CITY OF NORWALK
Norwalk City Hall
125 East Avenue, PO Box 5125
Room 225
Norwalk, CT 06856-5125
P: 203-854-7791 / F: 203-857-0143

CITY OF NORWALK
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
February 6, 2018

ATTENDANCE: John Igneri, Chair; Thomas Livingston; Michael Corsello; Eloisa Melendez; Doug Hempstead; Travis Simms (7:25pm)

STAFF: Bruce Chimento, Director; Lisa Burns, Principal Engineer

OTHERS: Lisa Biagiarelli, Courtney Austin, Craig Flaherty, Robert Koch, Sandra Bullock

Mr. Igneri called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. A quorum was present.

PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR ALL PARTIES INTERESTED IN THE PROPOSED HONORARY NAMING OF CITY HALL DRIVE (SUNSET HILL AVENUE TO EVERSLEY AVENUE) TO "HONORABLE FRANK J. ESPOSITO WAY". (7:00 P.M.)

There were two (2) residents that spoke at the Public Hearing, Lisa Biagiarelli and Courtney Austin.

Ms. Lisa Biagiarelli she thanked the committee for allowing her to speak. She introduced herself stating that she serves as the Tax Collector and she is also speaking as an 18 year employee of the City of Norwalk. She said she was hired in March of 2000 and was appointed by then Mayor Frank Esposito. She said that overtime she developed a great friendship with Mayor Esposito and more recently since his passing with his widow Louise who now lives in Nevada and we have had many conversations about a proposal to honor of Mayor Esposito and name something after him. Ms. Biagiarelli stated that Louise expressed to her that this gesture of recognition would be very much appreciated by her and the family. She said that Mayor Esposito was the longest serving Mayor serving 7 consecutive terms for 14 years, a State Representative, a Council Member and he served the community and gave a lot to the City of Norwalk. She said that it is her feeling that recognizing his legacy by naming this small portion of street right outside of City Hall is an appropriate and fitting gesture so she is here to ask you and on behalf of Louise to please consider this.

Ms. Courtney Austin spoke to the committee saying that she is sure that Mayor Esposito has done great things for the City. She continued to say that other Mayors have done great things as well. She said that she feels naming streets after Mayors or any politicians are unnecessary. She mentioned Mr. Alvord being honored for planting trees which she feels is much more suitable. She said that there will be more Mayors doing great things to come and we are running out of streets. Ms. Austin said that there are many people with gold stars next to their names on plaques downstairs that gave their lives for the City who should be honored. She said that she lives on East Avenue and it would be very distressing to her if they name the street after him. She said that there must be other ways to honor him than a street. She said she feels it's inappropriate.

Mr. Igneri thanked them for their comments. He called the public hearing to a close at 7:08p.m. and officially opened the agenda with public input.

PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public input at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Igneri made a motion to suspend the rules to add item #8 to the agenda. Mr. Igneri read the item to the Committee.

> **AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF AN ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FOR "LIGHT POLE BANNER SIGNAGE" IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANS PREPARED FOR CARMEL PARTNERS BY STREETSENSE TITLED "THE WAYPOINT, SIGNAGE DESIGN" FOR 515 WEST AVENUE AND 11 MERWIN STREET DATED AUGUST 30, 2017."**

Mr. Corsello asked the reason for the urgency.

Ms. Burns responded that the staff person who was supposed to add this to the agenda was not present at work on Friday so it didn't make it to the agenda until Monday, but they had made a promise to the consultant that he would be able to present.

Mr. Chimento stated that we knew last week but just didn't get on the agenda in time.

Mr. Igneri asked if they could take item #8 first since there was someone there to give a presentation.

Mr. Livingston suggested approving the minutes first.

Mr. Igneri asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 5, 2017 meeting.

Mr. Livingston moved the minutes.

1. APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING OF TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2017.

Mr. Corsello said that the minutes reflected the committee decided to, originally it came to us as just Frank J. Esposito Way and we have discussed and changed it to Honorable Frank J. Esposito Way and that's not how I remember it. He said that in fact he doesn't remember it at all and that they had some reservations about the Honorable Mayor, and that he knows he did. He said that it is reflected in the minutes that originally we began discussing Frank J. Esposito Way and that we decided to hold a public hearing on Honorable Frank J. Esposito Way is not how he remembered it.

The Committee began to discuss the item and how it was remembered. Some of the members remembered a discussion about it some didn't.

Mr. Igneri said that he remembered a discussion on how to name it and thinks they came around to an alternative whether it was honorable or something else. He said that it was a pretty long discussion.

Ms. Burns said that allow she wasn't at the meeting, but when the action came back there was a hybrid of two different ordinances. She said there is an honorable street naming and then there is street naming that are two separate ordinances. She said that they reached out to the Chairman and asked for his guidance on how to do this because honorable street naming will go on top of the street name, changing the street name has to go to different committees and is a whole different process. Ms. Burns said they massaged it to what they thought they intended when they rewrote the resolution.

Mr. Chimento said that they would be able to see the honorable signs around town like Travis Simms Way.

Mr. Corsello asked if what they are saying is there would be a blue sign on top of the other sign.

Mr. Chimento said yes.

Mr. Corsello said that they did not talk about that.

Mr. Livingston agreed that they did not talk about having a blue sign on top of the other one.

Ms. Burns said that if the committee wants to rename the sign then it has to go to planning.

Mr. Hempstead said that it is not officially a street.

Mr. Igneri said that it's a drive.

Mr. Chimento said that Mr. Hempstead is correct that it is not a street but right now it is called City Hall Drive where they would put a sign on top of that, that would be the Honorable Frank J. Esposito Drive or Mayor Frank J. Esposito Drive.

Ms. Melendez said that technically is not a real street.

