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 5, 2019

ATTENDANCE: John Igneri, Chairman; Thomas Livingston; Doug Hempstead; George Tsiranides; Eloisa Melendez; Darlene Young

STAFF: Lisa Burns, Acting Director of Public Works; Paul Sotnik, Acting Assistant Principal Engineer; Ralph Kolb, WPCA

OTHERS: Jody Proct, Diane Lauricella, Tony Farina

The meeting was called to order at 6:56 p.m. A quorum was present.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Igneri welcomed everyone and went over the public input item on the agenda. He asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak.

Ms. Jody Proct of 1 Naramake Avenue, off of Woodward Avenue, stated that within the last year they have had an excessive amount of flooding and not from the Sound, but from Woodward Avenue. She said that she understands that there has been a lot of rain, but a car cannot drive down the street because the water from Woodward Avenue was up to her house and she lives on the other end. She has spoken to neighbors that have lived there for over 20 years and they have never seen it flood like that from that direction. She said that she is thinking that maybe it is a sewer or a drainage problem and was hoping that DPW could look into the problem. She said that it is the entire area that is flooded and it is hard to see where the road ends and the curbs are hard to see as well. She said it just fills up like a lake and she is unsure if it is salt water or rain water that is coming up. Ms. Proct said that during the Nor'easter in October, the water from Woodward was coming up the street faster than it was coming from the Sound and she had to wait it out because she couldn't drive her car out of it.

Mr. Igneri stated that the Committee will take what is said under advisement.

Ms. Diane Lauricella stated that she would like to give her input on some of the agenda items. She stated that she is still reviewing the operating and capital budget requests and wanted the Committee to consider the possibility and need to electrify the City's fleet management. She said that other cities and towns are doing such and since the capital budget is a five year outlook, she would like to see a little more effort. Ms. Lauricella said that she had spoken with Mr. Alvord and he seemed dismissive to the idea. She said she asked about the trucks and having them run on energy sources other than fossil fuel. She spoke about solar panels for fuel and/or energy. She said she would like to have a conversation with Mr. Livingston. She said she was thrilled to see that Stormwater Management was on the capital budget and infrastructure will be something that is integrated within the next five years and she hopes to send everyone a packet on some of the measures that can be used. Ms. Lauricella said that in regards to the operating budget, she has asked before that the public be included in some kind of discussion on what they are looking for in a chief. She said that it is a very public position so the public should be a part of it since it is a very large part of the operating budget. She said she met with the Mayor and Ms. Burns and others on optimizing trash reduction and increasing recycling and possibly using options other towns are currently using. She said she was recently appointed to the Recycle CT and they have major grants making processes that would allow for towns like Norwalk to apply, which she would recuse herself should Norwalk apply. She said she thinks that the recycling rate is flat and it is not dead. She said they need to look at their waste streams and see how they can reduce them, reuse things and encourage through education. Ms. Lauricella said that she has followed trucks and has seen the trucks with these arms that dump the recycling and they are not able to see the plastic bag filled with garbage. She said she believes there is a lot more contamination than she is being told and she feels they will never really know due to the type of contract the City has with City Carting. She said the time has come to reduce the contamination in the recycling program, educate the public to reduce the trash and increase recycling.

Mr. Igneri thanked the speakers and closed the public input at 7:05p.m. He then opened the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR THE FREEHOLDER’S REPORT AND ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON SAID REPORT FOR THE ABANDONMENT/DISCONTINUANCE OF A PORTION OF STEVENS STREET BEGINNING AT THE EASTERLY BOUNDARY OF THE CITY PROPERTY LOCATED AT 340 WEST AVENUE (TAX LOT 1-8-15-0) AND HEADING WEST TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF THE CITY PROPERTY LOCATED AT 350 WEST AVENUE (TAX LOT 1-8-39-0) AS DEPICTED ON A MAP PREPARED BY RYAN AND FAULDS LAND SURVEYORS, A REDNISS & MEAD COMPANY ENTITLED “PROPERTY SURVEY ABANDONMENT MAP OF A PORTION OF STEVENS STREET, NORWALK, CONNECTICUT,” DATED OCTOBER 4, 2018, AT A SCALE OF 1” = 20’ ON FILE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS INDICATING SAID PORTION OF STEVENS STREET TO BE ABANDONED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING CITY PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 340 WEST AVENUE AND 350 WEST AVENUE. THE PUBLIC HEARING SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ORDER TO HEAR ALL PARTIES INTERESTED IN COMMENTING ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF SUCH REPORT, DETERMINE IF THE FREEHOLDER’S REPORT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CITY AND TO TAKE SUCH ACTION ON SAID REPORT THAT THE COMMITTEE MAY DEEM ADVISABLE. THE PUBLIC HEARING IS SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2019 AT 7:00 P.M. IN ROOM 225, 2ND FLOOR IN NORWALK CITY HALL, 125 EAST AVENUE, NORWALK, CT.

