are in favor of the conversion of East Avenue to a four lane road, they feel it is vital to East Norwalk and Norwalk. He said that they discussed emergency preparedness. In the event of a hurricane, East Avenue is the main thoroughfare out of East Norwalk to higher ground. Mr. Baum said that trucks now take the route through Fort Point Street because there is a higher bridge there. Returning Fort Point to a normal two lane road would be appropriate. Mr. Baum said that north of exit 16, East Avenue is a four lane road. He said that the Business Association is in favor of the project.

Ms. Marija Bryant, Morgan Avenue said that there are a lot of misunderstandings. She said that everyone agrees that the bridge is a choke point and that part of the project is logical. They also agree that lower East Avenue is congested, but she said that she does not think making four lanes will solve the congestion. The choke point is at exit 16. Ms. Bryant said that there are a lot of residential streets and people want to be able to walk to Mike's Deli and Rite Aid.

Mr. Bondi joined the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Ms. Bryant said that widening the bridge will solve the evacuation problem.

Mr. Anthony Rossi, Raymond Terrace said that a traffic study done 15 years ago showed that for every foot removed from a lane, causes the driver to reduce their speed. He said that the bridge is a separate issue and is shocked that they want to ruin the integrity of the neighborhood.

Mr. David Brown, Gregory Blvd. said that everyone agrees that there is a lot of traffic, but widening East Avenue will invite semi tractor trailers into the area. There are no benefits to East Norwalk. Mr. Brown said that he would like to see Raymond Terrace and Myrtle Street opened up. If the artery is opened there will be the problem of people coming from other directions. Inviting more traffic and bigger trucks is the wrong way to go.

Mr. Rossi handed Ms. Lindstrom a petition in opposition.

Mr. Napoleon Van, East Avenue said that the bridge is nice and if they take away the stones, they will only have concrete. He said that the bridge should not be removed.

Mr. Todd Bryant, Morgan Avenue said would like to separate the projects. He said that as much as he loves the brownstone on the bridge, it needs to be widened. If traffic is going to be speeding up 5-10 miles per hour, it is going to be like a bowling alley. Mr. Bryant said that when he went to the State hearings about this project, the business owners spoke out against it. It appears that the project should be separated have studied to deal with the traffic, such as re-timing the traffic lights. Mr. Bryant said that the intersection of Fort Point Street and East Avenue needs to be addressed.

Mr. John Decy, Lorena Street, said that he and his wife use Metro North and attend local Churches. He said that there is far too much traffic now and is a/fraid that if the road is widened and there is more headroom, there will be more traffic. Mr. Decy said that he would have no problem widening the bridge and would appreciate separating the projects.

Ms. Diane Cece, Olmstead Place said that she is opposed to widening East Avenue and more so the process of the project. She asked the Committee to table this. She said that she supports the bridge project. If time is of the essence, she suggested separating the projects. Ms. Cece said that she reviewed the traffic analysis available at Public Works, but it laced information related to East Avenue. She said that they got on the track of adding capacity to address traffic. This is a problem where no one did an analysis of the cause of traffic. Ms. Cece said that h adding capacity will result in a speedway with more truck traffic. She recommended tabling this item for further analysis or to separate the projects.

Mr. Bruce Kimmel, Toilsome Avenue said that he travels in that direction each day and traffic is a serious issue in the mornings. It is extremely congested getting off of the train. In addition it is extremely dangerous when it snows. He said that the bottlenecks are there and the proposed plan could create worse bottlenecks. Strawberry Hill Avenue has a strange lane configuration that slows down traffic. Mr. Kimmel said that he would rather not spend money on this part of East Avenue, but would rather see it spent closer to I-95. He said that he wondered what the compelling reason is to spend money on this stretch of road and what it will cost and if they would be able to use the savings for another project.

Mr. Joe Robideaux, Dairy Farm Court said that the two lane highway before St. John Street should have signs where it turns into one lane.