Ms. Burns said that it is on google as City Hall Drive.

Mr. Corsello said that they were talking about renaming the street in honor of Frank Esposito and it was a discussion Mayor Esposito, Frank J. Esposito, Honorable and he continues saying he thought that they were not going to use the word honorable because it was not a judge and he says that the minutes should reflect that.

Mr. Chimento said that in the minutes of the last meeting it does say that and the action that you take tonight could make it anything you want to make it.

Ms. Burns said that if they are going to officially name a street, if they say it's no street name right now then it goes to Planning.

Mr. Livingston and Mr. Corsello agreed that the committee did not discuss the color of the signs.

Ms. Melendez asked if there is a way to fix that part of the conversation.

Mr. Corsello said that he brought it up to simply amend the minutes to accurately reflect.

Mr. Chimento said that is what you will be doing but the committee is still going to vote on whatever you want to call it.

Mr. Hempstead said he was unsure procedurally how it works. He asked if they take that as a street would the City have to do their own application for a street acceptance because technically it's a driveway, it has never been named a street. He said to become a city street you have to be accepted by the City.

Mr. Chimento said that as far as they are concerned it's a driveway.

Mr. Hempstead said that he is okay with the blue sign.

Mr. Igneri said that blue sign isn't the issue, the issue is the minutes. He said that he recalls the committee having a long discussion about it and coming up with an alternative because originally it was Mayor Frank J. Esposito Way.

Mr. Corsello said that as long as they are on the subject so many variables have come in, a sign that says honorable is blue and a green sign remains below it, he asked if a sign that says Mayor Frank J. Esposito Way can be blue.

Ms. Burns replied yes.

Mr. Igneri said that was the discussion we had last time. He said that he thought they ended up with Honorable but if we didn't we can take that out right now.

Mr. Livingston said or we can vote on it.

Mr. Corsello said that the minutes reflected that we decided on honorable and that wasn't my recollection.

Mr. Igneri asked if everyone was in favor of the minutes.

Mr. Corsello said that he has another question that talks about the Walk Bridge and the Wall Street Station. He said that he recalls asking a question if she (Sue Prosi) thought about the viability of leveraging inconvenience to the City of the Walk Bridge to get the DOT and Metro North to assist us in creating a Wall Street Train Station and she gave us a fairly detailed response as to why she didn't think that was viable, having to do with the station at Merritt 7 and is just not reflected in the minutes accurately.

Mr. Livingston said that he remembers her talking about it.

Mr. Corsello said the minutes don't capture the essence of what she was talking about.

Mr. Igneri asked if Mr. Corsello would like to amend the minutes.

Mr. Corsello responded yes.

Mr. Igneri asked Mr. Corsello how he would like it to read.

Mr. Corsello said that he would like it to read "in response to the question to the viability of leveraging the inconvenience to the City to the Walk Bridge to the possibility of using that to get the DOT and Metro North to assist us in establishing a train station on Wall Street and Ms. Prosi explained for a variety of reasons that was unlikely to occur".

Mr. Chimento asked if everyone remembers that.

The Committee replied that they remembered that conversation. Ms. Melendez abstained as she was not present at that meeting.

Mr. Igneri asked if anyone else had anything to add regarding the minutes. Mr. Igneri motioned to move the minutes as amended.

Ms. Melendez abstained.

****MR. IGNERI MOVED THE ITEM AS AMENDED**
****MS. MELENDEZ ABSTAINED**
****MOTION PASSED WITH CORRECTIONS AND ONE ABSTENTION**

Mr. Igneri stated that they will be going out-of-order to discuss item #8

8. AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF AN ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FOR "LIGHT POLE BANNER SIGNAGE" IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANS PREPARED FOR CARMEL PARTNERS BY STREETSENSE TITLED "THE WAYPOINT, SIGNAGE DESIGN" FOR 515 WEST AVENUE AND 11 MERWIN STREET DATED AUGUST 30, 2017."

Ms. Burns introduced the item. She stated that this is for the Waypoint Midblock development. She said that the current owner and property manager had a packet of streetscape improvements that they wanted to make such as street furniture, signage, artwork and such. She said they had meetings with other City Departments such as Redevelopment Agency, Planning and Zoning and Public Works. She said that Zoning has already giving an approval of their jurisdiction over this, Redevelopment is coming up with a set of standards for this in other areas for banners and such. She said they do not normally come to the Committee to issue an encroachment permit but they have a concern with the banners displaying/advertising private businesses so they reached out to the Corporation Counsel Office and they suggested that it goes through committee and council for approval.

Mr. Corsello asked why the Department of Public Works Committee because it encroaches on Public Works.

Mr. Chimento answered because it is their permits.

Ms. Burns said that they will take an encroachment permit because they own the light pole that they want to affix the banner to and they will also get a bond should something happen to the pole. She said that they verified that a wind blow analysis was conducted. She said that Mr. Flaherty is going to give a presentation on what they want to do.

