

RTM Minutes
May 3, 2011

The call

1. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the estimate and recommendation of the Board of Finance, to adopt a budget for the Town of Westport for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, and to make such specific appropriations as appear advisable.
2. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance, to adopt a budget for the Town Railroad Parking Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, and to make such specific appropriations as appear advisable.
3. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance, to adopt a budget for the Town Sewer Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, and to make such specific appropriations as appear advisable.
4. To take such action as the meeting may determine to require that property taxes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, shall be due and payable in four quarterly installments, and to designate the dates of the first days of July, October, January, and April as the dates upon which such installments shall be due and payable, and that all taxes in an amount of \$100 or less shall be due and payable in a single installment on the first day of July.
5. To take such action as the meeting may determine to require that the motor vehicle tax shall be due and payable in a single installment.

The following items will also be considered as time permits:

6. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance to approve a request of the First Selectman for an appropriation of \$30,000 to the Historic District Account (Fees & Services) for updating the Historic Resources Inventory which shall be fully reimbursed through the CLG Supplemental Grant at the completion of the project.
7. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance to approve a request of the Parks & Recreation Director for an appropriation of \$26,690 to the Golf Account (Capital Equipment) to fund the purchase of a greens mower which shall be substantially reimbursed through the Department of Environmental Protection LEEF Program.
8. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance to approve a request of the Finance Director for an appropriation of \$1,200,000 to the Pension Budget Account (OPEB Plan Funding) for the remaining fifty percent (50 percent) cost of the Town of Westport's planned contribution to the OPEB Trust Fund for 2010-11 fiscal year.

Moderator Hadley Rose:

This meeting of Westport's Representative Town Meeting is now called to order. We welcome those who join us tonight in the Town Hall auditorium as well as those watching us streaming live on www.westportct.gov. watching on cable channel 79. We are on ATT now as well on channel 99. My name is Hadley Rose and I am the RTM Moderator. On my right is our RTM secretary, Jackie Fuchs. Tonight's invocation will be given by Ms. Flug.

Invocation, Eileen Flug, district 9:

Good evening and thank you for coming. Tonight is hopefully the last night of our budget meetings. It is the culmination of at least a six month process of preparing a budget for the 2011/2012 year. So, I chose a poem to read tonight to honor and thank and celebrate the work that all of the town employees have been doing for the past six months or so in digging into details, doing the research to come up with the budget and also all of the appointed and elected volunteers on the Board of Education, the Board of Finance, all of the boards and commissions, the RTM, all of the RTM committees. People, paid and unpaid, have spent countless hours, have rolled up their sleeves and dug into details and did the hard work that was necessary to bring about the budget.

This is a poem by Marge Piercy called "To Be of Use"

The people I love the best
jump into work head first
without dallying in the shallows
and swim off with sure strokes almost out of sight.
They seem to become natives of that element,
the black sleek heads of seals
bouncing like half submerged balls.
I love people who harness themselves, an ox to a heavy cart,
who pull like water buffalo, with massive patience,
who strain in the mud and the muck to move things forward,
who do what has to be done, again and again.
I want to be with people who submerge
in the task, who go into the fields to harvest
and work in a row and pass the bags along,
who stand in the line and haul in their places,
who are not parlor generals and field deserters
but move in a common rhythm
when the food must come in or the fire be put out.
The work of the world is common as mud.
Botched, it smears the hands, crumbles to dust.
But the thing worth doing well done
has a shape that satisfies, clean and evident.
Greek amphoras for wine or oil,
Hopi vases that held corn, are put in museums
but you know they were made to be used.
The pitcher cries for water to carry
and a person for work that is real.

There were 34 members in attendance. Mr. Keenan and Mr. Underhill notified the Moderator they would be absent. Mr. Mandell notified the Moderator he would be late. Ms. Bruce, Mr. Timmins, Mr. Bomes and Ms. Cherry were also late.

Announcements

The next RTM meeting will be possibly tomorrow, hopefully, June 7 at 8:00 p.m. If we are meeting tomorrow, it would be at 7:30 p.m., right here.

RTM Announcements

Lois Schine, district 8:

On Wednesday, June 1, the Westport Rotary will hold its annual golf and tennis tournament at Longshore. We invite you all to join us. This year and in previous year, the Rotary has been able to make donations to 30 local charities and we hope to continue that. You can come for golf, come for tennis, be a sponsor or just come for lunch. I have forms to fill out if anybody is interested or you can probably find us on line, as well.

Gene Seidman, district 4:

Liz Milwe was kind enough to mention a one man show that I'm doing on Saturday night. It's called "Provocation". It's going to be in Fairfield at the Fairfield Arts Center on Stafford Street, not at Lily's. I hope you can join us.

Mr. Rose:

Before we start tonight, just to refresh. We are starting off with the Board of Education budget. When we finish that, we will go back and finish up the town budget. We will vote on the combined budget. We will then move on to Railroad parking, Sewer Fund, Taxes, etc. and, eventually, hopefully, we will move to the last three items on the agenda.

Presentation

Don O'Day, Chair, Board of Education:

Many of you have seen this presentation so I will try to go through it as quickly as possible. I understand the RTM was here very late last night so it is my goal to get everybody out of here as quickly as possible. I'm going to go through the pages very quickly and will spend a bit more time on some of the newer pages just hitting the highlights and be happy to answer any questions that may come up. I want to thank the Board of Finance for working with the Board of Education the way that they all do. It was very, very helpful and it made our process easier. I think we knew what we were expected to do. I think we marched to those orders and I think we delivered. I want to thank the Board of Education for all the work they put in working with the administration to get this done. Also, the RTM Education Committee, the RTM Finance, we met with each of those committees at least twice. I don't know what the difference was this year versus the last couple of years, but the sense of community that I got in those meeting was measurable and very much appreciated. I felt like everybody kind of got it and we were all on the same page. Thanks to both of those committees, the chairs and

the members. So, I'm going to give you a little bit of the step by step process as to how we got to where we are today. We started out, Dr. Landon and his team, the school principals, the administration worked between October and December to come up with a budget. They had received some direction from the Board of Education as to where to come in. Coming in as flat as possible year over year was certainly the direction after covering for the contractual salary increases. In December, we had a joint budget meeting with the Board of Finance and the RTM committee chairs. We discussed what the expectations were for the budget. Early in January, Dr. Landon proposed the superintendent's proposed budget to the Board of Education. Throughout January, we met at least six times, one all day meeting, many of you attended all or part of that meeting. We looked at Dr. Landon's proposal for next year's budget. It was initially \$98.8 million which is a 2.79 percent increase. Through January into early February, we went through arduously every line that we could and we ended up with 2.36 percent budget. We took about \$471,000 out of the proposal. We ended up at 2.36. In March, the Board of Education presented that budget to the Board of Finance and the Board of Finance took \$250,000 out of our budget for next year bringing the total amount to \$98.1 million or 2.1 percent increase. So we went from 2.79 to 2.36 to 2.1. In April, the Board of Education, using the recommendation of the superintendent, we voted unanimously not to seek restoration for the cut that was imposed on us by the Board of Finance. I think that is what we would have done anyway. I think the Board of Education gets it. We have to do everything we can to reduce the taxpayer burden and to still maintain a school system that I think we all enjoy. So, we did not ask for restoration. So, that brings us to where we are tonight. We are asking the RTM to approve what essentially was the recommendation of the Board of Finance. I will let the committee chairs of the RTM speak for themselves for a \$98.1 million budget which is a 2.1 percent year over year increase. When we get to the next page, we started out at \$98.3 million. Some of the details you see in this presentation still say \$98.3 because we don't really know where we are going to take the \$250,000 from. Eighty-two percent of our budget is salaries and benefits. We are a people based business, a people based entity. Year over year, 2.1 percent. All of the increases, even before the \$250,000 were based on contractual salary increases. All of the lines were held flat. Now they'll be down year over year. Staff levels, next year, everybody employed by the Board of Education will fall by five to 878, the lowest level in five years. Our enrollment is dropping by 59 to 5,760 next year versus this year but it's still second highest level ever. Class sizes, this is something that all of us, the administration, the Board of Education, really set out to make sure we kept class sizes flat, on average, year over year. We did defer some maintenance projects that are not related to health and safety. The next page [of the presentation] is a summary. Again, you can see that it is still at \$98,345, 2.36 percent. We don't have the details yet of where we're going to find the \$250,000. If that is indeed what the RTM votes on, then on May 9, our next Board of Education meeting, the superintendent will make his proposal, the Board of Education will consider that and likely will vote on where the cuts will come from at the following meeting. The next shows a representation of where are staff

levels are and where our enrollment levels are. This year, the 5,819 is quite a bit higher by 70 some-odd versus what we came into the year thinking we would have. That 5,760 for next year, I'm not sure that is what's going to happen. I suspect that could be a little bit higher. The surprises could be in kindergarten and the places where school starts, e.g., the first year of high school or in kindergarten. That's where we saw the spikes this year. The next page is where the 59 is expected to fall. In elementary school, 42 of the 59 is where we see the reductions. We'll know right around August where we are going to end up and then we have the final numbers in October. The next pages are the class sizes. In kindergarten and first grade where we have our goal of no more than 22 students per class. We are keeping those as flat as we can for the average of the elementary schools. The next page is for second and third, again, trying to keep those flat. You see some spikes, some higher, some lower. That depends where people move when they come into town. The last are fourth and fifth grade. Again, relatively flat, year over year if we have the funding that we are asking for. The next page is the bragging page, something that we are all proud of on the Board of Education. While the town has been incredibly generous, building the schools that we all enjoy, building the schools that help us get the reputation for being a very good school system and making people want to move to Westport. The funding for those schools has come over the last five, six, seven or eight years. Right now, the last three years or so, we have reduced the year over year increases in our budget. The yellow represents the percent increases added together over two year and the blue is the current year over year expectation. If you add those three together, the total is 4.71. That's fairly low relative to the schools in our District Reference Group (DRG). Darien is the highest. Weston is the lowest. We are pretty near the bottom, as well. I think that is a sign of what the board has done over the last three years working with the Board of Finance, working with the RTM to try to come in as low as possible year over year, to maintain the tax base as low as we can. The next page shows where we are relative to our District Reference Group relative to cost per student. This is cost per student as measured by the State of Connecticut. We're right in the middle, not the highest or the lowest. A good thing about this measurement is that it is an apples to apples kind of measurement of all the different schools. Again, right in the middle. In wrapping up, as I said, I think the Board of Education really has responded to the town's mandate to try to maintain the tax burden or keep it as low as possible. We've done the best we can. We've done that by reducing funding on staffing, services, programs, changing bus transportation. We have increased class sizes a little bit. I said earlier in the presentation that we kept it flat this year compared to next year but over the past couple of years, it has crept up a little bit. We've made some decisions. We've kept our goals the same and we're not over our goals but we've made some trigger changes. We will wait a little bit longer before we hire that incremental teacher. We elected not to seek restoration of the \$250,000. We are in this together. It's all part of one town. We are going to do the best we can. Again, 2.1 percent so we are going to ask the members of the RTM to approve the budget. I know there are a number of people who came to speak on our behalf. I truly appreciate it. I am going to be a

little bit bold. This is the third time I have done this so I am getting kind of used to reading the room. Unlike the last two years, I'm feeling the love a little bit. I'm starting to think that the RTM is going to approve the \$250,000 reduction and we are going to walk away with \$98.1 million budget for next year and we'll move on and do the things we have to do. If you're going to come up and speak, I really do appreciate it. We are going to try to get the RTM out of here as quickly as we can. For all of everyone's hard work over the last four, five, six months on this budget process which will end not tonight but when the Board of Education really decides where to find the \$250,000, that's when our process will be done. For all the hard work done by everybody in the process, thank you very much. That's the end of my presentation.

Mr. Rose:

Thank you Mr. O'Day. I also appreciate your recommending that everybody be brief tonight and I also appreciate that, as a cost saving measure, you brought your own tech person to take care of the Power Point presentation. [Superintendent Landon].