Ms. Scalzi, East Norwalk said that projects have to be separated. She said that she did not think widening the road will help. She said that her daughter was hit by a speeding car. Widening the road will change their quality of life and the character of the

neighborhood. She said that they will be unable to walk. Ms. Scalzi suggested turning the one way streets into two way streets.

Mr. Vicol, East Norwalk said that the project should be separated and noted that he does not see bike lanes or green space.

Mr. Michael Pablison, Olmstead Place said that he is in favor of separating the two projects.

Mr. Rossi said that he went to a local hair salon and they are against the street widening. Mr. Kydes said that there are a lot of businesses that do support the street widening.

Mr. McGreggor said that a poll in today's Hour showed that 66% are in favor of this project and the rest are not in favor. He said that they need to think carefully; once this is done, they will have to live with it.

**** MR. BONDI MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

8. Authorize the Mayor, Richard A. Moccia, to sign the Resolution for Replacement of the Metro North Railroad Bridge over East Avenue and Reconstruction of East Avenue

/

(RESOLUTION FOLLOWS).

RESOLUTION

Replacement of Metro North Railroad Bridge over East Avenue and Reconstruction of East Avenue

WHEREAS, the City of Norwalk, CT has conducted a number of public informational meetings regarding the proposed project for the "Replacement of the Metro North Bridge over East Avenue and the Reconstruction of East Avenue" (ConnDOT Project Nos. 102-1375/102-297);

and

WHEREAS, the City of Norwalk, CT has made a number of changes in the conceptual approach to the reconstruction of East Avenue in response to resident comments:

and

WHEREAS, the City of Norwalk, CT has published a legal notice display ad, mailed a news release to multiple officials and agencies, and mailed a formal letter to abutting property owners, announcing the latest public informational meeting on the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the most recent public informational meeting was held on March 17, 2009 from 7:00 PM to 9:30 PM in City Hall, at which residents and elected officials had the opportunity to provide additional comments and voice concerns; and

WHEREAS, the South Western Regional Planning Agency has endorsed these projects; and

WHEREAS, the Norwalk City Staff will continue to solicit and consider the comments and concerns of residents and the Common Council finds that the proposed projects, Replacement of the Metro North Railroad Bridge over East Avenue and Reconstruction of East Avenue (ConnDOT Project Nos. 102-1375/102-297) are in the best interest of the City of Norwalk, CT and will promote the health, safety and general welfare of its residents and provide for the convenience and safety of the motoring public and pedestrian traffic.

NOW THEREFORE, the City of Norwalk, CT based on the above information, and by virtue of this resolution, hereby fully supports the proposed projects.

Mr. Kydes told Ms Lindstrom that he would like to speak as a resident. He said that he has 105 residents looking to him to speak, which include businesses. Ms. Lindstrom told him that the general discussion will take place after the presentation.

Mr. Kydes said that he heard unfounded fear and is hearing people speak as if they are experts. He said that they went through this process with the DPW in the spring and the original plan was modified and those modifications were based on their expertise. Mr. Kydes said that before you is a plan developed by experts; not people working through fear. Ms. Lindstrom asked Mr. Kydes to keep to what the citizens said. Mr. Kydes said that he is speaking for 105 citizens and submitted the petition in favor of the project to the Committee.

Mr. Kydes said that the current condition for the past 20 years is no longer bearable. This is a stretch of 3/10 of a mile with six traffic lights. If anyone says that people go 50 mph on that stretch, they are grasping for straws and trying to justify opposition. The experts say there will not be traffic hazards.

Mr. Kydes said that a traffic study conducted in 1995 showed there were 15,000 cars; in 2006 it showed 22,000 on a daily basis. The road was not widened, but the traffic increased. He said that the project can't be separated. If this item is tabled it will force the DOT to come in and only give the City two lanes. They need the City's commitment that they will eliminate traffic by widening the road to four lanes. Tabled this item is a way to kill the bridge going from two lanes to four lanes. The DOT will not separate the project. Mr. Kydes said that you can't separate the project into two projects. If the item is tabled it is a roundabout way of killing this project. He said that they can't kill this for a handful of people with special projects. Ms. Cece said that Mr. Kydes'

comment was a personal attack. Mr. Kydes said that this project is crucial to East Norwalk and Norwalk in general.