Mr. Flaherty introduced himself. He said that he is a Senior Engineer Principal at Redniss & Mead. He said that they are a land use consultant company that does land surveying, civil engineering and planning and zoning consulting. He said that his client is Carmel Partners and they are the principal owners of the middle block and north block of the Waypointe District. He said that it is within the Redevelopment Agency's West Avenue Plan Corridor and this is the first major development within that West Avenue Corridor. He said that Carmel Partners, there are a lot of businesses that exist on the first floor of the middle and north block. He said many of those businesses look inward on the pedestrian street. He said that is a great planning idea that creates an interesting space but provides a negative for some of the businesses that are faced internally not externally. Mr. Flaherty continued saying Carmel Partners proposed this full streetscape plan with street furniture, murals on some of the empty building faces, improved lighting, improved signage all to make the street front more exciting and attention grabbing. He showed the Committee props to demonstrate where the signage would be. He said that Carmel is asking for permission to put banners on the light poles (pointed to highlighted poles on prop) along West Avenue, Merwin Street and Orchard Street. He said the ones on West Avenue are the tall 26ft goosenecks, Merwin and Orchard Street ones are 15ft goosenecks. He showed the Committee an example of the size the banner would be on West Avenue. He said that one side of the light pole would be something branded for Norwalk and that would be up to Redevelopment and the other side of the light pole they are asking to be branded for a tenant that resides on that block. He said so there would be two banners on the goose neck poles on the

West Avenue Corridor, one branded for Redevelopment's visioning of the corridor and the other branded for a tenant living on that block. He said that on Merwin and Orchard where they have post lamps there is just one banner because it is too low to have it project on the street side which could be an obstruction to trucks coming through so it would only be on the sidewalk side. He stated that every other light pole would be branded for a business on those post lamps.

Mr. Livingston asked if the City gains any money from the signage.

Mr. Flaherty said that it hadn't been decided, offered or discussed.

Mr. Livingston asked Mr. Chimento if this had ever been done before with private businesses.

Mr. Chimento replied he is not aware if it had.

Ms. Melendez said that in South Norwalk in front of the Maritime Aquarium she had seen signs like the ones the presenter showed.

Ms. Burns replied that they do not own the poles.

Ms. Melendez said that was the only example that she could think of that they have currently.

Mr. Flaherty said that there are a few signs in the POKO District where they try to create art district branding, he said those were small. He said that they were looking at this as advertisement in the right of way such as bus shelters, trash cans and adopt-a-spot.

Ms. Melendez asked if the funds from the Barcelona sign would go to Carmel Partners.

Mr. Flaherty said that Carmel owns the building and Barcelona is their tenant so no one is paying rent at this point to be there. He said it would be Carmel's choice to assist and pay for it.

Mr. Livingston asked if they would pay for it.

Mr. Flaherty replied yes Carmel would pay for it.

Mr. Corsello said that Carmel would be able to charge a higher rent to their tenants because of the signage.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there were any standards for something like this. He asked about the signs being maintained every two years and cleaned.

Mr. Chimento answered no we do not.

Mr. Hempstead said that they should have regulations for something like this and asked if the poles that are going up or presently there wind loaded.

Ms. Burns said that they are good with that and she said she asked that question that is why they were going to do it under the encroachment permit because they don't have a current regulation. She said that they could set out the criteria under the encroachment permit and she said that they will hold a bond for the amount of one pole replacement, $6,000, and the permit would be issued for the period of one year.

Mr. Hempstead said that he remembered when they had the 350 year anniversary of Norwalk and the signs were on poles. He stated they don't have any regulations for it. He said zoning would be illegal because that is an advertisement would be considered a billboard. He said he wouldn't like to do this spot wise but would rather be organized. He said conceptually he doesn't have an issue but thinks Redevelopment and Zoning should sort it out.

Mr. Igneri asked since some signs will say Norwalk, who established a standard for that.

Mr. Flaherty said within this corridor it would be the Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Corsello asked if that would be the exterior sign closest to the street.

Mr. Flaherty responded great question and answered that he is not 100% certain if it is the street side sign or if it is the sidewalk side sign.

Mr. Livingston stated that currently they do not know what the redevelopment signs look like and at this point there could be one style, one style, one style then another.

Mr. Flaherty said they are all for taking the right amount of time and doing this thoughtfully. He said that Redevelopment has this item on their agenda for February 13, 2018. He said they have been working with the Redevelopment Agency for six to eight months on the concept and on Friday they received an email from Redevelopment saying they are looking forward to working on this concept throughout West Avenue Corridor and Zoning said that they do not have jurisdiction in the public's right-of-way but have jurisdiction over private property. He gave an example stating if this banner was on someone else's private property they could consider that an off-site sign and that is not allowed per regulations but this is not on another property.

Mr. Livingston said that he would be okay if there was a standard for signs along the entire strip and it wasn't for commercial purposes. He said that he has two objections to this so he can't support it the way it is now.

Mr. Flaherty said that they are working towards and have been working with the Redevelopment Agency hand in hand and this is heading in the direction of creating a standard for the West Avenue Corridor.

Mr. Simms apologized to the Committee for his tardiness. He said that he was hearing a lot of discussion about street signs in South Norwalk, etc. and he would like to know exactly what the proposal is with regards to the signage in South Norwalk.

Mr. Flaherty said that they are talking about the Waypointe District along the West Avenue Corridor. He displayed plans to demonstrate the areas he was discussing. He showed them by pointing to Mathews Park, he said the Children's Museum was on the bottom, he showed them where Loehmann's was located prior to its demolition and said that area is the new Waypointe District. He continued saying the West Avenue Corridor runs from approximately at the turn off of Route 1 and Berkeley Street and Leonard Street to the North and they are working for a property owner that owns those blocks and a portion of this plan area with a proposal to put light pole banners on existing street lights, light pole banners on the large street lights on West Avenue.

Mr. Simms asked if that signage would be consistent throughout the City.

Mr. Igneri said that is the question the Committee was asking.

Mr. Flaherty responded that they are conceptually working with Redevelopment Agency on the West Avenue Plan Corridor so they are looking at that six block stretch working with Redevelopment Agency to the character of that area.

Mr. Igneri interjected since they are working on the corridor, are they asking the Committee to authorize the issuance of an encroachment permit for just that area but we don't know what the rest of that area would look like.

Mr. Flaherty responded yes they are waiting for the Redevelopment Agency to decide that.

Mr. Igneri said that he would be hesitant to give the right to issue the permit.