Committee Reports

Education Committee, Velma Heller, district 9:

I don't have a power point. I'm sorry. Basically, the information is very much the same because it is based on our meeting with the Board of Education last week. The Board of Education requested an Operating Budget* of \$98,345,118 for the 2011-2012 school year. The Board of Finance reduced this request by \$250,000, resulting in a total of \$98,095,118. I do want to clarify that it has been the policy historically of the Education Committee to focus on operation budget. We are aware that there are additional funds which we will mention later on. If you look at our report, RTM members, you will note at the end of the report, the remaining funds that are in that budget. The members present: were Eileen Flug, Michael Guthman, Jack Klinge, Bill Meyer, Velma Heller (Chair), absent were Bob Galan, Paul Rossi, Stephen Rubin, and Gene Seidman. Background: The 2011 – 2012 Board of Education Operating Budget has undergone a lengthy review process with various reductions along the way. The Superintendent's proposed budget request of \$98,760,535 was discussed over the course of many Board of Education meetings and after intensive scrutiny by board members was then reduced to \$98,345,118 (+2.36 percent). The Board of Education Budget request to the Board of Finance for the above amount was reduced by \$250,000 resulting in a revised Operating Budget of \$98,095,118 (+2.1 percent). I'm sorry if this is repetitive but it is, in fact, what our committee dealt with as we talked with the Board of Education and we felt it was necessary for you to hear from us, as well. This was what was approved by the Board of Finance. All increases in this budget are the result of contractual salary requirements and benefits, which comprise 82 percent of total budget costs. Enrollment across the system for 2011-2012 is projected at 5,760 with 59 fewer students than this school year. Staffing is projected to fall to 878 FTEs, a five year low. With the Board of Finance cuts, the resulting 2.1 percent budget increase puts Westport second to

lowest in two year budget to budget increases in our DRG, second only to Weston. Average per pupil costs are in the middle range of comparable districts as defined by the State of Connecticut. The RTM Education Committee has met with the Board of Education and Administration during the budget deliberation process. Members have attended Board of Education meetings and monitored the process of budget review and revision. This process was characterized by detailed and candid public discussions. In their presentations to the Board of Finance and the RTM committees, the Board of Education clearly demonstrated their commitment to maintaining an excellent school system while simultaneously addressing the financial constraints facing the town, for example: maintaining class size levels at current levels, deferring maintenance projects that are not related to health and safety and holding other costs flat despite increases in the cost of transportation and special education. The Board of Education indicated that despite the need for the full appropriation originally requested of the Board of Finance, given their awareness of the financial climate, they would not seek restoration but rather find ways to absorb the cut with the least amount of damage to school program. Overall, their guideline in dealing with the \$250,000 reduction will be as they have done in the past, to try to avoid negative impacts on the classroom. Given the potential for ongoing financial pressures that impact the town's ability to fund education and other services, the Board of Education acknowledged their commitment to participate in achieving cost saving efficiencies for the town as a whole, getting as much savings as possible through consolidation with the assumption that the schools would take on certain responsibilities in support of these efforts as needed. To this end, the Board of Education in collaboration with Town officials is exploring opportunities for consolidation of certain overlapping functions. While these initiatives are not expected to have immediate impact, it appears that efforts are underway. The committee acknowledged the efforts of the Board of Education and commended their ongoing diligence in examining every area of expense in order to find significant cost savings in the 2011-2012 Budget. Due to lack of a quorum, the RTM Education Committee did not vote on a formal recommendation to the RTM. Rather, there was strong consensus among those present at the conclusion of the discussion (M. Guthman, J. Klinge, B. Meyer, V. Heller) that the Board of Education Budget for 2011-2012 in the amount of \$98,095,118 should be approved. There is a note at the beginning of the report which indicates that in addition to the Operating Budget addressed above, the total budget of \$112,425,806, as presented to the RTM includes funds for mandated private school services and debt service which are not included in this report because they are not part of the operating budget.

Finance Committee, Mike Guthman, district 2:

Would you like to hear the numbers again for a third time tonight? I'm going to skip that paragraph if no one objects and move on to the discussion in the committee. In our budget report last year we said: "...the Board of Education and Town government need to continue to focus on achieving cost reductions by all possible means. This should include consolidations (including those in the areas

of finance and payroll), joint maintenance and purchasing opportunities and possible outsourcing.” It now appears that tangible steps in this direction are underway. We applaud these efforts and urge that they move forward to realize significant savings. In addition to cost reductions, the area of revenue enhancement must continue to be considered by the Board of Education. We strongly urge that the Board of Education adopt a policy that permits rental of school facilities to others (both within and outside Westport) at a profit in order to bring in additional revenue. We understand the Board of Education’s reluctance to price local organizations out of the market, but nevertheless see the need for more revenue generation. Following our discussion, the committee the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval by the full RTM of the Board of Education’s operating budget as passed by the Board of Finance. Velma referred to the other budget items. There is a table attached to this committee’s report that lists all those additional items. The committee voted unanimously to approve: Michael Rea, Chair, Michael Guthman, reporter, Allen Bomes, Linda Bruce, Dick Lowenstein, John McCarthy, Lois Schine, Cathy Talmadge and Jeff Wieser.

Mr. Rose:

Before we turn to the public, just a little advisory, if you could try to limit your remarks to about three minutes. Please spell your names for the secretary.

The secretary read item #1 of the call - To adopt a budget for the Town of Westport for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, and to make such specific appropriations as appear advisable.

Members of the Westport electorate - No comment

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded by Mr. Rubin.

RESOLVED: That the Board of Education’s budget items as recommended by the Board of Finance and approved or amended by the Representative Town Meeting be adopted and the sum of \$_____ for the Board of Education Budget is hereby appropriated to meet expenditures.

Members of the RTM

Jack Klinge, district 7:

Back in the bad old days when I used to have to work for a living, one of our measures of performance was return on investment, what we got back for the dollars we invested in our projects. I’d like to spend a few minutes talking about this education budget in the context of a return on investment, what we have been getting for it. This investment covers all the way back from k through 12, students, teachers, schools, administrators and just a couple of anecdotal stories about this year’s senior calls. That is the final return on investment. The athletic teams were superb. As of today, the girls’ lacrosse team is still unbeaten, which was unheard of. The music department put on its normal, wonderful shows. The

orchestra played well. The Candlelight Concert was a big hit, as it always is. Academically, this year's senior class set all records for college acceptances to tier one schools: five at Princeton, six at Harvard, seven at MIT. It goes on and on. Finally, a story, I was subbing at Staples on Monday. I was talking to John Dodig in the foyer and there was a kid named Harris Duranni. He said, 'Mr. Dodig, 'My robotics team just won the world championship.' John and I went, "What?' 'We just won the world championship in robotics this past weekend.' It doesn't get much better than that...not state, not a region, world! So, we are getting a great return on our investment, the school system and all its components. I urge you, as I'm sure you will, support this budget.

Bill Meyer, district 3:

I was going to give a 10 minute speech but I'll cut back to one minute. Here's *Connecticut Magazine*. The number one school. Twenty-one percent of the people in Westport are seniors and want you to know that we are with you all the way.

Dick Lowenstein, district 5:

First of all, fear nothing. I have no motions to make tonight but I am going to speak to the record. One of the nice things about being on the RTM is that we keep verbatim minutes. What I have to say tonight will be in the verbatim minutes and I'm hoping that some time in the future, even if I'm not on the RTM, someone will say, 'What did we do back in the year 2011?' I want to talk about something that has been a pet interest of mine for at least four years and, finally, I'm seeing some realization. I want to talk about the Adult and Continuing Education budget. As many of you know, I have been arguing for at least four years that the Board of Education should take more money out of its burgeoning surplus from Adult and Continuing Education and use it for operating expenses. Unfortunately, until this year, it has fallen on deaf ears. But where there's a will there's a way and this year, I am very pleased to see that the Board of Education has exercised its will on this subject. When the budget was first submitted for Adult and Continuing Education by the Superintendent, it showed a revenue and expense budget of \$1.395 million. By the time it left the Board of Education meeting, the revenue had not changed one iota but the expense had gone up by \$247,000. Finally, the Board of Education was able to justify a reason for taking money out of the surplus. They took approximately \$50,000 out for electricity; they took \$170,000 for instructional technology acknowledging, essentially, that the people who go for summer and adult education do use computers; they took \$89,000 out of the capital budget for the pool, swimming pool related expenses. So, the expense that we saw on the Superintendent's budget for capital expenses this year, \$89,000, had disappeared by the time the Board of Education put its budget out. My purpose in speaking for the record is simply this, I want to encourage the board to continue to operate in this manner. Coming up in the next three years, are additional pool expenses. For example, for 11/12, there is a pool area ventilation capital expense shown on the budget. For the year 12/13, there is a pool boiler for \$550,000. For the year 15/16, there is a pool HVAC for \$370,000.

I'm not saying that those capital expenses should be funded wholly out of the surplus of the Adult and Continuing Education but, even if I'm not on this body in those years, I'm hoping that members who are here today will go back to the minutes and say, 'What did the Board of Education do then and are they doing the same thing in the year you are looking at the budget?' I really believe this is a sensible way to reduce a burgeoning surplus and find expenses that could be legitimately charged against it. I would urge the Board of Education though, as a matter of policy, to adopt some kind of rule or policy on what they want as a minimum coverage on this surplus in the event, that there is a loss of revenue that was unexpected. Beyond that, I urge the board to spend the money that is in the surplus on operating expenses.

By show of hands, the motion to approve \$112,425,806 for the Board of Education budget is approved unanimously.

Mr. Rose:

Speaking of world records, Jack, this was it. Thank you to the Board of Education. Thank you to the parents.

We are back in session. We are now going to pick up on the town side of the budget. Are there any comments on Parks and Rec.?

Jeff Wieser, district 4:

I make motion to restore \$70,000 to line 810-01 of the town budget. Mr. Rubin is recusing himself. Seconded by Ms. Bruce.

Mr. Wieser read the report of the April 14 meeting of the Parks and Rec. Committee meeting to put it into the record. In the report, you've got the members present at the meeting. Stuart McCarthy discussed the difficulty of meeting the \$70,000 reduction in Administration expenses required by the Board of Finance. He explained that this reduction must be a result of the elimination of a portion of the personnel expense – six persons - in the administrative offices of the Department. The amount required demands that he cut either two jobs, the Customer Service Representative and the part-time Accounting Clerk; or one of two Administrative jobs, Dan Devito or his own. The Board of Finance made this cut in the hope that it would force Parks and Rec. to discuss with the Board of Ed opportunities to consolidate various expense categories. The Board of Ed will not be seeking a restoration of the \$250,000 (0.0022 percent) Board of Finance – mandated cuts to its \$112,675,806 budget, as that mandated reduction can come from anywhere in the department, while the Parks and Rec. Department is required to reduce \$70,000 (13.4 percent) from its \$521,332 Administration Budget. The Parks and Rec. management and Parks and Rec. Commission believe there is inequity in this approach by the Board of Finance, especially after the approach made last November by the Parks & Rec Department and the Parks & Rec Commission to the Board of Finance. In this meeting, Parks and Rec. discussed the value of the revenue stream of the Department to the Town

and suggested that an increase in revenue should be used to keep the properties and the service of the Department in the best possible condition. However, in the projected 2011-2012 fiscal year, revenues are expected to be up 2.94 percent (\$134,228), while the Board of Finance approved budget shows expenses up 0.23 percent (\$9,521). With the requested \$70,000 restoration, expenses would still show a smaller increase than corresponding revenues, rising only 1.87 percent (\$79,521). It should be pointed out that Parks and Rec. Department is not seeking restoration of the \$10,000 cut from the capital budget to buy a new pickup truck to replace the current very old model. Parks and Rec. will be purchasing a used truck instead of seeking that \$10,000 restoration. In the past as the Parks & Rec. budget has been cut, Stuart has maintained his willingness to live within the budget and ensure as far as possible that there will not be a diminution in service or maintenance by his department. He advised in this committee meeting that with these cuts he is unwilling to make that claim and the Town must expect less service from the Parks and Rec Department. With these cuts, the Customer Service and PT Accounting Clerk jobs will most likely be the ones eliminated. Without those employees to administer the many requests of residents during the year, the supervisors will need to take time out of their supervising schedules to maintain the clerical schedules of the town. This will lead to reduced quality of supervision and effectiveness of the maintenance and customer service programs. Gordon Joseloff described the good working session that he had with the Education Superintendent earlier in that week and the advances in consolidation to which he expects that meeting to lead over the next twelve months. He supported Stuart's concern, however, that this could not happen in time to save the two jobs and corresponding customer service they allow within the Parks and Rec. Department. As a result, Gordon intends to seek restoration of this reduction as well as much of the \$250,000 that was cut from the town budget. Bill Meyer pointed out that many of the specific operations of the Parks and Rec. Department are breakeven, at worst, and that the Parks and Rec. Department as a whole is closer to breakeven than any of our neighboring towns (98.5 percent break even as proposed by the Board of Finance; 96.9 percent with \$70,000 restoration). He moved to restore \$70,000 to the Administration budget of the Town's Parks & Rec. Department. Eileen Flug seconded. The vote was unanimous, with Bill Meyer, Jack Klinge, Eileen Flug, Chris Urist and Jeff Wieser reporting and Allan Bomes abstaining until there is clarity on the overall restoration request that will go to the Finance Committee of the RTM. That speaks to all the points that I would make about this.