Ms. Lindstrom said that she represents District C and a member of the public gave her valuable information about the kinds of studies that were done about widening the lanes. She said that the Committee is going to definitely want to discuss this. She said that her personal feeling is that almost everyone is in support of moving the bridge project forward. Ms. Lindstrom said that the issue is when they get closer to exit 16 and there are already four lanes. She said that this is something they may need to talk to the State about. She said that this is not something the Common Council ever discussed.

Ms. Lindstrom said that East Avenue is a City road and the Common Council is responsible for doing due diligence on those projects. She said that they should not automatically accept what the experts say; that is their role as Common Council members. She said that as representatives of the public, they know their neighborhoods and that is where their input is valuable.

Mr. Bondi said that he wanted to hear what the experts had to say.

Mr. Alvord gave a brief overview of the circumstances and the history of the project. He said that the issue is the growing amount of traffic. He said that a traffic analysis in 1996 showed 16,000 vehicles on that section of East Avenue. The analysis projected that the traffic would grow to 20,000 by 2015. Three weeks ago the average daily traffic was 21,000. Mr. Alvord said that the area is a bottleneck. If the State builds two lanes, the City will have to live with it for the next 100 years.

Mr. Alvord said that if the resolution is separated there is the potential the funds committed will not be available. The DOT made it clear that the funds were committed to deal with the traffic and that the bridge may not be replaced into a four lane bridge. The DOT will not build a four lane bridge unless the City is committed to widen East Avenue. Mr. Alvord said that traffic volume and congestion is growing; this is a major arterial in the City of Norwalk. He said that there have been a number of concepts on how to address this. Over the course of feedback from the public, modifications have been made.

Mr. Linnartz reviewed the plan. He said that it was supposed to be done in 2001. He said that he wanted to put this project in perspective. The traffic between Sunset Hill and Eversley Avenue in 2005 was 26,100 and 26,900 on the bridge. Myrtle Street and Fitch Street – 20,500 and Connecticut Avenue 26,200. Mr. Linnartz noted that there are seven lanes of traffic on some locations on Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. Linnartz said that this project widens the road by about two feet on either side of the street. He said that he is distressed when he hears about the big impact. He said that his arm span is bigger than the East Avenue widening project.

Mr. Linnartz reviewed the project schedule and said that the State requires the final plans by October 2010. The property acquisitions are mostly easements.

Mr. Linnartz presented renderings of the project. He said that there are no property impacts south of the bridge and minor easements from Metro North, Third Taxing District, and the gas station on the east side of the road. The State will assist the City in the construction of sidewalks.

Ms. Brown asked how wide the road is now. Mr. Linnartz said the road is about 40 – 44 feet wide, but is 29 feet wide at the bridge. The road will be a consistent 48 ft. wide roadway. Mr. Alvord said that the State, SWRPA and other agencies agree that four lanes are needed to address the traffic issues. The State funding is contingent upon dealing with the traffic issue on East Avenue. Ms. Brown asked if there was any way to negotiate with the State. Mr. Alvord said that if the City does not commit to dealing with the four lane issue, then there is a good probability that the State will go to a two lane underpass.

Ms. Lindstrom said that the reality is that there are two lanes under the bridge and there are three lanes to Myrtle Street and then four lanes beyond that. Those lanes will allow for some amount of traffic, but will only increase speeding to the capacity there is already there because there are four lanes. Mr. Alvord said that the capacity is not there. There are four- ten ft lanes; the standard width is 12 ft, but they are being reduced to 11 ft. There is a potential for head on collisions with three lanes.

Ms. Lindstrom said that as for getting up from Myrtle Street to St. John St. there is a buffer for the residential area. Mr. Linnartz said that it is currently four lanes and the difference will be four ft. He said that when dealing with the State and Federal funding, you do it their way. He said that the City has gotten major waivers and had done a good job in minimizing the impacts.