Mr. Flaherty said that they do not have to do it now and that they could wait until after the Redevelopment Agency has their meeting on February 13th then they could come back to the Committee with the answer to that question.

Mr. Corsello said that he would think if they gave the authorization for this that there would be other private entities asking to do the same thing. He said that Mr. Flaherty eluded earlier that some of the tenants, unfortunately, their businesses don't face out onto the sidewalk but rather they face into like a court yard and one of the things that is going to be done is that there is going to be murals put on the side of the buildings.

Mr. Flaherty said yes, there not on the West Avenue side, that façade is already activated with tenant space. He said basically it is parts of the building that may have an electrical room or trash room behind it or a blank wall.

Mr. Corsello said that Mr. Flaherty used the word murals to make it known that their businesses are back there. He said that he is picturing murals making reference to them then banners on top of that and that may start looking like Times Square.

Mr. Flaherty said the murals have to be artwork they cannot be advertising.

Mr. Corsello asked if this would be regulated by Zoning because that is private property.

Ms. Melendez asked about the August 30, 2017 date and what that stood for.

Mr. Flaherty said that is the date of the plans.

Ms. Melendez said that she is in favor of this and thinks it would be great however she said that her concern is it needs to be better organized before she would say yes. She said there needs to be some control over the signs and what is on them.

Mr. Corsello stated he was piggybacking on what Mr. Hempstead brought up earlier about the signs being cloth and they would need to be maintained when dirty and unsightly.

Mr. Hempstead asked Mr. Chimento if Dunkin Donuts posted one of those big long flag things out in front of their store on public property, would the jurisdiction strictly be Public Works because it's a hazard of some kind. He said that he knows the City picked up some A frames.

Ms. Burns said that was from Zoning.

Mr. Hempstead said that is what confused him because that is not necessarily on private property. He continued to say that is why he was confused that Zoning would say it is not on private property and someone sticks an A frame out there.

Mr. Igneri said that they picked up the A frames because they were blocking the sidewalk.

Mr. Chimento said that if they were going to put a sign out there they would need an encroachment permit because it's on the sidewalk.

Ms. Burns said that they do not own that many historic street lights only West Avenue. She said they don't have this broad based jurisdiction about historic street lighting and that in some ways it is a discreet area for this program until lights change on Wall or more historic lights are put up somewhere else. She said that the light poles that are City lights that are just the galvanized poles that are maintained by Eversource and that is their permit so it's really just West Avenue and a sprinkling of light poles that this could happen for staff but the main concern was setting the precedent for the private business. She said that they didn't feel like they had the authorization to approve Barcelona putting up a sign or anyone else that is why they went to Corporation Counsel to ask them. She said that there isn't anything in the current ordinances that gives direction on this but really could only apply to this district in the City.

Mr. Igneri asked how far apart the poles are.

Ms. Burns used the plans to depict the distance between the poles. She said the larger poles on West Avenue and the maintenance questions would be addressed in the permit provisions.

Mr. Igneri said that he noticed that there are poles with signs on them.

Mr. Flaherty responded they say no parking on them.

Ms. Burns said yes those signs belong to them.

Mr. Igneri asked if those signs would stay there.

Ms. Burns responded that those signs would be approximately 8ft.

Mr. Livingston said that they need to take a real long look at private businesses because he would like to know how the City is going to be able to distinguish between one private business and someone that wants to put up a sign to repossess cars or whatever and how do they make the distinction. He said that he is very much against that, okay with art signs or Norwalk signs but advertising private businesses he does not know how they would do it.

Mr. Igneri asked if this was just for the district that is outlined in the agreement.

Mr. Flaherty said that is correct.

Mr. Igneri said is the staff there is looking to establish standards.

Mr. Flaherty said yes, Redevelopment is looking in at the green area to have this opportunity both for Norwalk and for activating businesses within that plan area, then we are looking for specifically this particular street encroachment permit for the magenta area around two blocks so there will be a defined property owner on the hook with a bond and insurance in that area. He said that they imagined they would complete a management plan for the signs and then he began to read from the plan. He said that some of the concerns could be outlined in the management plan and affixed to the encroachment permit and bonding.

Mr. Hempstead said that this needs to be comprehensive for the district. He said that he is not opposed to it however he has some concerns with the private businesses being a part of it so he would like to ask the representatives of the company to show him some examples in the area where they actually allow private businesses. He said that Fairfield has them with Fairfield University on them or Sacred Heart University and do all kinds of things but he doesn't think Ryan Park in that area, he doesn't recall seeing businesses names on those poles. He said it is usually an event which is a good thing because it is advertisement for an event.

Mr. Flaherty said that he will get him some examples.

Ms. Burns asked how would staff implement and if Redevelopment comes up with a standard how would the Council ties into that because this is the public right-of-way which is Council's jurisdiction. She also asked what kind of questions she will need to ask Redevelopment to make sure they consider what the Common Council wants in its right-of-way before they adopt some standard that may say they could put private business in there.

Mr. Corsello said that they talked about a need for regulation and he heard some proposals stating that they will replace the banners two years or earlier when they are frayed, well what's frayed. He said if they are going to approve something it needs to be more comprehensive, is it four years, a period of time that they are satisfied with.

Mr. Chimento said that is one of the reasons they are here. He said that they do not have any regulations in the area.

Mr. Igneri said should they take it to Planning.

Ms. Burns said that Zoning approved everything but the light pole banners.

Mr. Igneri restated that Redevelopment should take it to the Planning Committee.

Mr. Hempstead said that they need to ask for an encroachment permit. He said that they need to make sure that the City assets are protected.

Mr. Livingston asked if the Law Department has signed off on the advertisement for this one business.

Ms. Burns answered that the Law Department directed them to go to the Public Works Committee and then Common Council.