Westport electorate

Barbara Butler, Human Services Director:

I just would like to make a couple of points. I know you were all here really late last night and I don't want to keep you but I did want to say a couple of things. First of all, last night, I hope you saw in the department heads' support of the IT budget a demonstration of the interconnectedness of town departments. We are a team and we depend on each other in order to deliver services in the best possible way. Support of the IT budget restoration last night, during that

discussion, there was much acknowledgment of the critical importance of IT in this day and age and well deserved praise for what Eileen accomplishes with modest resources. She has brought us, some of us kicking and screaming into a new era. We appreciate that on a daily basis but some of us are still very people dependent as we deliver services to town residents. One small example I would like to give is a seasonal issue. The staff in Human Services works very closely with Parks and Recreation staff to give Westport children whose families might not otherwise be able to afford it, the benefit of summer programs that many of their friends take for granted. These are families also who may not have access to technology as most of us do. Last summer, with the help of Parks and Recreation staff, these children enjoyed 112 camp sessions allocated by Parks and Rec. at no charge and 56 camp sessions underwritten by donations to Human Services for that purpose. While it is wonderful that these children had the opportunity for fun, enrichment and socialization in supervised programs, it was also important to remember that their parents were then able to continue working for the summer months knowing their children were in a safe environment. For purposes of your consideration in restoring funds to the administrative budget, the administrative staff time invested in helping these families put together a summer program that engaged their children was critical in helping them pay the rent and put food on the table. It saved money and heartache down the road. In addition to these programs, Human Services staff and Parks and Recreation staff work together year round to arrange participation in an assortment of after school sports programs and clinics. Finally, in difficult economic times such as we have experienced in the last few years, Parks and Recreation offers affordable recreation opportunities for families who badly need these opportunities now. There are some community services who rely on people to deliver them. Technology may make it possible to deliver those services more efficiently but some human interaction is required and I hope you will keep that in mind as you consider this request.

Mr. Roda is an out of town resident but is the Director of Youth Sports. There is no objection from the body to having him speak.

Carmen Roda, Director of Youth Sports for the Police Athletic League:

I am here tonight to support the restoration of money to the Parks and Rec. budget. The Westport PAL has approximately 1,200 boys and girls participating in its youth sports programs all using facilities maintained by the Parks and Rec. Department. The PAL has many of the youth sports programs that have continued to increase the population of our programs over the last 15 years. This can be attributed in part by the partnership that the Westport PAL has with the Parks and Rec. Department. Youth sports programs help provide safe environments for the kids in our community. I feel, as the director of youth sports, I have absolutely no hesitation or fear to tell the parents that they have the quality of programming because of, in part, Stu McCarthy and his entire staff helping keep the facilities that we have safe, healthy and clean. Thanks to the Parks and Rec. Department, our facilities and our scheduling is flawless. There have been many

times in nights, weekends and holidays when there's problems that arise with scheduling conflicts or fields being closed where you could pick up the phone and call the Parks and Rec. Department, specifically Dan deVito, and he works out the problems. Not once, have I ever encountered a Parks and Rec. staff member who says, 'I can't, I won't, it's not my job' or 'It's after hours.' They go above and beyond the call of duty to help insure that the facilities that we use are the best in Fairfield County. As all the sports groups increase their population, we can't do this alone. We have done this in partnership with the Parks and Rec. Department. The taking of this money will hurt not only the Parks and Rec. Department but the community at large and our children. This is an investment in our kids. Thank you for the opportunity to be able to speak with you tonight and I hope you vote for our kids and the restoration of money to the Parks and Rec. Department.

Stanley Nayer, 77 Clinton Avenue, Chairman of Senior Commission and an active member of the Friends of the Senior Center:

I helped form ITN, a transportation program, and we are working now to develop the Baron's South property into a safe place for all Westporters, not only seniors, but for young and old. We advocate for the seniors and in the past I have attended Parks and Recreation meetings where seniors were involved and were affected by what Parks and Recreation were doing. When substantial budget cuts were imposed last year, I found it necessary to attend many, many more meetings because I felt that seniors would be adversely affected by the budget cuts. I cannot understand, during my attendance at these meetings, I was told how much Parks and Rec. collects in fees and how much they spend. It's amazing how little Parks and Rec. requires from the town to provide such facilities and such services to our citizens and our non-residents. What has happened is that Parks and Recreation has had to charge higher fees to patrons or customers in the cases of non-residents. What's happened is that the services have decreased. Last summer, there were accusations of unclean beach areas and so forth. As a CPA and attorney, I can't understand how we can reduce our standards and give our customers less for their money at the same time as we charge more fees. My final comment is simply this: With the recession, more and more Westporters are relying on Parks and Recreation facilities here because they can't travel, because they can't go elsewhere and spend the money. Seniors, many of whom are on limited incomes and fixed incomes, are facing one percent interest income on savings accounts and that's really hurting. They really need the parks for their recreation. I ask that you restore the budget reduction.

Maryann Goodell, 26 Ellery Lane:

I am PTA Council co-president, also a member of the Westport Youth Commission and I advocate for children and parents. I can assure you that I would like to encourage you to restore the \$70,000 cut to the administration budget of Parks and Rec. Many children, as Mr. Roda pointed out, do use these facilities. It is very important that they are maintained and that they are safe. It does provide, as he pointed out, a safe alternative for our students which I think

we all agree is a good idea. I know from a family's point of view, we all use the facilities. It is the number two reason I moved to Westport. For a lot of people, it's the number one reason. It maintains our property values just as our excellent schools do. Parks and Rec. sounds like it is a self-funding entity essentially. They require, as Mr. Nayer pointed out, very little from the town and a \$70,000 cut is a ridiculous percentage compared to a cut to any other budget. Its way out of proportion with any other cut that the Board of Finance made if you look at the percentages. They've sustained cuts over the years. They've had to cut substantial amounts of their staff as you've heard in their reports. Enough is enough. If you start to let the maintenance and the safety go, it's very hard to bring that back. It's like with your house or the school buildings, it starts to chip away and deteriorate to the point where it costs a heck of a lot more money to put it back into good standing. I do hope that you will vote for the restoration.

George Franciscovich, 25 Burnham Hill:

I am the longest tenured member of the current Parks and Recreation Commission. I'd like to let you folks know what has been going on down not only at the department but, more importantly, the commission. We've all been to a lot of meetings over the last months talking about budgets. Let me assure you... One of the rationales for this was that the Board of Finance was trying to send a wake up call, try to send a message, let me tell you, the Parks and Recreation Commission, we got the message a long time ago. It's not business as usual at the Parks and Recreation Commission. It hasn't been business as usual for Stuart since we got involved with things. Can I go over some of the high points. I'm not going to repeat what has been said. Our revenue, in this economy, is up. Over the last three budget years, we have gone from \$4.3 million to \$4.6 million. We're still delivering most of the same services. You can't get into Compo Beach officially after 10 o'clock anymore which kind of annoys me on the weekends. I always liked to swing by there on my way home and I can't do that anymore although Gordon tells me, 'Just go in the exit.' I just don't feel right, as a commissioner, doing that. At the same time, our expenses are down approximately \$238,000. I'll tell you, a lot of that is because, as a commission, we have undertaken an examination of our fees, the fee structure, the discounts, what are we charging, does it make sense, rather than hit or miss...Well, this year let's look at beach stickers. Let's up the beach stickers. We have discounts that are associated with beach stickers. Maybe we'll look at that next year. People from Weston can have beach stickers. How much does that cost? We've really undertaken a total look at the package. We have told Stuart not to come to us with just one fee. We want to see the whole scope of things. It's just not business as usual. We uncovered fees that hadn't been raised in ten, 15 years. We really tried to get thing in order. We tried to get things more into an order where things made sense. We adjusted some of the golf things so we can drive more business to the golf course. We have opened up to some of the out of town event. You have to look at the scope and how much it has cost us. We have doing things and using terms that I can't believe, as a commissioner, that I have had to use terms like "price elasticity". Our golf hand passes went up in the last

couple of years from \$50 to \$90. That's just going in. We looked at that and guess what? The year after we did that, the number of hand passes that we sold went down. We have to be sensitive to that. Weekend parking at Compo, it's a great money maker. I know Bill loves it. We brought in a couple of hundred thousand dollars last year but we are up to \$40/weekend day. You know what Sherwood Island is which is just the opposite way off Exit 18, for a non-state resident, it's only \$22. For an in-state resident on the weekend at Sherwood Island, it's \$13. We think we know why they are coming over to us. We have much better facilities. It's a much nicer beach and you can drink alcohol on South Beach. We can change that. I don't think anybody really wants to. Every year, we go through, actually, a couple of times a year because we have both winter and summer programs, we look at each and every program we have out there. We look at what they're doing, what the revenues they are bringing in, how many participants are undertaking that. Sometimes, we adjust the fee. Sometimes, we adjust the structure. Some of the camp things we look at. People aren't staying for the summer so you split it into two sessions. We are really trying to serve the community and make financial sense and we have been doing this for years. You heard Ken Bernhard here. We are doing private fund raising. We have established the new Friends of Westport Parks and Rec. They are going to be raising money for the big projects like the halfway house and for park benches. Community gardens has expanded. Those members now need to come to us for hand passes. We've got the new 191 Hillspoint which was done with very little out of pocket money from the town. It was fund raising. It was also an effort where town departments actually got together. Stuart said he had some guys, Steve Edwards said he had some people and working together with the different people in the community. A couple of years ago, we had a park planner in the budget. We outsourced that. We did not hire an employee. We got some very good plans that we were able to put on the shelf and to use. Even though we outsourced it, that has disappeared from the budget. The park on Riverside was completely refurbished with very little expense to the town. You are trying to send a message. What I'm trying to tell you is, we got the message a long time ago. We have been implementing it. Please help us to keep the services that we're delivering to the town and our facilities up to par.

Cindy Palaia, Program Specialist, Parks and Rec. Department:

I am here tonight to ask for full restoration of the \$70,000 administrative budget to keep the two positions that we currently have in our offices. I began working for the Parks and Rec. Department 12 years ago in the program department, first as a part-time employee and then as a full-time position as our enrollment and programs grew. When we implemented our online services three years ago, some of the ways we do business changed. This, ironically, coincided with the recession and budget cuts. Positions such as mine were reconfigured and consolidated. Now I spend half of my time in the program department and half of my time in the sales office. Gone are the program registration days at Bedford Middle School, waiting at 5 a.m. Gone are the stickers to your hand passes, the need for a form to fill out when you want to get a parking emblem. As you have

heard many times in the last few weeks and months of budget talks, our online services are a convenience for our customers but have not changed our work load. We still have phones to answer to help our customers with the technical support of their online system, questions regarding their parking emblems and hand passes, when are the fire works, program registration questions and on and on it goes. Emblems are now printed and mailed in-house. New resident accounts need to be approved and customers that need to be waited on. As many people have said to me in the last few days as they have been in our office to get their beach emblems, 'This is my favorite thing to do. You know it's spring when you have to go to Parks and Recreation to get your beach pass.' We have fees and invoices to collect for our boat slips, bath house, non-resident beach emblems and keeping up with our program registration wait lists. In order to keep our level of service that the residents of Westport need and expect, we need to keep our existing employees. As Eileen Zhang said last night, we all wear many hats and do what needs to be done whether it be submitting payroll, answering the phone, printing receipts, filing a job application, waiting on customers, printing program rosters, invoicing boat slips, it all has to be done. In order for it to get done, we need to keep our existing employees. We are a service-based department and to cut this money from our budget will greatly impact our department and the services that we offer. Please consider restoring this money to our budget.

Janis Collins, 41 Compo Parkway:

I spoke last night. I'm not going to take a long time. I just wanted to mention that somebody brought up Glastonbury as an example of a town that has actually saved incredible amounts by an online registration system. Being the analysis person that I am, I called them today along with Stuart who called the Director of Parks and Recreation for Glastonbury. We learned some interesting things. Yes, they do have an online registration system and they have had the same savings that we've had. They have gone from one full-time to a part-time person. We eliminated our part-time person last year along with about \$1,800 in supplies. They have yet to put on their online passes, like we have with our beach emblems, etc. They haven't gone that far, so far. The best part of the story is that I got to talk to the Director of Finance, Diane Waldron, who told me that they actually implemented two years ago a special fund for Parks and Recreation which is what we asked for from the Board of Finance last year and then this year where all of our revenues would go into this special fund that then would go back to Parks and Rec. services that those fees were generated for. They have created this for two years. It is called the Special Parks and Recreation fund. All those services that are self-sustaining, the revenue for that service goes into that fund and then gets reinvested and pays for the actual services. What I've found is that it is only about 30 percent of their Parks and Rec. budget. The town tax subsidy was the remaining amount. In our town, our fees are actually paying 98 percent of our Parks and Rec. budget. Two percent is from our taxes. We are asking you to restore the \$70,000. We want to continue on our way of doing the creative things that we are doing in terms of looking at outsourcing and looking at

creating private and public partnerships with organizations like the Friends and we'd like to create this special fund where our revenues that we get can go back and pay for the services that we render. So, if we have to charge an endowment for an athletic fee field use, the money from that could go back into the renovation of that field. Thank you for your patience and letting me talk again.

Members of the RTM

Mr. Meyer:

Now you see why I'm so excited being Chairman of the RTM Parks and Rec. Committee. Eleven people were up here and spoke. That is the most anybody spoke for restoration of any of the four different things that we had. Everyone is enthusiastic, they are different ages and different parts. Something that I am so proud of being Chairman of Parks and Rec., a few years ago, I called the directors of Parks and Rec. in towns around here and the average is 40-60 percent is paid for by taxes. We are two percent. If this was a business, you'd get a big bonus. That's a tremendous accomplishment. I go to the beach during the summer and I wear the shirt that says Parks and Rec. on it. We take in \$670,000 at the beach from out of town people. It is \$40 on the weekend, \$20 during the week. We've got 1,000 people in Weston who pay for stickers, \$1,200. That helps our taxes. People come here because it's clean. They are not concerned. I found last summer, I had to clean the women's bathrooms out a couple of times because we had cut back on four different maintenance people. Last night, I was so proud of the little boy who spoke. He is on Patch today. Yesterday, I took him to school. I'm his grandfather, 82. He has no father. He sat in the car and said he was going to speak. He came last night and you heard him. He hugged me. Every time I see him I hug him and say, 'I love you. That was a great talk you gave.' Then something else that really bothered me. I am so proud of the RTM. Steve and I have been here the longest. I heard comments last night that I don't want to overturn the Board of Finance. What are we here for? We are the last vote. People depend on us. Here is just \$70,000 we are hoping to restore. We are revenue producing department. Only two percent is paid for. We are the second biggest thing that draws people here next to the schools. I'm just so proud to be part of this. Let's do it. Last year we restored \$200,000. We have only done \$40,000 now. Let's catch up to last year.