Mr. Sotnik reported on this item by reading the item in its entirety at the request of Mr. Igneri.

Mr. Igneri asked if there were any comments about the Public Hearing which there were not. He then asked Mr. Sotnik to explain the Freeholder's recommendation.

Mr. Sotnik read the recommendation to the Committee.

Mr. Igneri called the public hearing to a close at approximately 7:16p.m. and officially opened the agenda with New Business.

NEW BUSINESS

1. APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2019.

There was no discussion on this item.

****MS. MELENDEZ MOVED THE ITEM**
****MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

2. AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING TO EXECUTE ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY ("FEMA") AND THE NORWALK WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY ("WPCA") IN CONNECTION A FEMA GRANT APPLICATION TITLED "CITY OF NORWALK FIVE MILE RIVER PUMP STATION UPGRADE-PDM2018". THIS GRANT IS FOR PROJECT COSTS OF 75% ($135,000.00) FEMA FUNDS AND 25% ($45,000.00) WPCA FUNDS.

3. AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING TO EXECUTE ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY ("FEMA") AND THE NORWALK WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY ("WPCA") IN CONNECTION A FEMA GRANT APPLICATION TITLED "CITY OF NORWALK FIVE MILE RIVER PUMP STATION UPGRADE-FMA2018". THIS GRANT IS FOR PROJECT COSTS OF 75% ($135,000.00) FEMA FUNDS AND 25% ($45,000.00) WPCA FUNDS.

4. AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING TO EXECUTE ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY ("FEMA") AND THE NORWALK WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY ("WPCA") IN CONNECTION A FEMA GRANT APPLICATION TITLED "CITY OF NORWALK KEELER BROOK PUMP STATION UPGRADE-PDM2018". THIS GRANT IS FOR PROJECT COSTS OF 75% ($2,250,000.00) FEMA FUNDS AND 25% ($750,000.00) WPCA FUNDS.

5. AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, HARRY W. RILLING TO EXECUTE ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY ("FEMA") AND THE NORWALK WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY

("WPCA") IN CONNECTION A FEMA GRANT APPLICATION TITLED "CITY OF NORWALK KEELER BROOK PUMP STATION UPGRADE-FMA2018". THIS GRANT IS FOR PROJECT COSTS OF 75% ($2,250,000.00) FEMA FUNDS AND 25% ($750,000.00) WPCA FUNDS.

Mr. Igneri reported on these items. He stated that items 2, 3, 4 and 5 will be discussed together. Mr. Igneri then gave the floor to Mr. Kolb.

Mr. Kolb explained the items. He stated that the WPCA is applying for two (2) grants, the Five Mile Pump Station and the Keeler Brook Pump Station.

Mr. Hempstead asked if the letter regarding the grants stated that there was only 2.4 million available overall.

Mr. Kolb explained that the letter is saying it is a $5 million project for both. He said they could apply for $3 million for Keeler Brook and at 75% that would get them $2.25 million and $180,000 for Five Mile at 75% would get them $135,000 so the total grant that WPCA could receive is about $2.4 million. He said so instead of WPCA paying out $5 million, they could potentially gain $2.4 million in grant funds from FEMA.

Mr. Livingston asked if this is something that needs to be done with or without the grant.

Mr. Kolb responded yes. He said that Keeler Brook is scheduled for rehabilitation. He said it is in a flood zone or flood way which means they can't have anything electrical above grade so they are going to move the station so it is outside of the flood way, it would still be in the 100 year flood location but they could build all electrical above ground and that way if they do have a 100 year flood the pump station would still be able to operate in flood conditions.

Mr. Livingston asked about the timing in regards to the work they want done through the grant.

Mr. Kolb said they are in the preliminary design phase right now. He said they just completed a survey on Keeler Brook for the relocation of the pump station. He said that Five Mile is just a rehabilitation of the station and as soon as they get the grant they are looking to add mitigation, flood gates and hatches so if the area floods the station will still operate.