Mr. Linnartz said that the railroad station at the instance of the City and other concerned citizens will be expanded to a full train stop and a staircase will be added to both sides. Each intersection will have protected cross walks for pedestrian safety.

Mr. Linnartz said that the road has to be lowered when the bridge is built. This is a four year project for the catenaries; the four lane roadway allows for staging during construction. There are three significant trees that will need to be removed from the area that has to be widened. The City has an aggressive tree program. Mr. Linnartz said that the plan has not been developed fully because he has not gotten the ok to move forward. He noted that the City standard in this area is not historic lighting or brick sidewalks; there is no money in the budget for these items. The biggest esthetic would be to put the utilities underground.

Mr. Robideux asked how much this project was going to cost the City. Mr. Linnartz said that this project was funded 100% by State and Federal dollars. Mr. Alvord said that there may be the potential to fund the placement of the utilities underground. He said that he is going to explore this with the State and then historic lighting would be more of an option.

Mr. Linnartz said that this would be a shared roadway. He said that Metro North wants the bridge to be at the same level as the tracks.

Mr. Hempstead asked if the traffic study took into consideration turns in and turns out. Mr. Linnartz said that they did turn movement counts at each intersection. The traffic levels were consistent during the day. He explained that the counts were done only on weekdays while school was in session.

Mr. Linnartz said that the City has a grant to install 2009 state of the art traffic signals.

Mr. Hempstead told Mr. Linnartz that he did a great job in toning down the project. He said that they need to separate the passion from the practicality. He said that he would like to see a bike lane, but that would mean widening the street more. He urged Mr. Linnartz to include as much green area as possible.

Mr. Conroy said that he asked for this presentation at the last meeting and suggested having enhanced photographs. Mr. Conroy said that he did not see seven foot wide sidewalks or a football field. He said that he had gotten a lot of wrong information. Mr. Conroy said that this presentation shows that it is a block and a half that is going to be widened 2 – 4 feet. He said that from what he heard the old plan was the pits and that is where he thought they were. Mr. Conroy said that this is acceptable.

Mr. Hilliard asked Mr. Alvord to address the feasibility of separating the project. Mr. Alvord said that he had a discussion with the DOT manager. He said that he was delayed because this item was tabled last month. Mr. Alvord said that he is clearly certain that if the City does not elect the four lane option, the State and Federal funding will not be awarded to Norwalk. The DOT does not see the reason to build the four lane bridge. If it is not replaced, the city will have to live with a two lane bridge.

Mr. Bondi said that this project has been going on for the last 15 years and remembers sitting in meetings about this. The DPW has done a tremendous job in lessening the impact. It is four lanes now and it will continue to be four lanes. Mr. Bondi said that it is unfortunate they are unable to add bike lanes. This project will take some of the congestion off of Strawberry Hill Avenue and Osborne Avenue which are more neighborhood streets than East Avenue. He asked about the intersection at Olmstead Place. Mr. Linnartz said that will be part of the I-95 bridge project. Mr. Bondi said that he supports the four lane bridge under the railroad especially because they are going to have platforms.

Mr. Hempstead asked Mr. Alvord if the brown stone from the bridge could be used somewhere else. Mr. Alvord said that he can make a suggestion. Mr. Linnartz said that the brown stone from Monroe Street was offered and no one was interested.

Ms. Duleep said that the Common Council had questions about safety and funding. Mr. Linnartz said that in an urban zone, the City requires seven ft, sidewalks and part of that is the green strip. This project started with seven ft. sidewalks, but they have been reduced to five feet in order to have less property impact. Mr. Linnartz explained that this project has not gone to final design. If the City wants a grass strip or wider sidewalks there will be property impacts and the State will have to start property negotiations. Mr. Linnartz said that the four lanes with a minimum of 11 ft. each is critical for funding.