Amy Ancel, district 3:

I want to say that the Parks and Rec. does a terrific job in everything that they do. I admire the work that they do. The other thing that I want to make clear is that this cut does not impact programming, parks and facilities maintenance, golf, all of those. The budget on those was actually increased this year from last year so in terms of having clean safe playing fields for the kids, that's now what this issue is about. What this issue is about is the Board of Finance has asked the Parks and Rec. Department to lower their overhead as all of the other town departments have over the past few years. What I don't understand and the big problem that I have with this whole issue is that Parks and Rec. has had online enrollment services for three years and we have just heard this woman say that

while this has been great for the customers and the public it has not changed their work load. My question is, why not? What's wrong with this picture because it should have. Maybe Parks and Rec. needs to get the hardest working person in Town Hall, Eileen Zhang to take a look at their system. I don't understand why it hasn't changed their workload when I would imagine that the majority of Westporters buy their beach emblems and their passes and all of that online now. It's common knowledge that efficiencies through technology allow you to reduce your overhead and your administrative costs. That's just the way that it works. The fact that it's not working that way at Parks and Rec. is really problematic for me. I have been in the customer service business all of my working life. I know that there are people who are always going to complain that a program is full and Johnny can't get into it because they didn't register him in time. Questions about programming or scheduling that is all in the booklet but people don't take time to read. We cannot be all things to all people. We just can't. The other statement that was made twice last night which really disturbed me was that supervisors shouldn't have to answer the phone. I don't believe that. I was a supervisor and a manager for a major health insurance company and when the phones were ringing, everybody answered the phones. I understand that Parks and Rec. has a specific crunch time. It's sort of like open enrollment in the insurance business where there is an onslaught of customers that you have to take care of. Overall, because I have these questions and this problem with why the online system which costs the taxpayer a lot of money has not managed to reduce their administrative costs, I can't support the restoration.

Mr. Klinge:

As I drove down the Post Road coming here tonight, I made a heck of a speech in my car. It was brilliant...fire and brimstone. I've forgotten half of it now anyway but I have a sense, a little of what Don O'Day had, that maybe this is going to be a different kind of audience from last night but nevertheless, I have to say a few things. I think we made some mistakes last evening. It is going to come back in the future to bite us. I think we sacrificed some common sense, some pragmatic good management techniques on the altar of philosophical musings, shots across bows and the dreaded demand for consolidation, all of which is going to lead to reduced services for Westporters; whether it is financial services, IT services. Eileen said she is going to lose a person or part of a person despite a partial restoration. There's a perfect example of a department who does more than they can do for any department in this town to save money and, yet, we fired a shot across their bow. No. We fired the great threat of consolidation across the bow of the Finance Department. We took a department with seven managers and made it six. Then we added an eighth job assignment, Personnel. We went from seven jobs to eight and seven managers to six. That was our consolidation threat, demand. As a kind of an aside, back in my work days, if we were going to consolidate something, we didn't eliminate half of the group and say to the other half, now go do both. We, in fact, ran a plan of the new consolidation concept and ran two parallel plans independently that were already in place until we were sure the consolidation plan worked. That's how

professionals manage consolidation not by fear and threats. Anyway, that's a long way of saying, I don't want to give up the services that Parks and Rec. provides to Westporters. This is a \$5 million business. Westporters pay \$5 million to join this club. If you think that 6,000 of us join it, that's like \$800 each we pay to join this club. For \$800, I want a person to answer my questions. I want a housewife who drives down to Parks and Rec. with two kids, worried about programs, worried about this or that, I want them talking to a real person. I don't want them coming in on Tuesday morning at 11 o'clock and someone says, 'I'm sorry, our customer service department is opened from 9-12, Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Come Friday, you'll get Dan DeVito to talk to you. Come Wednesday, you might get Dan Rackliffe, the golf superintendent to talk to you. Come Monday, you get Stu McCarthy. That's not the way to run a department. Those people should be out managing their people, getting the job done. That's the proper way to provide service. So we are asking tonight for restoration of \$70,000. That's \$7/year for our taxpayers, less than two gallons of gas per taxpayer. Think about it. I don't want my customers talking to a computer in Mumbai when they've got a problem in Parks and Rec. I want a Parks and Rec. employee answering the question. It's that simple. I am willing to pay a gallon and a half of gas to get it done properly. So, I am going to vote to support the restoration of the full \$70,000.

Mr. Lowenstein:

As I did last night, I will do again tonight, I will vote to support every request for restoration. I think these cuts have been close to intolerable. This is a story of somebody getting efficiencies through technology and they squeeze. The next year, they squeeze again. How much squeezing do we do before you can't squeeze any more? We have had technology in the Parks and Rec. Department for approximately three years. While we've talked about what will happen next year, I'd like to hear from Ms. Collins on what happened when technology was first introduced in terms of the efficiencies.

Ms. Collins:

I am going to try to explain a couple of things. Just a little bit about my background: I spent 25 years doing technology strategy and implementation. Most recently, I was a Managing Director of JP Morgan. Eight years ago, I retired. I ran the business incubation lab for them which was using technology to create new e-finance companies. Prior to that, I was a partner at KPMG. I ran the capital markets technology practice. My expertise is in using technology to create innovation and productivity. So, I do consider myself an expert in this area. I didn't do the implementation here but I would tell you, from a budget standpoint, what we did resulted in an efficiency for our online registration system for programs. There's really two things that we do online. There are programs which are for the kids and some adult clinics and there is the beach pass and hand pass registration. They are two different work processes. Program registration is where we have already received the productivity and it's in this year's budget. That was the elimination of a part-time \$28,000 employee along

with \$1,800 in supplies. What we haven't really changed though is on the online beach pass, emblem process which is, again, a productivity tool for you and I to do online but at the back end, we still have to do that manual process of checking stuff out, getting stuff in the mail, etc. With programs, we are not mailing things. It's not the same kind of transaction. So, productivity savings have been in the program registration but not, necessarily, in the beach pass, hand pass processing. Stuart, nod your head. Did I get it all? [Yes.] That's where we are. We already realized that savings. It's in the budget. We cut it last year and it's being cut so, we're there. We will continue to change the way we do our transaction processing and to streamline it so that it keeps getting more streamlined as we go along. As more people go online to buy their passes, the better it is for us because we can manage the workflow in a more timely manner instead of doing it one on one and having to turn around that emblem or that pass at that point in time. I want to add one other thing about the supervisors. The only other thing about the supervisors is that we only have one and a half administrative people for eight supervisors. We have 25 full-time people and 500 seasonal part-time employees. When I talked about Glastonbury earlier, they have three full-time admin people in their office. So, we are already at a minimum.

Matthew Mandell, district 1:

I'm a person who likes to go down to the Parks and Rec. office and get my hand pass and beach sticker. I happen to like the personal interaction. I am not a person who likes Kindles either but they're coming. Books are changing too and we seem to have to be changing. Parks and Rec. has a sympathetic ear in me for customer service. I think it's important for our residents and even our outside residents to be able to go and ask questions and have them answered. But I think the Parks and Rec. people also know, I'm a person of process. I'm a person who likes things to be done efficiently. A big question I have to ask is about a memo that was sent to the First Selectman by Mr. McCarthy that said that Parks and Rec. was not going to ask for restoration. They were going to study some more in June and then come back to the Board of Finance and bring the report back to the them and, at that point, a decision would be made as to whether or not we need to restore the money or we don't. I don't know if all of you saw it but Ms. Garten brought a part of it up. It said here:

Parks and Recreation: The suggestion is not to seek restoration at this time but would ask the Board of Finance to allow the option of returning in June with a potential appropriation request based on this reduction. In addition, allowing adequate time to provide greater detail on our administrative options, a delay to June will allow us another full season of assessing the impact of our online pass management software. This is the third year...

Mr. McCarthy, the process question has to be asked here because this is something the Board of Finance has in front of them. That information would be helpful to us to make a decision, as well, tonight.

Stuart McCarthy, Director, Parks and Rec. Department:

To be clear, the Parks and Recreation Department, after last year's very difficult budget cycle, along with the commission undertook discussions with the Board of Finance last fall on, specifically, the Parks and Recreation Department's budget and how the Board of Finance viewed the revenues derived from the Parks and Recreation Department in relation to our request for an increased budget. Specifically, we used some examples of our program budget, the desire to have program enhancements and to increase fees to cover those increased costs. We met on a agenda item workshop session with the Board of Finance in this room In November of last year. We presented quite a bit of detailed information for the Board of Finance. At that meeting, we had, what I would consider, a very productive discussion. I think I speak for Ms. Collins when I say that, as well. We further had a workshop session with the Board of Finance in February where we again answered all the questions. We discussed the revenue that was in the budget. We discussed the ability of the Parks and Recreation Commission to continue to raise revenue. We then met with the Board of Finance in the budget hearings and they made a reduction of \$70,000 in the administrative budget which is what we're discussing here this evening. I classify that as being an arbitrary number since it does not relate to any specific number in the administration budget. It was very specifically targeted to the administration budget. It was not as, in past years, where the instruction was, 'We're going to cut this money but if you can take it from somewhere else, come back for transfers.' It was very clearly laid out that we were to cut administrative salaries which is our full-time staff. So, that meeting took place on March 23. The budget restoration hearing was on April 5 just less than two weeks later. Given the fact that we had had three substantial conversations with the Board of Finance, that I did not have any additional information to justify a restoration request before the Board of Finance. They had heard all of this before. They had chosen not to engage us in a discussion of the revenue potential and instead asked for a budget reduction. I did seek restoration at that time. I should note that I was then contacted by Mr. Meyer, the Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Committee of the RTM, who asked me about restoration. I told him we were not requesting restoration before the Board of Finance. He asked me to outline, for his committee, the impact of the reductions in the budget which I did. You have a copy of that memo to his committee in the packet. It did not request restoration. It outlined the impact of the budget reductions on the Parks and Recreation Department, specifically, the reduction of two regular employees of the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Meyer's committee discussed that. I joined them for a discussion of that impact. They voted unanimously to restore the funds. I reported back to Mr. Joseloff and he asked for a restoration of the funds to the RTM based on the RTM Parks and Recreation Committee's recommendation. I fully support this restoration request. I can tell you, the more we look at these issues, the more it is clear to me that this is critical to the Town of Westport in providing the services that the residents deserve and expect from the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Rubin is here this evening as you know. His is one of the positions that is being considered for elimination. I don't think that's any

secret. Mr. Rubin was out of the office for a week with an illness last week and I can tell you that our staff, including the young lady who spoke earlier and her co-workers, worked their tails off. Our administrative supervisor was in the office almost every evening until six or seven o'clock because they weren't able to do any of the supervisory work during the day and stayed to do it late. I fully anticipate that you might say, 'That's fine. People work long hours and people work late.' That is absolutely correct because when someone is out, everyone else gets together and picks up the slack and gets the job done. My staff did that and I am very proud of the work they did last week. It is peak season and we were down people but I also don't anticipate that people will do that 365 days a year. I anticipate that 365 days a year they will work hard and on those days when something goes wrong, they will work even harder. We need to be properly staffed to address the concerns of the residents. We have people in our office who are able to address the concerns. They are able to answer the questions. They are able to assist the residents whether they are asking about Parks and Recreation issues, Public Works issues, Police issues. People call the Parks and Rec. Department and ask what the weather is going to be tomorrow. We can answer those questions and we take great pride in answering those questions but we have to have the staff to be able to do that.

Mr. Mandell:

Thanks for the summary. The question still remains about this study, finding out where we are at. Is this something that can be delivered in June? Is it something that, if we get it, we can make a determination by then? Or is it something that we work to next year because, clearly, we need to be looking at what kind of efficiencies can be coming from the computerization. That's sort of the way it works. That's sort of the rub. I understand we are under a tight time constraint but tell us about the study you are doing and when this information will come forward for us to make a rational decision moving forward.

Mr. McCarthy:

I'm just looking at the memo. Is there reference to a study being done there?

Mr. Mandell: An assessment.