Ms. Young asked what would happen if they did not get the grant.

Mr. Kolb said they would still move along with the pump station project. He said they have $2.3 million in pump station capital for WPCA and requested $2.7 million this year which has already gone through the planning process.

Ms. Burns stated that normally these WPCA items would flow directly through their board but because of the FEMA grant, Corporation Counsel thought it was more appropriate for the Mayor to sign the grant applications than for the Chairman of the WPCA.

Mr. Hempstead asked if each one of those items are a $2.5 million grant and is that a total of $5 million.

Mr. Kolb answered no $2.4 million is the total.

Mr. Hempstead said that it reads that each one is $2.4 million in grants.

Mr. Kolb said that there are two (2) different grants that they applied for at each pump station. He said that there is not going to be any more than $2.4 million combined.

Mr. Hempstead said he is more confused because one (1) says $2.5 million and the other says $2.5 million.

Mr. Kolb responded correct.

Mr. Hempstead then asked if that is a $5 million grant together.

Mr. Kolb responded no. He said the two (2) grants together will not exceed $2.4 million.

Mr. Igneri said that there are a number of other pump stations that need to be upgraded, is there a plan for those.

Mr. Kolb responded yes. He said they completed a capital improvement study with their consultant and learned about Keeler Brook. He said they have made improvements to the Marvin Beach Pump Station. He said they are working on punch list items right now. Mr. Kolb said they are currently making improvements at the Westport Pump Station and Fort Point Pump Station. He said they are just following their recommended capital programs and there are a total of 22 wastewater and three (3) stormwater pump stations.

****MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED ITEMS 2, 3, 4, AND 5**
****MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. APPROVE THE ABANDONMENT/DISCONTINUANCE OF A PORTION OF STEVENS STREET BEGINNING AT THE EASTERLY BOUNDARY OF THE CITY PROPERTY LOCATED AT 340 WEST AVENUE (TAX LOT 1-8-15-0) AND HEADING WEST TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF THE CITY PROPERTY LOCATED AT 350 WEST AVENUE (TAX LOT 1-8-39-0) AS DEPICTED ON A MAP PREPARED BY RYAN AND FAULDS LAND SURVEYORS, A REDNISS & MEAD COMPANY ENTITLED "PROPERTY SURVEY ABANDONMENT MAP OF A PORTION OF STEVENS STREET, NORWALK, CONNECTICUT," DATED OCTOBER 4, 2018, AT A SCALE OF 1" = 20' ON FILE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS INDICATING SAID PORTION OF STEVENS STREET TO BE ABANDONED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING CITY PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 340 WEST AVENUE AND 350 WEST AVENUE SUBJECT TO AN EASEMENT FOR THE EXISTING NORWALK RIVER VALLEY MULTI-PURPOSE TRAIL.

Mr. Sotnik reported on this. He read the item and there were no questions or comments.

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

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

Mr. Sotnik reported on this. He read the item and there were no questions or comments.

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

INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

A. Discussion

1. FY 2019/2020 Operating & Capital Budget Request

Ms. Burns reported on this item. She gave a brief overview of the budget request. She said that there was a planning meeting last week regarding the budgets. The Finance Department's recommendation is out and is currently online. The Operating Budget has been reduced due to the reorganization and positions were moved. The overall operating budget is much smaller than previous years.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there was a line item in the budget to get rid of leaves.

Ms. Burns said that it is not just one line, they have contracts to get rid of the leaves, Christmas trees, construction and demolition debris, dredging and catch basins cleaning and the leaves are composted and brought to Easton. She asked Mr. Hempstead if he wanted to know the volume or just the costs and she will provide him with that information.

Ms. Young asked how much was the operating budget reduced.

Ms. Burns said that last year's request was $14,931,000 and this year it is $14,917,000 but if you look line by line you would be able to see the differences. She said they have had a Junior Engineer position vacant since last July and have made four (4) offers, but have not been able to get a candidate because it has been a difficult for the salary. She said they have offered at the mid-point salary range but to no avail. Applicants that have applied don't meet the qualifications because the job market is very competitive right now and the geography. She said they hired Rob last year from Tighe & Bond and may need to hire another inspector for this season. There are a lot of City projects going on, and in addition there are State projects as well. There are a bunch of projects that are out to bid right now. She said they need to bring in someone since they are down one (1) Junior Engineer. She began to discuss the Capital Budget. She said the 5 year Capital Budget Request is $76,800,000 which is consistent with previous years. She said everything is a priority. The Capital Budget was developed based on their professional recommendation of what a City of 90,000 people need at a minimum to invest in its infrastructure. Finance recommended 9.7 million.