Mr. Alvord said that the current estimate for the four lane underpass is \$11 million. The roadway improvement is a little over \$4 million. If the City does not do the road widening project to address traffic congestion, the project will have to be sent for re-evaluation. Mr. Alvord said that East Avenue cannot be landscaped with that funding. He noted that the new traffic signal synchronization will help.

Ms. Duleep asked Mr. Alvord if he could look at different plans to address traffic congestion. Mr. Linnartz explained that this is a construction grant just for the construction costs. Mr. Alvord said that they are looking at other ways to do something with the esthetics of the project. He said that he will try to get the State or Federal government to pay for all they can; however, the City will have to invest in esthetic enhancements. The DOT is funding a construction project.

Mr. Alvord said that currently Fire and Garbage trucks can't get under the bridge. Ms. Lindstrom said that the reality is that the actual paved area is going from 40 – 48 feet. Mr. Conroy said that is only a block and a half; there were exaggerations. Ms. Lindstrom said that it is 58 ft, which is more than half the length of a football field. Mr. Kydes said that a football field is 360 feet; this is an exaggeration of the facts.

Ms. Lindstrom said that they could possibly negotiate later for property to put in grassy strips, but no Councilmember would want to take property by Eminent Domain. Mr. Conroy said that in looking at the map, there are some properties that may agree. Keeping the green area is important. Mr. Conroy said that he was struck by some of the discussions – they were so misleading; this is nothing like described in an earlier meeting. The facts are that it is not nearly as impactful as described.

Ms. Lindstrom said that she has experience living on Raymond Terrace and knows the neighborhood and what people are talking about. She said that it makes a difference when you take away the grassy strip.

Ms. Lindstrom said that it looks residential in this area. If the road is the same width, it looks like a DOT highway. She said that no one has gone to the State to ask them to

remove the stretch where there are trees. It is a very safe area. She said that the traffic will move faster if they have a 48 ft. width road. Mr. Kydes said that was an unfounded statement. Ms. Lindstrom said that no one loses by preserving that area. She said that she has to put it out there; it is important to the neighborhood.

Mr. Bondi asked how much was being widened. Mr. Linnartz said that a majority of the widening is on the east side. The City will lose the grass strip and 3-4 trees. It is a distance of 200 feet. He said that the trees are within the City right of way; they are beautiful, but do not belong there because they interfere with the wires.

Ms. Brown asked about the sidewalks under the bridge. Mr. Linnartz said that there will be 2 – 5 ft. sidewalks with new drainage to accommodate the lowering of the roadway. The sidewalk will go down with the roadway. Ms. Brown said that she is concerned about commuters being splashed under the bridge.

Ms. Brown requested a report about property taking. Mr. Alvord said that he could provide that to her tomorrow. Mr. Alvord said that the DOT was expecting approvals last month and hopes the Common Council approves the resolution at their July 14th meeting.

Ms. Brown asked if there was anything that the DPW could do to accommodate the requests. Mr. Alvord said that they will do anything they can to soften the impact of the project. Ms. Brown asked if there was any way to inform the neighbors about the construction impacts. Mr. Alvord said that they can do that and they will maintain one road of traffic at all times. The bridge construction will take four years. He added that there is a notification that the DOT and Metro North uses.

Ms. Brown asked how much it will cost to complete the design. Mr. Linnartz said that they do not have the final design cost, but can have that information available for Tuesday's Common Council meeting.

Mr. Serasis said that he hopes to have complete information before this item comes to the Council floor. He said that the esthetic costs have to be kept in mind, no matter if this is a good or bad project. He said that as taxpayers, the City is going to have to foot the bill for that. Mr. Serasis expressed appreciation for the hard work done by the Committee. Ms. Brown asked about paving costs. Mr. Linnartz said that is part of the project.