Mr. McCarthy:

The report that we gave to Mr. Meyer's committee was related to what the impact that these budget reductions would be on our department. The ongoing assessment of our work flow is exactly that, ongoing. What I referenced was the fact that each season we go through, we learn a little bit more. What we have learned to date, as Ms. Collins stated, our program registration is fairly significant online. That has had some impact, particularly in our fall registration period. Ms. Garten noted in the slide yesterday that Glastonbury had 89 percent of their program registration online. Our program registration online is just north of 80 percent. It is certainly similar. She also noted that Glastonbury doesn't have any pass management. They don't do any pass management in their Parks and

Recreation office. They don't do any pass management online. They do have some pass management that they do at the swimming pool or whatever it is that they have. The fact of the matter is they don't have the pass management issues that we have. One of the differences in our business from almost any other business, if anyone else has an online business and you have something to sell and someone wants to buy it, you sell it to them. There's no question. We don't operate that way. Before I can sell it to you, I need to know who you are, where you live. I need to verify that information. I need to know what type of vehicle you drive, etc. There is verification of every item. You can't go into our system and say, 'I need to add my 13 year old child to my account.' You need to call our office and do that because the Town of Westport requires every person who is purchasing resident benefits to be verified as a resident of the Town of Westport. That is the current standard that we go by. Those are the policies of the Parks and Recreation Department and the Town of Westport. It leads to some inefficiencies and it doesn't allow us to take full advantage of online registration. It does require that staff. The long answer to your question is we assess our staffing levels all the time. It's an ongoing assessment but there is also, as Janis said, we reduced our part-time staff by \$28,000. The reason we did the part-time staff instead of the full-time staff, again, in this case, is because there is some expertise that is needed in operating this system. It is not operated by a company in California. They provide the platform for us. We operate the system. We need to have the consistency and that quality in our staff. Ms. Palaia, who spoke earlier, was hired as a program specialist, was brought in to provide some expertise and support in that area and has stayed in that area. She is probably spending half her time supporting that system because she is able to both operate the technology as well as bring the program specialist knowledge to that operation. She is the one who sets the class sizes, sets up the parameters of the program for the program registration so the technology can serve us properly.

Mr. Mandell:

Just to let you know the Parks and Recreation section of our town is not the only department that makes money. The Building Department, P&Z, and Conservation combined together pay for themselves, as well.

Judy Starr, district 1:

I think we've pretty much established that the cuts would not be to program. Last night, Ms. Garten talked about how the Board of Finance actually recommended adding to programmatic lines including golf, skating, beach maintenance, mowing and programs, such as the Wrecking Crew, so that the programs available to the people of this town would not be suffering. So, we have pretty much established that. I would like to see the results of this study. If we restore the money, what motivation do we have for any department to look even more carefully at what it's doing with its operations. Last night, we spent a lot of time talking about IT and how it can create greater efficiencies. Here, we have a memo dated April 5 where Mr. McCarthy said to Mr. Joseloff said he wouldn't seek restoration. He will do this study. The season ends May 1. By June 1, he will have an evaluation

of how the online abilities that we have can affect our operations. Board of Finance meets early in June. He could have it for the Board of Finance. If it didn't make any difference, they could restore the money. I think there was pretty much an understanding. We saw this happen with the Transit District where about \$100,000 was cut and the Transit District came back and said they could they could cut \$40,000. They made a case and the Board of Finance restored \$60,000. They don't want to see departments suffer but I think what we're seeing is that the Board of Finance wants to give incentive to the departments to be as efficient as they can because one other player we're not thinking about here is the public as taxpayers. Even if the savings are small this year, we know we're not talking about a tremendous amount of money in dollars or percentage or whatever, we're talking about the opportunity to change the way we look at things and turn around a little bit the way we operate and move toward consolidation and outsourcing wherever we can. If we don't begin to do it now when the cost in dollars is not as high as it might be in other times, when are we going to do it? At some point we have to move further in that direction. I know it hurts. I want to talk about two things where I'm really uncomfortable. I want to also say that A, I'm going to stand by my comments of last night. Please consider them repeated. That's all I'm going to say. B, I think an RTM Committee has a right to ask for information from the department it works with but, on the other hand, I don't like seeing what's happened here where because that has happened, and I'm not saying it shouldn't have happened, suddenly, instead of a restoration request going to the Board of Finance, it's coming first to us. It's sort of that we are getting in the middle of an established process again. Some of you may not mind that. You may want to look at the individual lines, which I'm looking at with you but the overall picture has factors such as what's going on with the overall process that I think we should pay attention to. I think we, as a board that works with other boards, just like departments work with other departments, need to look at how we are working with other boards. We were subject to some criticism, about this unjustly with a land use body. But here, I think we should at least admit to ourselves that there's something going on. Secondly, I feel extremely uncomfortable now. I had suspected that one of us, his job would be on the line. Now I'm thinking I feel bad for this person. I know him and I work with him. On the other hand, I'm thinking my constituents can come to me and say you're protecting one of your own, aren't you? I'm between a rock and a hard place. Thank you very much. But, it's come to us tonight, nonetheless. We have to deal with this as best as we can with eyes wide open, with an eye to what our proper role in the bigger picture, the taxpayer who put us here in the first place and what we, in our hearts and with our integrity, think is the right thing to do. Having weighed all this, and I really do feel terrible, I'm going to vote against this because I really think it's the right thing to do. I respect everyone who disagrees with me but I think I've made my case. I hope you will agree with me.

John McCarthy, district 9:

I'm not sure what I am going to do here. I am extremely conflicted. Parks and Rec. is a great department. They do good work, the programs that they run, the

facilities that they run. They're fantastic. I have benefited since I was a little kid. My kids benefit from them today. I think it's something that we're all very proud of. I'm also hearing some things tonight about our proper role here in the RTM. This budget, the way we do budgets in this town is very frustrating. We're basically told, we need to go in and vote on the budget. When we say, 'You should cut the budget', they say, 'Where would you cut?' Then we say, 'How about here?' 'Oh, no, no, you can't cut there because of this.' 'Well, how about over here?' 'No. You can't do that. We need more information.' Wait a second. You're micromanaging. It's frustrating. This is the way bureaucracies perpetuate themselves. Last night, we heard about a few different departments who had people on their staff for years doing their IT support. When those people retired, they said, 'Maybe we'll have Eileen do IT support for us.' Two, three, four, five, six years ago, why wasn't the right answer to have Eileen in the IT Department to do the support? Why did it come upon somebody retiring for the right, most efficient answer to be the IT Department should handle all IT in the town. Why is that? That's the way bureaucracies work. That's what we're dealing with here. It's frustrating. You don't want to micromanage. When I drive, I look out my windshield. I look to my left and I look to my right. On my left, I see my beach sticker. On my right, I see my railroad sticker. Twice a year, I have to prove to the Town of Westport that A, I live here and B, my car is registered here. Once I do those things twice a year, I can get something for the left side of my windshield and the right side of my windshield. Can I prove to the Town of Westport once a year that I live here and that my car is registered here and that I'm paying property taxes on it? I'd like to do that. I think most people in this town would like to be able to do that. I would like to see not just consolidation between the Board of Education and the town, I would like to see consolidation inside the town and then we can start worrying about consolidating between the town and the Board of Education. Pretty simple. For those of us in business, there are lots of different things that we know we should be doing if we looked at the town as an organization. So I'm conflicted. Parks and Rec. does a great job. Yet I also think there is a lot of opportunity for the town to consolidate its operations. I'd like to see established a customer service center in which citizens of Westport can come to this building get any number of services, any number of permits, any number of licenses from a single counter talking to a single person. It should not be that difficult. It should not be something that takes a lot of studying. Quite frankly, when people say let's study that, let's research that, that's usually the way of saying, let me figure out how I can get my cut of the pie so my department doesn't suffer. So, quite frankly, I'm not really interested in studying this for too long. I'd love to see the First Selectman get his department heads together and say, okay, who in the town government, who in this building, who in the Police Department, who in Park and Rec., who among you deal with the public. How do we get what you do into a single department within this building? How do we make that happen? Oh, you're going to need \$150,000 for some capital to possibly build out another office and divide the offices? Fine. Let's talk about that. Let's go back to the Board of Finance and the RTM and ask for an appropriation. Guess what? If there's a sensible case made, I'm pretty sure we'll all do the right

thing. Until we get to the point where pressure is applied, I don't think we're going to see the type of consolidation that we all know should happen. If we sat down and looked at it, we would say this is the right thing to do, the sensible thing to do. This is what the Town of Westport and the people of Westport expect of us.

Mr. Rose:

Before anyone else comes up, I would just like to make a suggestion. We discussed the general budget for weeks and months now. We discussed philosophies. When we are dealing with specific requests for an appropriation or restoration, if we can try and confine ourselves to what we're voting on, as opposed to expressing our overall general philosophies about budgets, I think that would be helpful and probably get us out this evening.

Joyce Colburn, district 6:

There is so much to respond to. I'm really surprised that our RTM does not recognize that...let me start this way. When we had our questionnaire put out for the new Town Plan of Conservation and Development, one of the largest, the biggest thing that people cared about was our recreational facilities. I was at Longshore years ago and I thought it was so nice and pretty here, I decided to move here. It wasn't about the schools then. It was about the beautiful town that we have, the beaches and Longshore. Longshore, you don't have to join a country club. I didn't have that kind of money. I think it's essential that Parks and Rec. be given, let me ask, how much money has been taken away from Parks and Rec. from the past three years? Who can answer that? Stu? This is a department that makes money.

Mr. McCarthy:

If this restoration is not sustained, I believe that number is \$220,000 which is approximately five percent of the budget. The full-time work force will have been reduced from 30 to 23 people which is a 23 percent reduction in full-time staff.

Ms. Colburn:

We just voted on a \$112 million budget. I know maybe it's not apples and oranges but, nonetheless, we didn't quibble about anything on that budget. They got what they needed to operate in an efficient, organized way for our students. I feel that the town, we don't have a constituency for the Parks and Rec. People just accept it. Oh, it's always going to be there. Our beaches are always going to be nice. Longshore is always going to be nice. Our grass is going to be mowed. Our programs will continue. I just think that we should support this tonight. I'm going to support it. I hope that you do.

Ms. Schine:

I think it's important to remember that the Board of Finance said that this money should specifically be taken out of the administrative line of the Parks and Rec. budget. I think if they had said it differently, had they said you have to save some

money somewhere or you have to increase the revenue somehow, that maybe Parks and Rec. could have reacted to that. I am going to support the restoration of this money. It will make no difference to our taxes and will enable Parks and Rec. to provide the kind of service that we all want.

Liz Milwe, district 1:

I don't know how many of you have purchased something online lately but every time I go to purchase something on line, I get so excited. I put my billing address down and then I get to submit and something goes wrong. Then I look for the phone number to call someone and I can't find a phone number. Here we live in a town where the first thing a real estate agent does after they show you the house is they take you to Longshore. They tell you all about the programs. I think we need to have someone answer the phone to talk to us when we sign up for a program. If you are signing up for a tennis class and it's intermediate for your kid, you think, is he intermediate or is he advanced? So then you call and you ask. You need somebody on the other end to tell you about it. Or if it's the golf course for one of your kids. Which one is appropriate? That's what makes Parks and Rec. so special, that we have somebody at the other end who can answer those questions. I think our parks are what make our town. We have great staff there. It will make very little difference in our taxes if we pass this tonight but it will make a difference in the quality for our town.

Mike Rea, district 8:

Don't forget about Gene's provocation. I agree with everyone who spoke previous to this. I have both feet firmly in the air on this issue. As you all know, I spent a lot of years on the side of soccer fields and baseball fields and on the Parks and Rec. Commission. One of the great things that has happened during this conversation that we have had during the budget season, is that I have gotten to connect with members of the Parks and Rec. Commission. They are talented and committed and I have every confidence that they will follow through with everything that they have been talking about. One of our conversations, the Director of the Parks and Rec. Department spent a lot of time talking about this online process. We got all hung up but Hadley is cautioning us to stay on the issue. I'm going to try to stay on the issue about the computerization. One of the sidebar conversations I had with the commission chairman was, 'I understand about the authentication.' John McCarthy understands. He's trying to look at why he has to go two times a year. Because we have these kinds of conversations. Why don't we just sell a permit like motor vehicle and get it renewed every two years? Maybe three or four? You might not be able to do that with the summer residents that come in and go away but just think of the cut down on the workload. It's those kind of things that you talk about productivity and efficiency. Let's factor that in. This is a particularly difficult decision for me because it touches me personally. I've heard over and over again that this cut is a couple of positions. Those positions have faces. I have history. I have feelings. It is something, as Liz was talking about earlier, I have said in committee meetings, my wife is a residential broker. The first thing she does after she sells a house,

she brings people down to the Parks and Rec. Commission. Who do they greet? The person they greet down there is probably the only face in town government that they'll run into for many, many years in the Town of Westport. It's our face of Westport. It leaves an impression and it's important. It's for that reason, I think, the way it is being interpreted is probably ill-suited to our goals. I don't see it as a cut that needs to be done on our front line services. I've said that before but then I'm conflicted with the fact that there are productivity issues and there are savings. When I read Stuart's book that he forwarded to the Finance Committee, a lot of it was talking about, if you cut me in the back office, I need to bring the front office to the back office and the back office to the front office. All of a sudden, we wound up with duplication of services. Isn't there anyone else who can cut payroll checks and do payroll and do centralized purchasing? If the town took the initiative and it filtered down to this decentralized system, wouldn't that free up people and budget and money so that we can keep the front line service? Why is there so much resistance to trying to do that? As difficult as it is, I'm going to vote against the restoration. I'm going to do it because I believe we made a pact, a mandate. I've said this before. I don't think the cuts that were proposed this year reflect the seriousness of the economic situation we're in but the hand that we are dealt, as I said last night, is one where we are expecting both parties to anti up and make their fair share effort of consolidating and outsourcing and making some hard decisions. We need to do it as a town. We need to do it in Parks and Rec. There's room. I have a question for Ms. Garten if she'd be good enough to answer it. Should our conversation occur prior to June whatever the date is, should the Parks and Rec. Director come with an assessment that shows that there could be other savings or some savings, will the Board of Finance continue this conversation? Will we be able to save these positions yet tonight still vote to restore to keep the feet to the fire because there seems to be a resistance in town government, whether it is on one side or the other, to confront these issues and I understand what you've done so I want to know how do you feel about the process and how do you feel about the assessment that is to be given by June 30?