Mr. Livingston said that he is still uncomfortable with this.

Mr. Corsello asked if this is going to be limited to just this particular district and what happens when a different area of town wants the same thing.

Mr. Flaherty said that one of the answers is that there isn't a lot of light poles around.

Mr. Livingston asked if they were saying that someone could put up a banner on a light pole in the middle part of town without you knowing.

Ms. Burns said that the taxing district does it on their poles.

Mr. Livingston asked even if it is over a City sidewalk.

Ms. Burns replied that she is not a sign expert and would have to find out.

Mr. Corsello asked if Eversource wanted to start selling advertising space on their pole, is there anything we could do about it.

Mr. Chimento replied he is not so sure because it would still be in the right-of-way, an encroachment on their right-of-way.

Mr. Corsello said that then they will get into issues with Zoning and their approval and then someone could make an argument that well Zoning approved this.

Mr. Igneri asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Flaherty asked the Committee what other information he could obtain for them.

Ms. Melendez answered they could provide examples.

Mr. Igneri said the standards.

Mr. Livingston asked what is in it for the City.

Mr. Flaherty answered successful businesses.

Mr. Corsello asked if this would open up Pandora's Box.

****MR. HEMPSTEAD MOVED TO TABLE ITEM TO THE NEXT MEETING**
****MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Simms asked to Suspend the Rules to add an item to the agenda so Ms. Bullock could address to the Committee.

Mr. Igneri stated that Ms. Bullock was offered that opportunity earlier.

Mr. Simms asked again to Suspend the Rules to add an item to the agenda so Ms. Bullock could address to the Committee.

Mr. Igneri asked Mr. Simms if he was adding her to the agenda for public input.

Mr. Simms answered correct and said if she has to wait to the end of the meeting that would be fine.

Mr. Corsello asked if this was a matter of public comment.

Mr. Igneri said yes.

Mr. Corsello said as opposed to an action item.

Mr. Igneri answered yes there is no action being taken.

Ms. Melendez asked if it was about something on the agenda.

Mr. Simms said she just wanted to be added to the agenda to address the committee.

Mr. Igneri explained to Ms. Bullock that the standard for public input is three minutes and they will limit her to the three minutes as they did everyone else. He asked Ms. Bullock to stand up when she address the Committee and give her name and address for the record.

Mr. Corsello asked why she wants to address this as public comment, why didn't she do it when we had public comment at the beginning instead of the onset of the meeting.

Ms. Bullock replied that it was a misunderstanding.

Mr. Igneri reminded her that she has three minutes.

Ms. Bullock said that her issue is South Norwalk Inner City sidewalks getting repaired. She said that she spoke with Mr. Chimento twice briefly concerning the repairs to get done. She passed around photos of the sidewalks. She said that she is looking for South Main Street to get repaired. She said that they clarified that it will be getting repaired but there is some misunderstanding with Mr. Igneri and Mr. Chimento in reference to a schedule for her to come in and lay out the accomplishments and progress that has been made so far. Ms. Bullock said that she was told it was going to be repaired in 2018 and she would like to know that something is going to be accomplished as soon as possible. She said that she has been injured by falling off a sidewalk and into a street so she is here today to get some solid information and direction as to when it will actually be done. She reiterated that she wants to know when the sidewalks are going to get done. She said she is seeking the same results as other streets such as West Avenue, Washington Street and North Main Streets to be done in South Norwalk. Ms. Bullock stated that she is hurt and offended because nothing has been accomplished and done and her streets are very broken. She then thanked the Committee for allowing her to speak.

Mr. Igneri thanked her for her time. He then clarified for the record that they have listened to her and saw the pictures and scheduled the sidewalk repairs this year on South Main Street and she has an appointment with Mr. Chimento.

Mr. Simms said that these are the very streets that he has been talking about over the past ten years since he has been on the Council. He said that every year they say it is going to get repaired next year. He said this is ten years now and he understood her pain. He said as a Committee they should sympathize with that and not brush residents off and say you got two minutes. He said he understands where she is coming from. Mr. Simms said that this is the same issues that they dealt with when the Republicans were the majority. He said he has been told that the streets would get done and as a representative of this Committee and the Common Council he would like to see these streets get done as well. He made a statement saying it is a shame that all the streets are getting done throughout the City and the TOD area but you look at these streets on South Main Street and Meadow Street and these streets are in total disrepair and have been for almost 40 years so he would like to see some action on this as he has spoken with Mr. Chimento about this numerous times.

Mr. Igneri said that it is on the agenda and it will get done. He addressed Mr. Simms and said with all due respect, he and Mr. Chimento have spent hours speaking with Ms. Bullock and have worked with her and she has also spoken with the Mayor.

Ms. Bullock interjected that she had never spoken with the Mayor but have spoken with Mr. Chimento and Mr. Igneri. She thanked the Committee and said that she would like to be heard with results.

Mr. Igneri said that her issue is on the agenda and the only thing that would impact them is weather.

2. APPROVE THE HONORARY NAMING OF THE CITY HALL DRIVE (SUNSET HILL AVENUE TO EVERSLEY AVENUE) TO "HONORABLE FRANK J. ESPOSITO WAY" IN MEMORY OF MAYOR FRANK J. ESPOSITO.

Ms. Melendez asked if the way it reads with Honorable makes it clear that it is a blue sign because it is honorary naming not street naming.

Ms. Burns answered correct.

Ms. Melendez asked if she could go ahead and make the motion now to take Honorable out and change it to Mayor.

Mr. Livingston said that he has done more than just Mayor.

Mr. Hempstead said he thinks Honorable because he served so many positions.

Mr. Igneri said that was part of the discussion they had.