Mr. Livingston asked if the budget was reduced by 8 million.

Ms. Burns responded yes and it is consistent with last year when they requested about the same amount of funds and the Council approved $8,900,000. She said that the budget director worked with them on the budget.

Mr. Tsiranides asked if Ms. Burns was comfortable with the projects that will be picked and those that would not be picked this year.

Ms. Burns replied that they hired Freeman, the engineering firm to do the bridge inspections, $250,000 for the bridge inspections, but they do not know what the cost would be to repair those bridges. Based upon the results of the inspections.

Mr. Livingston asked about street light conversion spans.

Ms. Burns said that they asked for it to be phased.

Mr. Livingston asked what the payback is for that.

Mr. Sotnik said about two (2) to three (3) years, but conservatively it maybe four (4) years, no more than five (5).

Mr. Igneri said they have been talking about doing that for a while and asked if they are at a point where they could move forward.

Ms. Burns responded yes. She said they made a request for $1.7 million but after submitting the request they were asked if they could smooth it out and phase it over a longer period of time. Mr. Sotnik received a proposal from the company.

Mr. Sotnik interjected that the proposal was for the design work and it maybe $75,000.

Mr. Livingston asked if they are replacing the heads.

Mr. Sotnik responded yes. He said they will get the design phase completed and pick out the fixtures, receive a more detailed audit then go back and negotiate with Eversource and then begin the construction phase and change them out.

Mr. Livingston asked if Eversource offers a rebate.

Mr. Sotnik responded yes they are and there are talks now about what those could be, because it varies. He said the only way to guarantee the rebate is to do it now because it can change depending upon available funds.

Ms. Young said that $9.7 million is half of what was requested then asked how would you prioritize on what gets funded.

Mr. Hempstead responded by taking $1 million out of the paving program.

The Committee began to discuss a project on the intersection of Glover Avenue and Grist Mill. The Bonding Commission authorized a $7 million bond toward the project. It is still very conceptual and the Department of Transportation has done the preliminary design work.

Mr. Igneri asked if the project is still very conceptual, will they be spending $1 million in this budget.

Ms. Burns answered that it is a topic of discussion that they are going to have with the Department of Transportation this week. Ms. Burns began to go through the requested budget with the Committee. She stated that it is available online.

Mr. Livingston asked what they are dredging.

Ms. Burns said that they are required to dredge the big outlet pipes at Total Marine and Norwest Marine as requested. She began to discuss the process at Total Marine. She said that it is an obligation the City has. She said it does not reduce the flooding on Water Street which is a separate issue. Ms. Burns went on the next subject of ROW (Right of Way). She stated that ROW needs a policy because every fiber and utility company wants to be on the streets which currently has sanitary, sewer, gas, phone, cable and now even more than that. The City does not want to clog up the ROW with all of those utilities. She said that although Companies may feel they have a right to be in the ROW, they do not without permission and permits from DPW.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there was a policy already out there in regards to this, DOT must have something.

Ms. Burns replied that they could not locate a policy on ROW because they are a municipality and the regulations are different from DOT's.

Mr. Igneri inquired about a project that Eversource has going on at the bus depot (school buses).

Ms. Burns said that Eversource has a vault in that location and they need to have access for maintenance. The City requested police presence because the buses were parked on top of the vault. Eversource has an easement on that property so when they access the easement, the buses had to be moved. Eversource secured a space across the street and the police assisted the drivers with crossing the street.

Ms. Young asked if the $9.7 million is the total amount for the budget.

Ms. Burns explained that the total bonding has been set for the City so it's working within this budget and the only way to increase Public Works bucket is to take from another department's bucket.

Mr. Igneri stated that this year's budget increased almost a million and asked if that helped.

Ms. Burns replied yes. She said that they are having to do a lot of special capital appropriations. She began to explain the watercourse maintenance stating it is for the flooding issue and they didn't ask for funding because they already have approximately $2 million due to the special capital appropriation. She said that stormwater management is the MS4 Program which is the municipal separated storm system, a permit program which is not for flooding. She said that this is to comply with requirements for the stormwater management program. An analysis was completed by Environmental Partners. Next year, a request will be made for $1 million for watercourse maintenance.