Helen Garten, Board of Finance:

Obviously, I cannot predict exactly what the Board of Finance is going to do but when we make cuts, sort of to cite what John McCarthy said before, we're always asked, 'Specifically, what are you talking about? Where are the savings?' So, I suggested the online technology system as the source of the savings. That was what I said. I don't even know, necessarily, if every other board member agreed that was specifically the area. Obviously, we are always open to the conversation. I assumed, after reading the memo, that Mr. McCarthy was coming back to us in June with an assessment of the online system. Obviously, it would go on the agenda and we would discuss it. If the Parks and Rec. Department came back to us and said 'We've looked at it and there are absolutely no savings from the online system or what savings we have, we'd like to redeploy those people. Maybe they are no longer servicing people online, they are in the back office doing something.' Then we might well say, 'No savings, fine, we'll restore

the full amount of money.' I realize we put Stuart on the spot a little bit in our meeting. He didn't have all the information at his finger tips. If, on the other hand he said there were savings but savings in another area, absolutely, we would consider that. We did that last year. He did come back to us and said, 'I would like to take the cuts in other areas.' Many departments said the same thing. Because we are in this difficult position. We are asked, if we just simply make a cut and say, 'Okay guys, figure it out. We think there ought to be 10 percent cut in administration. You figure out why.' Then essentially, we have made an arbitrary cut. I kind of agree with that. We just come up with a number. On the other hand, if we say, 'We think there are savings in this way...' We are not the experts. We don't know for sure. If we make a suggestion like that, we are beginning a conversation and, absolutely, people can come back to us. In this case, simply, we would like to see if there are any savings from the online pass sales system. Maybe there are. Maybe there are not. We don't really know. Absolutely, we want the conversation to continue. If I can just add, in terms of the meeting last November, I thought it was a productive meeting because it was explained to us that if you put more money in programs, you can make more money and you can also serve the citizens better. We, indeed, try to do this in this budget by increasing many, many lines: the boating line, the golfing line, the programs line, etc. But, we just simply were asking, 'If, indeed, you can devote more fee money, if you can have any savings in overhead, then there's more of the town money and more of the fee money is going to the programs people want. We were simply asking a question and hoping to start a dialog. This has been an unusual year budget-wise. Frankly, everything we did was not final in the sense that all of it was try it, come back to us, we'll make adjustments if it doesn't work. That's essentially the offer we were making, not just to Parks and Rec. but to every single one of the departments. I hope that answered in a round about way.

Arthur Ashman, district 7:

I am confused because the process supposedly says...We spent a lot of time debating things that should have been brought back to the Board of Finance. Somehow, the process has been reversed and they have come here first and we're debating things that, perhaps, could have been settled another way. Helen, could you explain why that has happened?

Ms. Garten:

I am not the one who can explain what has happened because I put on the agenda the restoration request that came to us that was the Transit District. I agree with you. It's not that the RTM shouldn't be part of the conversation. It is. Frankly, different things emerge in different bodies. Sometimes, issues come up that we talk about. Sometimes, issues come up out of the RTM like John McCarthy's wonderful idea I talked about last night which is something I'd love the Board of Finance to talk about. I think it's good to have the two steps because I think you have a better conversation and reach better results that way. He [Dr. Ashman] said, 'Which steps come first?' Ordinarily, in my experience,

restoration requests are brought first the Board of Finance. We then make our final recommendation and then it comes to you for the budget decision.

Dr. Ashman:

The question I've raised is a broader one. Why has the process happened this way? I don't think I've gotten an answer. It should have gone back to the Board of Finance first unless I've missed something.

Point of information, Dr. Heller:

I would like to ask the Moderator, is there any specific sequence that must be followed? He asked what is the reason?

Mr. Rose:

There is not defined process for that. Typically, it has gone to the Board of Finance; however, there is no prohibition about that being skipped and coming directly to us. There can be various reasons that it happens but there is no charter-defined process that it must go A, B, C, D. It doesn't exist.

Dr. Ashman:

I'm not trying to be critical of the process. I'm trying to understand it. Helen said we get idea in the RTM and that's fine. She has their ideas in the Board of Finance. It's just a question of what do we do and how should we do it? A lot of the items we are discussing now could have been taken up at the Board of Finance first and then we should have our comments and vote on it, not debate it and get philosophical and that's what we're doing.

Mr. Rose: I understand that.

Dr. Heller:

I just wanted to mention that this particular budget session has been very complicated for a variety of reasons. We are in a tough time. You need to know that this is clearly not the first time that restoration has come up without going to the Board of Finance. I remember in Health and Human Services Committee a few years ago, those of you who were on the committee with me may recall, that in the Health and Human Service Committee, there was very strong feeling that they were sorely in need of more funding than they had. It came directly from that committee that there should be restoration. It was not even asked for at that point. It was recommended that the First Selectman, who was a different First Selectman, ask for that restoration. This is not entirely without precedent that something like this has been done. I think it's important to recognize that. There is no one way to skin a cat here. There are many productive routes to getting what is best for the town. That's what we're all interested in. It's not a matter of looking for a rigid way of operating. I think it's important for us not to arbitrarily think there is only one correct process. There are probably a number of processes that can serve us well. One of the things that I feel is that a lot of what's happening is that people, in an effort to do the right thing, to try to save

money because they feel that's the right thing to do, are kind of restructuring, trying to restructure offices in the middle of the budget process. I think anyone who knows anything about management, who has ever been in the management field, know that this is not the way it goes. I just don't feel that you get to the best outcome by looking at things on the spot and trying to make what should be an integrated, systematic look at things and just taking a poke at this account and that account and saying do something about it and now consolidate. I think consolidation is a great idea. I think building in efficiencies is absolutely a very important thing to do but it takes time and you don't do it well overnight. We are talking about accounts that are about services for the Town of Westport. No matter how much good technology can do for us, no matter how much it can improve certain aspects of productivity or timeliness, it doesn't take the place of people who know about the program educating people who want to know more about the program. Westport is a small town, known for the kind of personalization that we give. I think it's a mistake to just abandon that as an important element. We have to look to that as one of the things that we hold dear. I think, unfortunately, the cuts we have been talking about, this particular cut, does not really accomplish the purpose of trying to build up for OPEB or whatever else it is. It's not getting us there. It is a very small amount of money in the overall process. Let us not lose what there is that is important to our town. This \$70,000 may be, in the long run, they may find ways to save that money. To take it away, at this point, without having the opportunity to look at what are the best ways to reorganize themselves, I don't think it's a smart way to go. I will support the restoration.

Ms. Flug:

I have been on the RTM Parks and Recreation Committee for five and a half years. When I first started covering the Parks and Rec. Commission, the tax subsidy for Parks and Rec. was somewhere between 15 and 20 percent. Now it's like two percent. This is a department that has been cut year after year. A major change that has occurred, since I have been covering Parks and Rec., there have been three different chair people on the Parks and Rec. Commission. They have all been wonderful in their own way but with Janis Collins as Chair, it has been revitalized to an extent that I have never seen. She has a background in consulting and finance that the town would be paying a fortune for if this weren't a volunteer position. She meets regularly with Stu McCarthy. She looks deeply into the details. She spends a huge amount of time looking at the budget and looking at how the department is run. We can all rest assured that there is a lot that is being done and will, as a result of this, Parks and Rec. Commission under the chairmanship of Janis Collins. At this point, the tax subsidy for Parks and Rec. is \$163,000. The Board of Finance cut \$70,000 from the budget. That's a huge percentage of the amount of taxes that are used to fund the Parks and Rec. Department. Mike Rea mentioned that we have to address the seriousness of the situation. The \$70,000 that is being cut here will not address the seriousness of the whole economic condition of the town. It's a small amount for the Town of Westport, huge amount for the Parks and Rec. Department. It will make a

significant change to the functioning of the Parks and Rec. Department. The Parks and Rec. Department is the second largest revenue generator in the town. The largest is the tax department through property taxes. It raises like \$4.6 million and it covers virtually all of its expenses. This is an area where we want to incentivize the Parks and Rec. Department to increase revenues. The way to do that is to follow Janis' advice which is to allow the Parks and Rec. Department to use the revenues that it generates to apply to the expenses. That is a structural change that may happen over time. That's not for tonight to decide. I think the bottom line is we need to keep these positions. We need to keep the Parks and Rec. Department functioning. We can have hope that with this highly active Parks and Rec. Commission, we will be seeing structural changes that occur with time going on, people delving into the details and getting all that done. Please support the restoration of the \$70,000.

John Suggs, district 5:

I am intrigued by this issue that we're debating of what is the proper procedure. Should it come here? Should it go to the Board of Finance? I am specifically intrigued by the three briefings that Stuart gave during the course of this fiscal year to explain the fees and the programs and so forth. What I'm struck by is when the final decision came down and the department had the opportunity to ask for restoration, the response by the Director was he had nothing new to add. Stuart, if I'm ever in trouble, I hope to God, you would be one of the people by my side. You are an incredible advocate. You fight for your department. You fight for your people and you do an excellent job of it. I commend you for that. I'm wondering how we got to a place where he felt he had nothing new to communicate? I think that, if you are curious about that, then we might have some explanation tonight for why we're here. I see the RTM as a safety valve. I see us as the appeal, the representative of the people. Obviously, there was a need to appeal directly to us rather than go through the restoration process. That is valid. That is legitimate. I have no qualms with that. I'm going to vote tonight for the restoration. I think it's important. I think it's needed but I would be curious and I would ask for some serious thought to how do we get to the place where, after three briefings, we have an articulate, intelligent, clearly dedicated director of a department who said earlier tonight that he felt he had nothing new information to give. How did we get to that situation? Thank God we have the RTM for exactly these situations. Thank God we can actually be on the receiving end and can take matters in our own hands and decide for restoration. Again, I support the restoration but I really want to ask, challenge, call the question about an apparent failure to communicate.

Wendy Batteau, district 8:

To get back to the point, we are being asked to restore a rather small amount of money in the scheme of things. I think that Lois Schine probably put it the best. We are here to represent the people in our district and the people of the town. It is going to cost virtually nothing. It's going to provide services, as Liz Milwe

pointed out, that everybody in town values that shouldn't be done without, costs nothing, provides excellent services. Let's just vote for it and move on.

Linda Bruce, district 2:

I'm voting for this restoration. I agree with many of Eileen Flug's comments. I also have a couple of points that I wanted to put on the record regarding the Board of Finance saying it is not an arbitrary cut. As pointed out earlier by Mr. McCarthy, it is \$70,000. It doesn't go to any particular thing. It's just \$70,000. In my opinion, it seems to be an arbitrary cut. We are hearing about programs that aren't suffering, clean and safe playing areas aren't suffering. What hit me at the Finance Committee meeting, as well as tonight, 500 seasonal workers. I'm thinking young adults. I'm thinking I raised two pretty decent young adults. I'm an administrator of my household. I'm in a supervisory position. They have jobs. They have job descriptions. They have chores but, guess what, I just had to keep on checking in on them and prodding them and saying 'take the trash out' or 'do the dishes' or 'walk the dog.' A lot of times when I wasn't prodding them or checking up on them or supervising, those things didn't get done. I'm just wondering as the administrators working down to keeping things going, I don't really want to take the risk what that might mean. It needs a little time to sort out what that means. Again, the Board of Finance, I do agree with Helen as far as changes needed and things to work forward with reorganization and consolidation. These are just chipping away. Many people have said that. We want to be courageous. We want to see something happen. Next year say no to the budget next year when it comes around. That puts us in the hot seat, right. Next May, you guys work together, do something. We won't pass the budget. Anyway, that's food for thought.

Mr. Seidman:

Last night was tough. Earlier tonight, we passed a \$98.1 million budget in about 12 minutes. Now we are talking about \$70,000 for a department that is a revenue generator. The math is very simple. We should get all on the same page and vote. I hope we call the question.

Mr. Rose:

Let me see if anyone else wants to speak. Can we let Mr. Meyer speak?

Mr. Meyer:

I'm proud of the RTM all the time and getting more proactive. The vote of the Board of Finance was 4-3, a split decision. It's a money maker. Let's go with it.

Mr. Rose:

That was quicker than voting on calling the question. We have 33 voting members. It requires 24 people to pass.

Point of information, Mr. Lowenstein: How many members are present?