Mr. Hempstead said that it was coming back to him from December that is part of where the Honorable came out of because the Mayor was much more than just Mayor.

Mr. Simms said that he doesn't have a problem with Honorable and as someone stated he served in the State Legislature and was the longest serving Mayor in the City and is well deserving of maybe putting Honorable before.

Mr. Livingston said that either way is fine with him.

Mr. Corsello said not to disparage Mayor Esposito but 75 years from now people may thing he is a jurist.

Mr. Hempstead said that he is okay with Honorable. He said he knows that there was a person from the public not in favor of this but there are parks named after Mayor, there are senior housing projects named after Mayors.

Mr. Igneri asked if it says Honorable.

The Committee began to discuss the options for the honorary street name.

Ms. Melendez googled Honorable and read the definitions to the Committee. She read the definitions which stated "bringing of worthy of honor", "used as a title indicating eminence or distinction given especially to judges and certain high officials". She said she understood their point with Honorable. She said that her personal opinion is she thinks Mayor, although he served in different capacities, Mayor is the one they are honoring him for.

Mr. Hempstead said that he is okay with Honorable just because he had multi positions.

Mr. Igneri took a count of who was in favor of Honorable Frank J. Esposito Way.

Mr. Corsello said that he is opposed and wants it to be on record not for honoring the Mayor but he thinks it should reflect him being honored for being a Mayor.

****MR. IGNERI MOVED THE ITEM**
****MR. CORSELLO OPPOSED**
****MOTION PASSED WITH ONE OPPOSITION**

3. **AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING, TO EXECUTE ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE EXECUTION OF THE EASEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NORWALK AND THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR A PERMANENT EASEMENT OF 23,060± SQUARE FEET TO CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN THE WALK RAILROAD BRIDGE AS DEPICTED ON A MAP PREPARED BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ENTITLED "COMPILATION PLAN TOWN OF NORWALK MAP SHOWING EASEMENT ACQUIRED FROM CITY OF NORWALK BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WALK RAILROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT," DATED DECEMBER 2017, AT A SCALE OF 1" = 40' ON FILE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS IN EXCHANGE FOR A PAYMENT OF $580,000.00.**

****MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED ITEM 3, 4 AND 5 AS WRITTEN**

4. **AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING, TO EXECUTE ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE EXECUTION OF THE EASEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NORWALK AND THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR A PERMANENT EASEMENT OF 6,098± SQUARE FEET TO CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN THE WALK RAILROAD BRIDGE AS DEPICTED ON A MAP PREPARED BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ENTITLED "COMPILATION PLAN TOWN OF NORWALK MAP SHOWING EASEMENT ACQUIRED FROM CITY OF NORWALK BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WALK RAILROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT," DATED DECEMBER 2017, AT A SCALE OF 1" = 40' ON FILE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS IN EXCHANGE FOR A PAYMENT OF $154,000.00.**

5. **AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING, TO EXECUTE ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE EXECUTION OF THE EASEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NORWALK AND THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT OF 18,780± SQUARE FEET FOR THE PURPOSE OF STORAGE OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND TO PROVIDE ACCESS BETWEEN THE NORWALK RIVER AND LAND OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DURING THE WALK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT AS DEPICTED ON A MAP PREPARED BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ENTITLED "COMPILATION PLAN TOWN OF NORWALK MAP SHOWING EASEMENT ACQUIRED FROM CITY OF NORWALK BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WALK RAILROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT," DATED DECEMBER 2017, AT A SCALE OF 1" = 40' ON FILE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS IN EXCHANGE FOR A PAYMENT OF $386,000.00.**

Ms. Burns explained the easements. She said that there are a number of easements that the State of Connecticut needs to obtain to construct the Walk Bridge. She said that one of them are affecting the Waste Water Treatment Plant site on 60 South Smith Street on the East Side of the Norwalk River. She said that initially they were looking to take a temporary easement. (She showed the Committee the areas, bridge, tracks and aerial view on the smartboard). She said that there is contaminated soil and showed them that area as well.

Mr. Igneri asked if this is vital.

Ms. Burns said that they wanted to use the property as a waste stock pile area and they were given permission. She said that she saw plans where they wanted to put construction work platforms since they already have an access easement through their driveway to get to the property. Ms. Burns said she told them that they couldn't work on the road abutment which is basically Waste Water Treatment Plant property. She said they can't store anything on it which was added to the contract. She said that they have to make sure that the contractors abide by those additional terms. She said that is a temporary easement and she said they proposed a permanent easement (showing property on smartboard).

Mr. Corsello asked what is there now.

Ms. Burns said that they have already condemned the property and now there are condemnation proceeding on them.

Mr. Corsello asked if they have eminent domain proceedings why need an easement.

Ms. Burns answered that the condemnation is for the permanent easement that happened in September/October.

Mr. Corsello asked it's not an outright to take the property it's just to get an easement.

Ms. Burns replied yes.

Mr. Corsello said that he knows what a permanent easement is but he asked if a temporary easement is limited in duration.

Ms. Burns replied it is and it isn't. She said that a temporary easement by Connecticut DOT mind as well be a permanent easement because these projects go on forever and there is always another phase of the project.

Mr. Corsello said that is a real issue because when you're negotiating the price there is a different price for a permanent easement as opposed to temporary easement and if a temporary easement is a permanent easement anyway shouldn't we get the same price.

Mr. Chimento said that they value it the same way.

Ms. Burns said that she spoke with Corporation Counsel and they had appraisals and went back with counter offers to them.

Mr. Corsello asked so if it's not limited in duration basically it's for as long as the project take.

Ms. Burns said that their original offer was like $700,000.00 and then $1,120,000.00.

Mr. Igneri asked if we had appraisals.