2. Recycling and Automated Garbage Collection

Mr. Tony Farina of City Carting gave an overview of recycling and automated garbage collection. He stated that he has been in discussions with Mr. Chimento and Mr. Torre for the past year on upgrading the solid waste collection and enhancing the recycling program. He said from a solid waste standpoint going to automated collection which is similar to what they do for Norwalk, put out wheel carts for all residents in the taxing district which increases the appearance, so it's all uniform and manages solid waste generation. He continued saying if you give a home owner a cart they may try to put all of their waste into one (1) cart thus reducing waste. He said if a home owner needs a second cart, there is an opportunity to enhance and increase fees. Mr. Farina said that City Carting would invest in a truck, one arm collection trucks and to decide who would purchase the carts for the residents, City Carting or the City.

Mr. Farina said the second piece is to enhance the recycling program. He said that the recycling market has changed drastically over the last 12 to 18 months. Recycling collection is changing. He said that single stream has been a common practice over the last 10 to 15 years and now towns are going back to dual stream which means fiber collection on one (1) day and other things on a different day. He said that towns were also looking to eliminate certain products from the recycling program such as certain

types of plastics which are difficult to get rid of, for example plastic bags. Towns are also reducing and eliminating glass and trying to enhance bottle bills or the product generators to take the bottles back. He said they began several conversations then the Director retired so he is trying to pick those conversations back up with Mr. Torre and Ms. Burns and the new team. He said they have a lot of suggestions to offer and this is a general discussion about some of the things that were discussed in the past. He said those conversations would entail capital investments and changing the recycling program. He said better education is true. To enhance a recycling program is to reduce, reuse and recycle. Residents have the reuse component and the collectors have the recycle component and then you move forward to the producers/packaging companies to come out with a reduction in the amount of product that they generate so consumers could buy less which means the consumers reuse less and they recycle less.

Ms. Burns asked about the wheeled carts and the issue Norwalk has with residents putting plastic bags in them although the ordinance doesn't allow for that, what would be some of the benefits of wheeled carts.

Mr. Farina said that some of the benefits are they would all be uniformed, minimize and manage how much garbage is put out there.

Mr. Livingston asked how big they are now.

Mr. Farina answered they are 64 gallon and they seem to be working well from a recycling standpoint. He said if they decided to go with the dual program, it would be every other week with two (2) carts for recycling, either two (2) 32 gallon or two (2) 64 gallon and one week will be all fiber and one week the other things and would be wheeled out every other week.

Mr. Livingston asked what he means by fiber.

Mr. Farina answered fiber meaning newspapers, junk mail, card board boxes and cereal boxes. He said single stream was great for increasing recycling generation, but it caused contamination because people do not clean out the containers as well as they should so it causes contamination on the fiber which degrades the fiber. He said that was coupled with the overseas market where most of their material goes, increasing their quality standards so they went from a 5% contamination rate down to a 0.5% contamination rate. He said that China has made drastic changes going from a GDP economic generated philosophy to a quality of life. China is trying to clean up their environment so they are reducing the amount of product coming in.

Mr. Livingston said that part of this is education and asked if City Carting educates the public.

Mr. Farina said that Ms. Lauricella made a good point about the automation on recycling component because you don't have a chance to look in the bin. He said they support education and the State of Connecticut provides some guidance and direction on education. He said it is a long term process. They went from three (3) bins of product

to just one (1) bin where everyone just comingles. He said that people ignore rules and regulations and put as much as they can into the big bins. It's a process of education and it will take a while, but it can be done.

Mr. Livingston asked about composting.

Mr. Farina replied that they do a little composting, but the challenge is that there is not a lot of outlets for that material, but it is great that it is separated. He said that they have a small contract with a company that does a very good job of composting, but once again it is an education process.

Mr. Tsiranides asked if there is a bigger market for clean products.

Mr. Farina said they are finding that they are getting better product when they go back to dual stream to start with because newspaper and junk mail is coming in clean. He said they have one of the state of the art facilities in the Northeast over in Stamford which is a $15 million facility, which gives them a better ability to clean the materials that comes through dual stream than single stream so when the fiber goes up the line by itself, they could pick it out better and the screens and optical sensors do a better job when it is only fiber and additionally, when the set up comingles, the same thing happens. It is easier for the system to clean it up.

Ms. Burns said that the current contract for recycling and solid waste ends in 2023. She said that the carts are not in the budget this year. She asked Mr. Farina how long he thinks it would take to get a program in place and should it be in the budget before the contract ends.

