



Operations Committee - Board of Representatives

Jonathan Jacobson, Chair

John Zelinsky, Jr., Vice Chair

Committee Report

Date: Tuesday, February 26, 2019

Time: 6:30 p.m.

Place: Republican Caucus Room, 4th Floor, Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard

The Operations Committee met as indicated above. In attendance were Chair Jacobson, Vice Chair Zelinsky and Committee Member Reps. Coleman, Lee, Mahoney, Sherwood, Spadaccini and Watkins. Also present were Reps. de la Cruz and Stella; Thomas Turk, Road Maintenance; Bharat Gami, Chief Building Official; Dana Lee, Law Department; Mark McGrath, Director of Operations; Michael Pollard, Chief of Staff; Jonathan Gottlieb, Rippowam Corporation; Leslie Pollner and Lisa Barkovic, Holland and Knight; Laura Burwick, Special Assistant to the Mayor; Lou Casolo, City Engineer; Robin Stein, Special Assistant to the Mayor; and Jay Costello, WMC Consulting Engineers.

Chair Jacobson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Item No.	Description	Invitee(s) or Designee(s)
1. O30.032	REVIEW; City Response to November Snowstorm. 12/05/18 – Submitted by Rep. Zelinsky 12/10/18 – Moved to Pending 01/29/19 – Report Made and Held by Committee 4-1-0	REPORT MADE

Mr. Turk responded to Mr. Zelinsky's written questions:

- The City pays Connecticut Weather for weather forecasting; they also use News 12, Channel and other forecasts to get rounded forecasts. This includes the NWS; CT Weather is the official weather
- The last report that the City received at 3 pm only stated snow this afternoon turning to sleet at 5 pm; there was no start time indicated
- The prediction was 2 inches of snow (this was a bad forecast)
- The snow actually started at around 3:30 pm.
- The snow plows went out around 2:30 p.m. In the morning, they converted the trucks from leaf pick up to snow, had lunch and then went out proactively before the snow started
- The City has 34 snow routes mapped out throughout the City. The drivers were sent to their routes
- The streets were treated with dry salt, as is typical
- The official end to the snow event was 12 pm the next day
- The City's does not plow West Main Street because it is a state road; the City was at Palmer's Hill Road at 2:51 pm and 3:01 p.m. and salted the road before the snow started

2. [O30.035](#) REVIEW; City of Stamford's 2019 Leaf Collection Process. **HELD 7-0-0**
01/03/19 – Submitted by Reps. Jacobson and Watkins
01/29/19 – Held by Committee 9-0-0

A motion to hold this item was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-0-0 (Reps. Jacobson, Zelinsky, Coleman, Mahoney, Sherwood, Spadaccini and Watkins in favor).

3. [O30.037](#) REVIEW; Meeting With City's Federal Lobbyist, Holland & Knight, to Discuss Outlook for Federal Infrastructure Funding and Process of Securing Grants. **REPORT MADE**
01/23/19 – Submitted by Pres. Quinones and Michael Pollard

Mr. Pollard explained that much of the financial benefit received from the federal government relates to the Operations Department. Mr. Pollard, Ms. Pollner and Ms. Barkovic reviewed the [attached presentation](#) with the Committee.

Holland & Knight identifies opportunities, and the department and the Grants Office are then involved in the application process. Holland & Knight discusses department needs with the departments in order to look for opportunities. Committee members requested a list of grants being examined.

4. [O30.038](#) RESOLUTION; Potential Exemptions from building Permit Fees For Non-Profits And Affordable Housing Developments. **REPORT MADE & NO ACTION TAKEN**
02/05/19 – Submitted by Rep. Jacobson and Zelinsky

Chair Jacobson noted that the Committee does not currently have a resolution. The Law Department has said that the Board can enact such a resolution. Committee members discussed this possibility with Ms. Burwick, Mr. Gami and Mr. Gottlieb, as follows:

- The current increases go into effect on May 1st
- It gets complicated to have something go into effect after July 1st that credits back
- The Charter Oak proposal would impact very few proposals, since it is limited to projects where more than half the units are affordable, as provided in deed restrictions and fee-in-lieu restrictions
- The reduction could apply solely to projects with long-term affordability
- The resolution should specify that the charge should be \$16.50 per 1000 ft²
- Would this apply to all non-profits? Only to affordable housing developments? It would help the Building Department to keep this simple
- Some affordable housing is built by for-profit entities
- Maybe the threshold should be lowered in order to encourage affordable housing
- Affordable housing would need to be defined
- Often developments funded by low income housing tax credits have multiple tiers of affordability based on area median income; the HUD definition of AMI for Stamford is \$143,899 for a family of 4
- Should the prior resolution be amended?
- Much affordable housing is rehabilitation of older units
- Language should be submitted prior to Steering

- Who will be responsible for determining if a project is eligible? There would probably have to be a mechanism as part of the zoning process
- Would it need a public hearing if the original resolution were modified?

5. [O30.029](#) REVIEW; Results of completion of Phase I of **Report Made**
[agreement between City of Stamford and Wengall, McDonnell & Costello, Inc.](#) Regarding West Main Street Pedestrian Bridge ([O30.016](#)).
 11/23/18 – Submitted by Rep. McMullen
 12/10/18 – Moved to Pending

Mr. Casolo, Mr. Stein and Mr. Costello reviewed the [attached presentation](#) with the Committee.

- The contract was broken into 2 phases, the first phase was on a cost plus basis not to exceed \$98,000 to answer 1) what is it going to cost and 2) can the structure support an emergency vehicle?
- This is not about the approach to the bridge
- Landscaping and planters add weight to the bridge, which is what they are concerned about at this point (a landscape engineer will determine the actual plantings)
- Utilities will need to be resupported
- The cost difference based upon the analysis done in Phase 1 is \$335,494, so the total cost of the structure is estimated at \$1.5 million.
- Sec. 4 gives the City the ability to award the next phase of the work
- The structure is deteriorating quickly and is closed whenever there is a significant rain event
- It is complicated to relocate some of the utility cables, especially because some are very old
- This plan will be able to support 14,000 lbs, they did not analyze the maximum weight the bridge can carry
- The reconstructed bridge would survive a “100 year storm”
- Some of the structural parts of the bridge were in worse condition than expected
- There will be some removal of lead paint
- The center pier is deteriorating rapidly; if it were to deteriorate significantly, that would affect the estimate
- The Administration has not sent down an item for approval of the Board of Phase II
- The estimate in 2014 was for a total replacement of the bridge, and so is not relevant to this project, which is attempting to keep as much of the bridge as possible; this proposal is the same project as in August 2018. The new estimate is based upon more detailed evaluation; the scope of the project has remained the same
- The design is anticipates as many pedestrians as it can hold as well as plantings
- This work will be bid publicly; this report is only a cost estimate

Chair Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
 Jonathan Jacobson, Chair

This meeting is on [video](#)