Ms. Burns responded yes and they were a little higher, then they added more property. She said that they are getting constrained on the site right now. She said they had to move a lot of the construction materials. She said that the property is condemned and now it is a matter of money.

Mr. Corsello asked if they started the condemnation process to get an easement right.

Ms. Burns answered no it's condemned.

Mr. Corsello said that it is more of a legal issue but basically condemnation. He said you go to court and show that we have a need for it and we get it and the fight is over so then how much.

Ms. Burns said that is where they are.

Mr. Corsello asked if it had actually been condemned.

Ms. Burns replied yes back in September/October.

Mr. Chimento said that they filed the condemnation papers but haven't been to court.

Mr. Corsello said because it is two steps when you go to court, once you file it the court has to agree that it is essential then the question is what conversation.

Ms. Burns said that the Walk Bridge is way bigger than this piece of property and thinks that Corporation Counsel feels that the property is needed for the Walk Bridge.

Mr. Corsello asked what if we don't approve it and it goes to court and then there is two issues, is this actually essential to the construction of the Walk Bridge, maybe it is, maybe it isn't, maybe they don't need everything they are asking for.

Ms. Burns interjected and said that they need more.

Mr. Corsello continued asking what the compensation is for it.

Mr. Burns said that they already taken possession of the property.

Mr. Livingston said if we don't approve it the only recourse is to go to court.

Mr. Corsello said that it could take years.

Ms. Burns said in the meantime they are going to use the property. She said that they want them to get this done on the Walk Bridge property as quickly as possible.

Mr. Corsello asked if it was in their best interest to delay.

Ms. Burns said no.

Mr. Chimento said that they do not think they have enough property so they are going to have to come back.

Ms. Burns said they are going to replace a bridge (showed on smartboard). She said that it is really complicated to replace that bridge. She said to swing the steel out they would have to come onto their property and they can't turn because the Parks building is there. She said they have been telling them that they need more property. Ms. Burns said that they are willing to work with them because it is in the City's best interest to help the project as much as they can to facilitate getting the project done faster.

Mr. Corsello asked if Ms. Prosi had been helpful in trying to convince them what reality is.

Ms. Burns said that they have a lot of other outstanding right-of-way issues. She said there are higher priority right-of-way issues for Ms. Prosi to work on right now. She said that this one came up, the offer came in, Corporation Counsel rejected the offer, then went to condemnation proceedings missing a piece of property they needed. She went over the offers with the Committee. She said that they finally added that to the condemnation and when they received their rebuttal appraisal they took that and added that little piece.

Mr. Corsello asked if they received an appraisal for the little piece.

Ms. Burns responded no but they got back to the appraiser and they just did it on the same square footage basis.

Mr. Livingston said if they had an appraiser look at the addition and didn't see a reason not to put the same price on it effectively.

Ms. Burns said that their appraiser looked at the additional taking of the little pink parcel and applied what the negotiated per square foot would be.

Mr. Corsello said so they are paying our price.

Ms. Burns said that it is in between.

Mr. Corsello said that it is his understanding that they came up with their offer, we came up with ours, and it was compromised in between.

Ms. Burns said including this little piece at value at the same cost per square foot.

Mr. Corsello continued asking if it was two different appraisals, ours and theirs and we compromised in between.

Ms. Burns yes.

Mr. Corsello asked if they offered $386,000 for one of those easements and that seems to be the price.

Mr. Chimento said that was the total amount for that easement $386,000.

Mr. Corsello asked if that was the negotiated amount.

Ms. Burns said that the temporary easement in green they initially offered $350,000.

Mr. Igneri asked if the amount that the Corporation Counsel negotiated was a good offer.

Ms. Burns replied it is a good offer.

Mr. Igneri said that at the end they will accept this but are going to need more property, he asked if there was any property around there they could acquire.

Ms. Burns responded no. She said that they will get the green back but there will be some permanent in the orange area for utilities and they have some plans in regards to expanding the treatment plant which shouldn't be a conflict.

Mr. Igneri asked if Public Works and Corporation Counsel was comfortable with this.

Ms. Burns said that they wanted to give them $705,000 for everything but the pink then it was revised to the 120 including the pink.

Mr. Hempstead asked if the permanent easement was strictly a no build easement.

Ms. Burns responded yes.

Mr. Corsello stated that he understood that you can't construct in anyway.

Mr. Chimento said that after they are finished we could use the areas that they are vacating.

The Committee began to discuss the fees and definition of an easement and how it will be used.

****MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED ITEM 3, 4 AND 5**
****MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING, TO EXECUTE ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE EXECUTION OF THE EASEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NORWALK AND THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR A PERMANENT EASEMENT OF 998± SQUARE FEET TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE YANKEE DOODLE BRIDGE STRUCTURE AS DEPICTED ON A MAP PREPARED BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ENTITLED

"COMPILATION PLAN TOWN OF NORWALK MAP SHOWING EASEMENT ACQUIRED FROM CITY OF NORWALK BY THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REHABILITATION OF BRIDGE NO. 00059 (YANKEE DOODLE BRIDGE) I-95 OVER NORWALK RIVER AND HENDRICKS AVENUE," DATED NOVEMBER 2017, AT A SCALE OF 1" = 20' ON FILE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS IN EXCHANGE FOR A PAYMENT OF $1,050.00.

Mr. Chimento and Ms. Burns explained this item. Ms. Burns informed the Committee of the issues King Industries has with the State. She said that the only way to get to the bridge is through King Industry's property.

Mr. Corsello asked if this was just to repair the bridge and not for the Walk Bridge.

Ms. Burns answered yes.

****MR. IGNERI MOVED THE ITEM**
****MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO EXECUTE CHANGE ORDERS FOR THE GRASSO COMPANIES, LLC PROJECT RD2017-2 CONCRETE CURBS AND SIDEWALKS, FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $162,300.00.

