

Public Information Meeting on Activities at the Public Works Yard to be held June 23, 2016 at 7pm
Neighborhood response to materials provided

We are seeking additional information / clarifications on the following:

- 1) Clarify inconsistencies with RFP and current practices, notably in scope of services (pp5-6)
 - a) Reduction of max height to 30 feet by Dec 15, 2014
 - ⇒ ***Please clarify (i) current pile height and (ii) pile height per RFP***
 - b) Operating hours indicated from Mon – Fri (7am -3:30) March 15 – Dec 15.
 - ⇒ ***Explain why routine practice extends beyond 3:30 and into weekends***
 - ⇒ ***Provide approvals from Dir of Public Works for extension of these hours.***
 - c) 6,000 cubic yards per year maximum allowed from outside entities
 - ⇒ ***Provide records the town keeps to ensure compliance with the limit***
 - d) The Proposal must address dust control and minimize noise from each aspect of the operations. This includes storage, crushing, screening and transporting the materials.
 - ⇒ ***What are specific limits***
 - ⇒ ***What records does the town keep to ensure compliance with these limits***
 - e) Installation of hay bales or wood chips to prevent contaminated water runoff from all boundaries and access roads (addendum).
 - f) Process to reject material unsuitable for processing (e.g. large concrete that requires excessive crushing).
 - ⇒ ***We've seen large concrete on the top of the pile. What process is in place to prevent this?***
 - g) Process to monitor and reject hazardous and contaminated materials.
 - h) Process to ensure compliance with all federal, state and local regulations.
- 2) There are multiple examples of non-compliance with above.
 - ⇒ ***What steps are taken to resolve***
 - ⇒ ***What are the penalties***
- 3) What was the 2012 through 2016 to date annual volume of product brought to the site and the volume removed?
- 4) What is the industry standard and/or regulated grade for the materials now on site by product type, and what are the actual current grades? Have there been any washouts, material slides, etc.?
- 5) From the Osprey reports, please clarify the following:
 - a) The Recommendations & Conclusions section (p.9) includes several bullet points that might be better described as observations. Does Osprey offer any Recommendations? Any Conclusions?
 - b) Clarify whether the operations are grandfathered from environmental regulations (the statement from Osprey was vague on this point).
 - c) What is meant that the site did not appear to meet the definition of an “Establishment” under the Transfer Act?
 - d) Are there any risks associated with Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), possibly as deep as 20' that was intended to be recycled?

- e) Given there were significant data gaps concerning the composition and depth of the base municipal solid waste layer as well as fill material, what is being done to address? Was a core sample taken?
 - f) What are implications, if any, of parcel being partially within an identified Natural Diversity Database area, within a hurricane Category 4 surge zone, and within the “coastal boundary”?
 - g) Documentation reviewed did not indicate that hazardous wastes had been generated on-site. What were the specifics of this review? Visual walk-through?
 - h) It’s indication that there are no operational limits for noise contradicts the explicit language in the RFP (see above). What explains this?
- 6) Stormwater infrastructure:
- a) Status of DEEP citation for registering/complying with storm water Permit? Was the recently installed sedimentation basin in response to the citation?
 - b) Status of Stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for the Site (Osprey’s note indicates it was under review by Julian)?
- 7) Request for 12 most recent weekly erosion and sediment control reports and explanation of any adjustments made since inception of the agreement with Julian.
- 8) Provide contact person at the conservation department on this matter and status of most recent discussions.
- 9) Was the contract with Julian renewed? If so,
- a) Was there an operational and financial review (if so, please provide)?
 - b) What are the payment terms and charges to the Town for product?
 - c) When was the renewal issued?
 - d) For what time period?

Please provide timing for the following open information requests:

- 10) Research by town of CT DEEP files to determine if location of the recycling is capped or lined.
- 11) Clarification on core soil sample results and implications.
- 12) Specific recommendations on testing protocols (expanded water parameters (e.g. include pH, sulfates, calcium, and nitrates), air borne contaminants) from Osprey. If they recommend against testing above, please have them provide rationale.
- 13) Status / next steps with Christopher Allan (Land Tech).

Updated: June 23, 2016