Mr. Farina suggested doing it before the contract expires. He said that it would take probably 120 days to ramp up with equipment, trucks and carts.

Mr. Livingston said he assumes they are losing money on the contract.

Mr. Farina responded that they break even on the trash collection/solid waste and they are losing on the recycling so that needs to be adjusted.

Mr. Hempstead asked for an explanation on plastic bags and their collection process. He asked about water bottles that are plastic and when you buy them, they are sealed in plastic, do you put that plastic in with the recyclables.

Mr. Farina responded that plastic is difficult to collect, difficult to run through the lines and there is no product for that film. He said they call that film and there is not a big market for that.

Mr. Hempstead asked so should that be garbage.

Mr. Farina said that a lot of towns and the State of Connecticut are banning plastic bags.

Mr. Hempstead said so the plastic bags are a market issue because there are products made out of plastic bags.

Mr. Farina said for example, glass is recycled, but it costs them money to collect and process it. He said they invested about ½ million on a glass cleaning system so when the glass comes out it is actually a lot cleaner then it was a year ago and it still cost $34/ton to get it recycled. So it is costing approximately $100/ton to recycle glass. He said that there are towns that are banning glass.

Mr. Livingston asked what he sees as the next biggest problem.

Mr. Farina answered that most towns are going to go with dual stream programs instead of single stream. He said that most people are taking a proactive approach and getting rid of plastic bags. He said he met with Senator Duff who had a lot of the similar questions and told him that they have to start with the producers because he is putting the onus on the consumer and the collectors and making them handle all the problems when it is really the producers problem. He said there was a meeting in New York and there was serious talk about reusing wine bottles and getting the wine bottlers to take their product back and reuse them. Mr. Farina said that there would be a cost associated with that. He continued that paper, cardboard boxes, certain plastics are very recyclable, but glass is difficult to get rid of and there is not enough demand for that material.

Mr. Livingston asked about Styrofoam.

Mr. Farina said that Styrofoam is not recyclable.

Mr. Hempstead asked if milk cartons were still ok.

Mr. Farina said aseptic milk cartons have a small market for them and they do process them. He said that it is better to get milk jugs.

Mr. Tsiranides asked if any of the neighboring cities switched over.

Mr. Farina said not in Connecticut. He said they have been working to change the way they collect. He said they need to go back to the consumers to start with, and then get with the producers and reduce what comes out.

Ms. Melendez asked why dual stream wasn’t suggested for Norwalk.

Mr. Farina said that it probably was dual at one time.

Ms. Burns responded that it was more advantageous at that point to go with single stream, it was a different market then.

Mr. Farina said that single stream began in the early 90's because it was simpler and increased the volume of recyclables. He said they are finding out that the market changed

and the products they are getting are not just recyclable products, it is also garbage so that is why the volume is so much.

Ms. Burns stated that in the contract, they get paid $17.50/ton for recyclables and now the tip fee is $80 or $90 per ton. She said at the transfer station they charge $86/ton but by 2023 the contract will go up and they will be paying $97/ton.

Mr. Livingston asked what Stamford is paying.

Mr. Farina answered $65/ton and a small revenue share as well.

Mr. Hempstead asked what can and cannot be recycled and are there other items that could possibly make money.

Mr. Farina said keys and pots and pans are not recyclable.

The Committee began to discuss all the things they can and cannot recycle. They discussed a metal program and how it works, compostable and curbside pickup. Education seemed to be the theme of recycling beginning with the schools and possibly at City Hall. They talked about glass and ridged plastics such as paint barrels being things that should not be in the recycling program.

Mr. Igneri thanked Mr. Farina for his time and presentation and stated they would like to have more conversations.

Mr. Farina stated that he spoke with the former director about an education program at the transfer station.

Mr. Igneri said there would be smaller meetings about this in the future.

Ms. Burns said there were discussions with the Mayor's Office and Diane Lauricella about creating a steering committee to discuss these issues.

B. CUSTOMER SERVICE REPORT JANUARY 2019

There was no discussion on this item.

C. MONTHLY SOLID WASTE REPORT – DECEMBER 2018

1. FOURTH QUARTER 2018 REPORT

There was no discussion on this item.

UPCOMING PROJECTS

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 5, 2019
Public Works Committee Meeting
7:00 P.M. Room 225, Norwalk City Hall

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

There was no further business and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Monique Cipriano
Executive Assistant
Public Works Department