ACCOUNT NO. 09 16 1000 5777 C0536
09 17 1000 5777 C0536
09 18 0910 5777 C0287

Mr. Livingston asked if Grasso has been in terms of performance and zoning violations and compliance.

Mr. Chimento responded that they do not get involved with zoning violations but there performance has been fine and they have no issues other than punch list items.

Mr. Livingston asked if they were still held under the same provisions under the existing contract.

Mr. Chimento replied correct.

Ms. Burns stated that it is just a change order.

Mr. Simms added that he does not support this item because Grasso Companies are not friendly neighbors, continuing to litter their properties and not being respectful to their adjacent neighbors. He said that he is still not convinced that they are compliant. He said for years they have been reorganizing changing their names just so they don't have to pay taxes and if we continue to allow this then we are sending a message to every developer or contractor that it is okay for you not to pay your taxes. He said for those reasons he will not be in support of this item.

Mr. Livingston said that he would like to see by the time the Council meets that they are in compliance with zoning.

****MR. IGNERI MOVED THE ITEM**
****MR. SIMMS AND MR. HEMPSTEAD OPPOSED**
****MOTION PASSED WITH TWO OPPOSITIONS**

INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

A. MONTHLY SOLID WASTE REPORT – NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2017

1. QUARTERLY REPORT - 4TH QUARTER

Mr. Chimento gave a brief report to the Committee.

B. CUSTOMER SERVICE REPORT – DECEMBER 2017/JANUARY 2018

Mr. Chimento gave a brief report to the Committee.

C. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence to report.

D. FY 2018-2019 CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET

Mr. Chimento and Ms. Burns reported on this as the Committee reviewed Mr. Barron's recommendations.

Mr. Chimento said that there are three items that would go together which are paving, sidewalks, and general drainage. He said those are all part of the paving program. He said that South Norwalk and West Avenue require concrete sidewalks and curbs.

Mr. Livingston asked who requires that.

Mr. Chimento replied public works require it in the business district.

Ms. Burns said that overall the department requested 16 million in the capital budget but finance recommends 9 million. She said that it did not fund concrete, sidewalks and curbing at the same level. She said that they need the funding so they can pave the streets.

Mr. Igneri asked if this was the official budget.

Ms. Burns said no but would like to know what their priorities are for public works. She said that she met with Mr. Barron and said that they can move around as long as they don't exceed their last year's 5 year capital request. She said that Mr. Barron funding things that were not asked for.

Mr. Hempstead said that he is not accurate and said that they set the total capital budget. He said that as long as you request it the Council can fund it, so the Council has the authority to move anything as long as you request it. He said that Mr. Barron's comments are misleading.

Mr. Igneri wanted to know if Mr. Hempstead was suggesting that you could take money from one department and give to another.

Ms. Burns said that what Mr. Barron is willing to do with Public Works as a department is set priorities because he blew their priorities out the window by funding things they didn't ask for.

Mr. Livingston asked if they could go back to him and say they don't want certain line items.

Mr. Chimento mentioned that there will be a public hearing tomorrow night at the Planning & Zoning Commission but they will just sit and listen.

Ms. Burns said that she just wanted the Committee's input on the capital budget.

Mr. Livingston asked about the allocated number and if that was a good number.

Ms. Burns said that they had an internal meeting and feel that they can work within those parameters taking some risks. She gave an example regarding the Norwalk River.

Mr. Simms asked if the State is requiring them to build something that separates the condos from the water.

Mr. Chimento replied yes but it is not the State its Federal. He said that is something they have to talk about.

Ms. Burns said that they are making the Committee aware of the liabilities of the City.

The Committee continued to discuss the issues.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there was an updated paving prices.

Ms. Burns said that the PCI (paving condition index) is going up. Ms. Burns said that their issues is drainage and sidewalks are being cut.

Mr. Hempstead asked why the property owner don't fix the sidewalk.

Mr. Chimento said that in the past that when Public Works go in to do the street, they do the sidewalk also. He said that there are certain cases where the sidewalk was in disrepair they ordered the property owner to fix it and they did then couple years later Public Works redid the street and the owner came back and wanted to be reimbursed for fixing the sidewalk. He said but usually when we come in to repair a street they will replace the sidewalk if needed.

Mr. Simms said that he thought they automatically replaced the sidewalk.

Mr. Chimento replied only if needed.

Mr. Igneri asked how much more money would you need for the budget.

Ms. Burns replied that they are just looking for priorities from Public Works Committee as they retour their budget before it goes to the Mayor based on Bob Barron's recommendations.

Mr. Livingston said that he noticed the Norwalk River Valley Trail was cut out and would like to see it put back in.

Ms. Burns said that a high priority is East Avenue Road Reconstruction Project, she said that there is an opportunity to change how East Avenue looks by putting the utilities underground from exit 16 to Van Zant. She said that would really open up that corridor and increase property values. She said they asked for more money for that.

Mr. Livingston said that East Avenue was a big deal a few years ago.

Ms. Burns said that they need the capital funds to match that. She said that they may not need the funds until 2022. She said that the City is interested in making Glover Avenue a TOD.

Mr. Simms asked about the improvements on Ely Avenue

Ms. Burns responded that it is the Nathaniel Ely School.

Mr. Igneri asked if they were uncomfortable with the budget.

Mr. Chimento said yes and we will give you a list.

E. FY 2018-2019 OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET

Ms. Burns went over the operating budget. There were no questions or issues to discuss.

UPCOMING PROJECTS

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 3, 2018 in Room 225.

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

There was no further business and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Monique Cipriano
Executive Assistant
Public Works Department