Mr. Kydes said that he heard Mr. Alvord talk about putting the utilities underground. Mr. Alvord said that there are utilities that have to be relocated and there is a cost that would be covered under the funding. He said that he is going to explore if they will cover putting them underground. Mr. Alvord said that if the City wants historic lampposts, then the City is going to have to pay for the difference between what is provided and the historic lampposts. Mr. Brown said that when the Third Taxing District asked South Norwalk about the replacement cost for the historic lamps, they were told they were

\$5,000 each. He added they were told it would cost \$1 million to put utilities underground from the railroad station to the East Side Café.

8B. Mr. Hempstead offered the following amendment.

**** MR. HEMPSTEAD MOVED TO DIRECT THE CITY TO PURSUE NEGOTIATIONS WITH PROPERTY OWNERS TO ACQUIRE PROPERTY FOR GREEN STRIPS; CREATE AN ENHANCED TREE PLAN; FOR THE CITY TO PURSUE AND ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH UTILITIES TO PROVIDE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AND DECORATIVE LIGHTING**

Ms. Lindstrom said that this pulls in everything they discussed. She asked if Myrtle Street and St. John Street could be removed from the resolution.

Mr. Bondi said that he accepted Mr. Hempstead's amendment as a friendly amendment to his motion Mr. Bondi and Mr. Hilliard told Ms. Lindstrom that her suggestion would not fly with the State. Mr. Conroy suggested that Ms. Lindstrom support the amendment.

Ms. Lindstrom said that she has had a lot of contact with the neighbors and it is going to be a tough sell for some of them to give up part of their property. She said that she does not want to give up on the grassy strip. She said that their role is to do due diligence. She said that she is concerned that they are going to lose something valuable that they are not going to be able to get back.

Ms. Lindstrom said that she spoke with Bob Duff and he is willing for the DPW and Common Council to sit with the DOT to discuss removing some sections and dividing the resolution into two parts. She said that there would be less to pay because they will have to do improvements in that one area. Mr. Conroy told Ms. Lindstrom that he had a problem with her using the Chair position to dominate the discussion.

**** THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

8C ** MS. LINDSTROM MOVED TO DIRECT THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO MEET WITH CDOT AND ASK IF THEY CAN REMOVE MYRTLE STREET ST. TO RAYMOND TERRACE FROM THE PROJECT WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING THE PROJECT. IF YES, THEN REMOVE THAT SECTION FROM THE PROJECT

Mr. Alvord said that this will not solve the safety aspects of the project. Mr. Bondi added that this is going to cause more dangerous issues. Ms. Lindstrom said that since it is at an intersection, it is not as dangerous. Mr. Linnartz said that they can't narrow the road in

the direction of travel; there may be property impacts. Ms. Lindstrom said that she would like that explored. Mr. Linnartz said that leaving the block the way it is, is not proper for safety. Mr. Alvord said that if they take that out of the project they have to go back to step one. He said that the staff does not recommending the removal of that portion of the project. If Ms. Lindstrom's resolution is passed, the project will be dead. The State does not want a conditional resolution.

Mr. Alvord said that he will not put 8B or 8C on the main resolution; they are directives to the staff.

**** MOTION PASSED WITH THREE (3) VOTES IN FAVOR (MR. CONROY, MR. HEMPSTEAD AND MS. LINDSTROM) AND TWO (2) VOTES IN OPPOSITION (MR. BONDI AND MR. HILLIARD)**

**** MAIN MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR (4) VOTES IN FAVOR (MR. BONDI, MR. CONROY, MR. HEMPSTEAD, MR. HILLIARD) AND ONE (1) ABSTENTION (MS. LINDSTROM)**

Business Portion

**** MR. BONDI MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

1. Approve the Minutes of the Public Works Committee meeting of Tuesday June 2, 2009.
- 2.

The following correction was made: correct the spelling of Nick Overall throughout.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. BONDI MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

2. Authorize the Director of Public Works to issue Orders on Contract to the Brunalli Construction Company for Project No. BR 2007-2, Reed Street Railroad Bridge and Reed Street Extension, in an amount not to exceed \$13,787.
Account No. 0920910 5777 CO241

Mr. Linnartz explained that this is the balance from a Redevelopment account.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. CONROY MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

2. Approve revision to prior authorization:

a. Resolution authorized on May 12, 2009:

Authorize the Mayor, Richard A. Moccia, to execute an Agreement for Professional Engineering Services in connection with Project RD2009-1, West Avenue Roadway Improvements, Scope of Services to be in accordance with Tighe & Bond Proposal Section A Bidding Phase Services and Section B Construction Administration Services (Office) for a sum not to exceed \$88,500.00 (including \$6,000.00 in reimbursement direct costs).