Mr. Rose:

There are 33 potential voters, excluding Mr. Rubin. Seventy percent is 23.1 so the vote requires 24 members. If anybody abstains in the voting process, we adjust the number. It's present and voting. An abstention is not a vote.

The motion passes 28-5. In favor: Wieser, Levy, Lowenstein, Rossi, Suggs, Colburn, Lebowitz, Talmadge, Urist, Ashman, Bomes, Klinge, Batteau, Schine, Flug, Heller, McCarthy, Cady, Mandell, Milwe, Bruce, Guthman, Timmins, Galan, Meyer, Cunitz, Seidman, Rose. Opposed: Cherry, Rea, Green, Starr, Ancel.

Mr. Rose continued reviewing the budgets.

Mr. Lowenstein:

I want to address myself to the Transit District budget which is budget 915. I am not going to make any motions tonight but I want to talk about a couple of points. On the RTM Finance Committee, I was initially prepared to ask for a \$28,000 restoration of the remaining \$40,000 that was not restored by the Board of Finance. By the way, I think the vote tonight on Parks and Rec. and the vote last night on IT establishes that there is no precedence for whether you have to go to the Board of Finance first for a restoration. For the record, I think we should all observe that next year and the year after and the year after that. Anyway, getting back to the Transit District budget, the transit people only asked for \$60,000. I'm not sure if it's because it's a realistic figure or they did it out of fear or they didn't want to lose any more than they had already lost. I was prepared to ask for \$28,000 more but in conversation with one of the directors, they informed me that the Norwalk Transit District had agreed to put in their budget for state approval a request to cover the Norden facility to Saugatuck. Had they decided they were going to do it to Norwalk from Norden, I would have objected. It's been claimed that the Transit District did wonders. They cut their budget and they didn't reduce service. That is just not the case. They have cut their budget but they are reducing service to Nyala Farms. They are reducing the service on the Post Road to Pepperidge Farm. There is a diminution of service. I don't think we should be dissuaded from the fact that the budget cut had a price to pay for it. Another claim made during the hearings was that these buses only get five miles/gallon and they cost a lot to run. Guess what? That's the same miles/gallon that the school buses get. Buses don't get high mileage. One of my biggest concerns was the idea was presented by some members of the Board of Finance that the problem they had with the Westport Transit District was it was not run like a business. My contention is that you can run it in a business-like, professional manner, which they do, but to run it as a business, to claim that you can make a profit is totally absurd. For example, the Shoreline East, the train that runs from the Groton area/New London to New Haven, only 8.9 percent of the cost of each ride is paid for by fares. On the Westport Transit District, 13 percent of the cost of each ride is covered by fares. I think that we have to understand that there is no such thing as a profitable public transportation system anywhere

in the United States. The same applies to the Westport Transit District. We are closing a chapter on a fiscal year coming up but I want to make sure that, if and when it comes up again, that we understand we are running it in a business-like manner and professional manner but it is not a business.

Mr. Rose: Anything else on section 9?

Mr. Mandell:

I don't mean to be a contrarian, Dick, but I think what occurred with the Transit District is exactly how our process should work. They went back to the Board of Finance. They presented their case after they did some analysis. The Board of Finance restored back some of that money. We didn't hear a minute of it and saved as we work, two hours or three hours of our time. I would hope that in the future, we could stretch the time between when the Board of Finance makes their decision and when they have their restoration meeting. They are the body that should be hearing this first. They are the ones who went through the process. They went through the three meetings with each department. That's how we should be doing it. In terms of Transit, I think that the Board of Finance, by putting their feet to the fire and changing things, it's exactly what had to be done. There is no reason in the world that Westport should be paying for people who are taking a train to a Westport station and going to a Norwalk business. That business isn't paying us any taxes at all and those people don't live here and they are not paying us taxes. Norwalk should be paying for it and now they will be. By the actions of the Board of Finance, Westport is saving money and those people are moving away from our responsibility.

Ms. Starr:

Same district as Matt Mandell, I just want to say, I agree with what you say 100 percent. Having the Board of Finance hear appeals before we hear them does save us a lot of work and we had better hope that, that is how the process stays or otherwise we are going to get a lot of work. There is a reason for that. It's a practical thing and we see in this example how it really works.

Diane Cady, district 1:

Under miscellaneous, there are two huge topics. One is pensions for \$10 million. One is insurance for \$9 million. I remember it was suggested in the past that these should be shown under the departments in which they are occurring. It hasn't happened but I think it ought to .

Ms. Batteau:

So, I'm moving back to last night. Earlier tonight, Barbara Butler spoke about the interconnectedness of town departments as a strong factor enabling each of them to get their work done. Last night I think we and by that I mean I made a mistake having to do with this factor and I have been bothered by my and our decision to deny restoration of the \$75,000 to the town Finance Department after we'd also voted not to restore funds to the Personnel Department. I know

that I voted on principal divorced from the reality of daily exigencies and to push for change in a way that is probably inappropriate as I suspect the Board of Finance did when it proposed its cuts. The cut in the Finance Department would cost the figurative average resident \$7.00/year in taxes. I believe this cut, as a practical matter, is likely to cause serious trouble not only for the staff but other services Westporters receive and expect to receive. As Jack Klinge said, we cut a staffer and we added a job to the finance position. I believe this is going to end up costing and hurting the Town of Westport; therefore, **I am moving to reconsider restoration of \$75,000 to line 151, Finance, in the general government section of the Town General Fund.** I could speak about this but I would rather ask Mike Guthman to speak more articulately and concisely than I could, as always, to the consequences of making cuts in both the Personnel and Finance Departments. It is seconded by Mr. Lowenstein.

Mr. Rose: He will have the opportunity to speak when the RTM speaks.

Point of order, Mr. Rea: What is the basis for reconsideration?

Mr. Rose:

It is in order. It can be almost as simple as buyer's remorse. It is a legitimate motion.

Members of the Westport electorate –no comment

Mr. Rose:

I am going to make a suggestion. It's getting late. After we get done doing this and possibly redoing it and the town budget, we still have three items to go. Would there be objection to limit debate to five minutes as opposed to 10 minutes? No objections.

Members of the RTM

Mr. Klinge:

I think you heard my talk earlier. You know where I stand on this. This is a clear cut example of misguided management procedures. I certainly endorse the restoration. You don't take a department from seven people to six people and back to eight job assignments. That's not how you improve productivity or service so I'm for it. Thanks for bringing it up, Wendy.

Mr. Guthman:

I think Jack has really put his finger on it. We eliminated the Personnel Director and adding that function to the Finance Department and are reducing the staff of the Finance Department by one. That alone, to me, doesn't make a ton of sense. It gets even more complicated because, over the next few years, the problem we are facing is what to do with pensions and what to do with medical insurance. These are very difficult problems. If we have already cut staff by two professional people, who is going to take the leadership in dealing with all these issues? They

have to be dealt with quickly. There are rumors already floating around among the non-union staff in town. They're concerned about what is going to happen to their pension. We need to move forward quickly. We know we have to deal with the non-union pension before we deal with the union pension. The big savings we are going to get on OPEB have to do with moving forward. What is the definition of retirement for purposes of getting post-retirement benefits? That's where we are going to get the big savings. Those things have to be done and we need the staff to do it. We can't do it with consultants. We all know from other experiences we've had, you need some champion in an organization taking responsibility for moving things forward. Consultants don't do that. Outside experts don't do that. Elected officials don't do that. It really needs to be done by staff. Cutting staff at this point in time is a savings of \$75,000 and putting at risk \$20 million that we know we have to deal with. I think it is, again, an example of being penny wise and pound foolish. I think it is our responsibility to move this whole thing forward. I urge you to vote for this restoration.

Mr. Rea:

Quite frankly, I'm a little surprised that we have to reconsider and reconsider. What I find unusual about this, Mr. Moderator, is that we have an agenda. We have a series of people who showed up for the meeting yesterday. If we have questions and clarifications, no one is in the room. It's a different cast of audience. It doesn't serve the public well for us to keep bringing up items that we voted on and on. Having said that, if it is the will of the body, I have no problem. You could all vote differently or the same way or any way you want. I just think it's a bad precedent. I think it's tough to believe that we would be called on to vote on an issue over and over and over. I would question whether a restoration shouldn't be raised at the time the vote is taken on that particular item, at least on the same day out of fairness to the people in the room who came up to see it.

Mr. Rose:

Just to let you know, it's a simple majority vote whether we go to the restoration debate.

Ms. Starr:

I want to follow up on Mr. Rea's question. Will there be any finality on any of our decisions if we make a decision and come back the next night and say we want to redo the decision? We could be here for a very long time and none of our decisions are final. I also want to say that the three contracts, the municipal and the Fire Department and Public Works, three are in arbitration right now. This does not have to do with the Personnel Finance Director or anything. This has to do with a process outside of them. They would come to us and it would be up to us to decide to approve it or not approve it and so forth. But, that's a little off the track. As far as the other post-employment benefits go, I was talking to a couple of Board of Finance members outside in the lobby, Mr. Kanner and Mr. Lasersohn last night. They explained that OPEB is calculated by actuaries. The

calculations are outsourced. I don't know if that is helpful or not but I thought that is interesting information in the context of what we are talking about. Do we have any new information tonight from what we had last night? This seems to be something that should have gone to the Board of Finance. The Board of Finance works with the Finance Department. Our Finance Committee knows the Finance Department pretty well but the Board of Finance, they work really closely with them. I think this should have gone to the Board of Finance but, okay, it didn't. We heard last night why the cut was made in order to motivate consolidation with the Board of Education and/or outsourcing payroll, or both. In the public sector as in the private sector, there is little better motivation than to say, 'Okay, you need to do this. We are going to adjust the budget so you absolutely have to do it.' If we don't, it's painful but it is the only way that change is going to happen. I think that everything was discussed last night. I don't think there is anything new to say. I'm not changing my mind and I don't see why we should but I am going to yield the microphone

Mr. Rose:

This is about whether or not we should reconsider. This is not the restoration debate itself which will still require a 70 percent vote.

Ms. Schine:

For one thing, as far as pensions are concerned, consolidation with the Board of Education will do absolutely nothing. Teachers' pensions are paid by the State of Connecticut, not by the Town of Westport. Our pension plans are quite separate. What we need is a powerful leader in the Personnel Department who, now it's falling on John Kondub to do this, who can work out a pension plan, first, with our non-union members that we can afford, that's reasonable, similar to the kind of pension plans you have in private industry. Once we do that, yes, we are in negotiation and that is exactly the issue that we went to negotiation about, the pension plan for future employees, not even present employees. We weren't trying to change the current employees and we had to go to arbitration to get that to happen. We are not the only town in arbitration. There are six other towns in arbitration on the same damn issue. If this isn't the time to fight for these changes, I don't know when it is. We need a leader in town government who will fight for it. Seventy-five thousand dollars is a small price to pay. I would also restore the \$50,000 in Personnel. This is not the time to save pennies in those departments.

Dr. Heller:

I am speaking in support of the motion to reconsider. I think it is appropriate to approve this motion because, even Robert's Rules, in their infinite wisdom, some time ago, understood the concept of buyers remorse and that there are times when there is not necessarily new data but there is an opportunity to reflect on your thinking at the time and to take into consideration the complexity of the situation which you may not have seen at the time. I do want to applaud the courage of the member who came and said that because I feel that reflection is

one of the most important things that we learn to do in our lives as we grow up. The more you can learn from reflection, the more it's possible you can contribute to the general good. I would support this motion.

Point of order, Mr. Mandell:

Robert's Rules said if the reconsideration is moved while the subject is before the assembly, it cannot interrupt pending business. We're in the middle of pending business.

Mr. Rose: This is part of the pending business.

Mr. Mandell: We were on a different agenda item later in the budget.

Mr. Rose:

The budget is one agenda item. There are different sections to it. We are still on the same agenda item. We haven't done anything yet.

Ms. Cady:

I am changing my vote to be for the restoration. Last night when I voted, I was tired and I also didn't get the implications. Michael Guthman and Lois Schine have really talked seriously about what the implications are.

Ms. Bruce:

I am in support of Wendy's restitution. Also, there is, perhaps, new information. New information is that Velma said "in consideration." In consideration, because when you think about things, you do have unintended consequences. This body voted about three years ago for early retirement plan for a number of people. When we voted for the early retirement plan, there were lots and lots of benefits but guess what? That's what we are dealing with now, the lots and lots and lots of benefits. Initially, that plan was undertaken because we were going to save money. Yes, operating expenses for that one year. I'm not sure exactly how much we saved, or not, but the unintended consequences are going to bite us and continue to bite us for years to come. So, when we are talking about forcing it, we are doing this consolidation, this is what we want to do...I think great idea but unintended consequences. I'd like to see us look at this again.

Mr. Seidman: I'm happy to call the question.

Mr. Rose: I don't think anybody asked to speak but you!

The roll call vote on the resolution to go back to the restoration requires a simple majority vote.

Mr. Rea:

I would like to go on the record as saying the chair has erred on this ruling. I don't think the reconsideration should be done so late in the process. I'm not sure it

hales to what Matt was talking about as far as pending business. Whether it is technically, it just feels morally wrong to be reconsidering this a full day after we voted on it. It was a closed topic then. I would just like to go on record.