Account No. 09020910-C0241

b. Revised authorization:

Authorize the Mayor, Richard A. Moccia, to execute an Agreement for Professional Engineering Services in connection with Project RD2009-1, West Avenue Roadway Improvements, Scope of Services to be in accordance with Tighe & Bond Proposal Section A Bidding Phase Services, Section B Construction Administration Services (Office), and Section C Construction Observation Services (Field) for a sum not to exceed

\$440,000 (including \$13,500 in reimbursable direct costs).

Account No. 09020910-C0241

Mr. Linnartz explained that this is for professional engineering services on the 95/7 project. The total cost is approximately \$6 million.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. HILLIARD MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

4. Authorize the Mayor, Richard A. Moccia, to execute an Amendment to the contract with A DiCesare Associates, PC for Professional Engineering Services Regarding the Reed Street Extension Project, to provide additional construction administration and inspection services and to extend the contract completion date to December 31, 2010, for a sum not to exceed \$75,000.00.

Account No. 09020910-5777-C0241

Mr. Linnartz explained that this is an amendment to the contract for the Reed Street Extension Project. The contract has been extended to December and this is for three additional months of construction service.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. CONROY MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

5. Authorize the Mayor, Richard A. Moccia, to execute an Amendment to the Agreement with Milone & McBroom, for the design of a culvert replacement on Rowayton Avenue at Woodchuck Lane, to evaluate the effect of the improvements on 405 Rowayton Avenue, for a sum not to exceed \$5,000.00.

Account No. 090740215777 C0395 (FEMA Grant)

Mr. Linnartz explained that this is an increase in cost for the design of a culvert replacement on Rowayton Avenue. The culvert will allow higher flows.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. HEMPSTEAD MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

6. Authorize the Mayor, Richard A. Moccia, to execute a Second Amendment to the Agreement with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin (VHB), Inc. for the East Avenue Corridor Signalization Improvement Project, to prepare final as-constructed plans for STC submission, for a sum not to exceed \$4,000.00.

Account No. 090741205777 C0397

090741205777 C0410

Mr. Linnartz explained that this is a request for additional funds for the East Avenue corridor signalization project. Ms. Lindstrom said that the sooner this can be done, the better. Mr. Linnartz said that they are doing the replacements in house, resulting in significant cost savings.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. HILLIARD MOVED THE FOLLOWING ITEM:**

7. Authorize the Director of Public Works to issue Orders on Contract to Wanat's Westport Electric Company, Inc., for the Washington Street Historic Light Project, for a sum not to exceed \$38,500.00.

Account No. 014031-5264

014031-5267

014031-5269

014031-5296

014031-5336

014031-5341

014031-5343

014031-5345

0900 091 05701 C0009

Mr. Linnartz explained that this is a change order. The lights were done during the 1980's.

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Project updates - See attached project status sheet.

The project updates will be discussed at a later date. Mr. Alvord reported that the DEP published their determination of no significant impact on June 23rd. If there are no comments by August 2nd they should be able to advertise the bid package.

General Information Portion

1. Norwalk transfer station.

There was no discussion.

Ms. Cece asked Mr. Alvord where she could submit an FOI request for copies of the petitions and who signed the petitions. Mr. Alvord told her to contact the Law Department. Mr. Hempstead said that he would also like copies.

**** MR. BONDI MOVED TO ADJOURN
** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

There was no further business and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosemarie Lombardi
Telesco Secretarial Services