Mr. Rose:

...which I appreciate, Mike. We're voting. He was just, personal privilege.

By show of hands, the motion in favor of reconsidering passes 24 – 10. Opposed: Rea, Rossi, Starr, Cherry, Cunitz, Urist, McCarthy, Ancel, Mandell, Timmins.

A motion to reconsider restoring \$75,000 to the Finance Department.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comments

Members of the RTM – no comments

Mr. Rose: We have 34 members. The vote requires 24 members to pass.

Point of information, Ms. Bruce:

The point of information is that everyone is going around on their boards figuring out what's going on, what's moral, what's acceptable. I made a motion for reconsideration, last year, three days into the meeting. The timing is just fine. This is a legitimate motion. There is nothing untoward about it.

Roll call vote, the motion passes 26-8. In favor: Cady, Milwe, Bruce, Guthman, Timmins, Galan, Meyer, Seidman, Wieser, Levy, Lowenstein, Suggs, Colburn, Lebowitz, Talmadge, Urist, Ashman, Bomes, Klinge, Rubin, Batteau, Schine, Flug, Green, Heller, Rose. Opposed: Mandell, Starr, Ancel, Cunitz, Rossi, Cherry, Rea, McCarthy.

RESOLVED: That the First Selectman's budget items recommended by the Board of Finance and approved or amended by the Representative Town Meeting be adopted, and the sum of \$66,463,304 for the First Selectman's Budget is hereby appropriated to meet expenditures and such sum shall be added to the amount appropriated for the Board of Education Budget tomorrow night.

RESOLVED: That the Board of Education's budget items as recommended by the Board of Finance and approved or amended by the Representative Town Meeting be adopted and the sum of \$112,425,806 for the Board of Education Budget is hereby appropriated to meet expenditures.

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Town of Westport General Fund Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, as recommended by the Board of Finance and approved or amended by the Representative Town Meeting, be adopted and

the sum of the Board of Education Budget and the Selectman's Budget in the amount of \$178,889,110 is hereby appropriated to meet expenditures and that for the purpose of raising a tax on the grand list of 2010, the sum of \$159,418,899 is hereby appropriated.

The budget, item #1, passes unanimously, 34-0.

Mr. Rose: We have seven more items to go through if you want to finish tonight.

Mr. Rose read item #2 of the call – Approval of railroad parking budget.

Presentation

Finance Department, John Kondub:

The budget is \$1,727,983. It is covered all by user fees. To get a parking permit for the railroad station, it was increased by the Board of Selectmen on April 27. There is an increase also proposed to increase the daily parking cost to cover the cost of the budget. It is fairly much self sufficient. It is a balanced budget.

Committee report

Finance Committee, Mr. Rea:

The RTM Finance Committee did review this and the sewer fund. We reviewed it and recommended them both unanimously.

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded by Mr. Klinge

RESOLVED: That the Town Railroad Parking Fund Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, as recommended by the Board of Finance and approved or amended by the Representative Town Meeting, be adopted and the sum of \$1,727,983 is hereby appropriated to meet expenditures.

Members of the RTM

Bob Galan, district 3: Are the new parking rates included in the \$1.7 million?

Mr. Kondub:

When we built the budget in February, in order to balance the budget, we needed a fee increase. Having a balanced budget, that's the most important thing.

Ms. Colburn:

Even though the railroad parking is a balance budget, I wonder, I want to support this anyway. Steve Edwards isn't here to answer but I can get it later. The cost to Westport of maintaining the facilities with the parking given that we have a lot of out of towners who park daily. They use our roads and our whole infrastructure. That's my question.

Mr. Rose: Send him an email.

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously, 31-0.

The secretary read item #3 of the call – To adopt a budget for the town sewer fund.

Presentation

Mr. Kondub:

This budget presented as recommended by the Board of Finance is \$4,920,720. It includes all the debt service, appropriate fringe benefits, employee personnel cost, operating materials, etc. to run the sewer system for those who are hooked onto it. It is funded by sewer user charges and sewer assessments are levied on people who hooked up to the system. It's a balanced budget.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comment

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded.

RESOLVED: That the Town Sewer Fund Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, as recommended by the Board of Finance and approved or amended by the Representative Town Meeting, be adopted and the sum of \$4,920,720 is hereby appropriated to meet expenditures.

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously, 31-0.

The secretary read item #4 of the call – Property taxes shall be payable in quarterly installments.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comment

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded by Mr. Rubin.

RESOLVED: That property taxes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 shall be due and payable in four quarterly installments and the dates upon which such quarterly installments are to be due and payable shall be the first days of July, October, January and April; and be it further resolved that all taxes in an amount of \$100.00 or less shall be due and payable in a single installment on the first day of July.

Members of the RTM – No comment

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously, 31-0

The secretary read item #5 of the call - Motor vehicle taxes shall be paid in a single installment.

Point of information, Ms. Starr: Is there a date? [July 1].

Members of the Westport electorate – no comment

RESOLVED: That the motor vehicle tax shall be due and payable in a single installment.

Members of the RTM – No comment

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously, 31-0

The secretary read item #6 of the call - An appropriation of \$30,000 for updating the Historic Resources Inventory which shall be fully reimbursed through the CLG Supplemental Grant at the completion of the project.

Committee report

Finance Committee, Cathy Talmadge, district 6:

The Finance Committee met on April 21. We had a number of questions mainly around whether the \$30,000 would actually be there. We receive the money after...Don't they usually give the report first?

Presentation

Frances Henkels, Acting Chair, Historic District Commission:

I am coming before you tonight on behalf of the commission to present a request for interim funding for a fully reimbursable supplemental grant in the amount of \$30,000 for the grant we are seeking from the State Historic Preservation Office. The purpose of the grant would be to fund a contract with an architectural historian, on a consulting basis, to update and expand our historic resources inventory. The survey forms constitute the more detailed information data base. The HRI is an inventory of town-wide historic resources worthy of special consideration for preservation. It's a broad data base that we maintain as an informational tool to local officials and boards to help guide in the decision making that will preserve and enhance the character of our community. The information in the inventory is also made available to the general public and is also available online on the HDC website with the express intent of educating the community and individual property owners about the significance of historic structures in our town. The focus of this effort will be in four areas of our town: downtown, Post Road/Main Street business districts; approximately 60 properties in the Kings Highway North Historic District; 35 houses designed by the prominent local architect Frasier Peters in the 1920'/30's and lastly, a selection of significant properties identified in the 2007 windshield survey where complete surveys were not performed. In closing, it is important to understand that this is a request for interim funding. This is for a grant that should be fully reimbursable from the state.

Committee report

Finance Committee, Ms. Talmadge:

So, we met initially on the 21st. We thought the grant sounded appropriate but we wanted to insure that the funds would be there after the state budget process. So, we asked Carol [Leahy] to provide us with a letter from the state to assure us that the funds would be there. She provided that letter on April 27. We met and voted to approve it unanimously.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comment

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded by Mr. Rubin.

RESOLVED: That upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance and a request by the First Selectman, the sum of \$30,000 to the Historic District Account (Fees & Services) for updating the Historic Resources Inventory which shall be fully reimbursed through the CLG Supplemental Grant at the completion of the project is hereby appropriated.

Members of the RTM

John Suggs, district 5:

I have a question for John on this. If you look in the budget for this year, when it shows us the actual versus the revised budget from last year, I would ask your attention to the Historic District where a year ago, we were asked to approve a budget that would make the staffing cut in half. It was a tough decision. It was one of those very difficult decisions that we had to make last year. We made it. To my surprise, the money was restored after we made that decision, based on the administration going to the Board of Finance. What troubles me the most was it came out of service monies that had been set aside to provide services by this department. Basically, the administration funded a position at the cost of providing services. My question for you is, if we were to allocate to this \$30,000, would it be possible for a second attempt to reallocate this money to go to salaries instead of providing the service that they are supposed to go to.

Mr. Kondub:

Last year, I believe, as you all know there was a budget cut the Board of Finance enacted. It got sustained, carried forward through the whole process for 2010/2011. The Historic District Commission came in and applied for a series of transfers from all the other budget lines that ended up funding an office salary line and still fund the position because that person still had work to do. That money that was in fees and services from prior years was in the salary line. It wasn't there any more to take up new work, historical studies to be done. The same holds true in the budget that you just adopted 10 minutes ago. What happens in this year's, you are appropriating it to this year. Go to the fees and services line in this year's budget, by the time the work is done, it will probably be sometime in the fall, that money is carried forward. It stays in the 10/11 budget on that budget line, not to be shifted. It has to be expended by that in order for us

to get the reimbursement for \$30,000. We are fronting the money. Then, they file for reimbursement. There is no chance in blank that it can be moved.

Mr. Suggs:

You are saying there is no chance for it being moved because if it is moved, it won't be reimbursed.

Mr. Kondub: There is a commitment to do this work

Mr. Suggs:

If it were to be moved like it was moved last year after we did our budget work, it wouldn't be reimbursed and we would just lose the \$30,000 for this item.

Mr. Kondub:

This gentleman from the Historic District, Mr. Henkels, they are committing to do this project. The Board of Finance knows that. They are asking you to acknowledge that. They will go forward and get it done and then we get the \$30,000 back.

Mr. Suggs:

I understand that but I also understand that the \$21,800 that was taken out of the budget last year had been committed for services, for programs and it wasn't used for services and programs. There's an old saying, "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." Since there is this precedent last year that services and program money was taken to backfill a salary, is it possible that will happen again?

Mr. Kondub: I won't let it happen again.

Mr. Suggs:

You're on the record that you will not allow these monies to backfill salaries.

Mr. Kondub:

I will advise the First Selectman not to authorize any transfers that way either. Okay?

Mr. Suggs:

Thank you. With that public commitment so that we don't have happen what happened last year, I will support this.

Allen Bomes, district 7:

Mr. Suggs, what happened is very common. The Board of Finance makes transfers. The department goes to the Board of Finance to make the transfers. You should go to the Board of Finance meeting and question it when they are going to vote on that. If it comes up this year, you should go to the Board of Finance meeting and object to it. I would doubt that the Board of Finance would

make this change because we would lose the \$30,000. It is more than just a transfer.

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Rose:

Before we read the next item, by charter, we have to take a 2/3 vote to see if we are going to continue. It is after 11:30 p.m. By show of hands, there was one person opposed. We will continue.

The secretary read item #7 of the call – Appropriation of \$26,690 to purchase a greens mower.

Presentation

Mr. McCarthy:

I could give you a long explanation of this but let me give you the short one. We received a grant for just over \$30,000 worth of equipment. We are asking for an appropriation of \$26,000. The balance will come out of operating accounts because we are actually buying equipment that we would be normally buying out of our operating account. We'll take that money out of the operating account. This represents a greens mower which we did not have in our operating account. It will come out of a capital account. We are asking for this appropriation. The reimbursement of 80 percent of the entire \$30,000 will give us a reimbursement of \$24,343. We will buy a \$26,000 lawn mower for \$2,300. It's a pretty good deal and I hope you will approve it.

Committee report

Finance Committee, Ms. Bruce:

There is back up information. I'm not going to repeat all the information in the packet. The only clarification, that it's not low emission. It's Lawn Equipment Exchange Fund. It is a low emissions program but the actual name of the fund is the Lawn Equipment Exchange Fund for all kinds of equipment the capital equipment that we are talking about, the greens mower as well as some small ticket items, such as hedgers Stuart explained he is also purchasing.. We met on the 12th. We approved the recommendation 6-0.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comment

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded by Mr. Rubin

RESOLVED: That upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance and a request by the Parks & Recreation Director, the sum of \$26,690 to the Golf Account (Capital Equipment) to fund the purchase of a greens mower which shall be substantially reimbursed through the Department of Environmental Protection LEEF Program is hereby appropriated.

Members of the RTM – no comment

By show of hands, motion passes unanimously 31-0

Mr. Rose:

Before we read item #8, a show of hands of those who wish to stay and finish this off tonight. Passes unanimously.

The secretary read item #8 of the call – Appropriation of \$1,200,000 to the Pension Budget Account (OPEB Plan Funding) Westport's planned contribution to the OPEB Trust Fund for 2010-11 fiscal year.

Presentation

Mr. Kondub:

Back on April 5, the Board of Finance passed a recommendation to this body to approve the second half of the funding of the ARC that is not built into our budget to meet our obligation to the OPEB trust fund for 10/11 fiscal year. The arc is about \$4.1 million, \$1.7 million is built into our budget. Your body approved an appropriation on March 1 or 2 for \$1.2 million which we took out of the surplus acknowledging some good financial results from the 09-10 fiscal year. Some of those results continue this fiscal year. We said we were going to come back for the funding again and we did, May 3, to do the second half of the funding. The administration has lived up to the commitment to fully fund this year.

Committee Report

Finance Committee, Mr. Bomes:

I have a 17 page committee report which I will never read. Just kidding. You could almost replay, if we had a video camera, what I said in March. We approved \$1.2 million in March. We have a request to fund another \$1.2 million. This is all for the 2010/2011 fiscal year so we have met the Annual Required Contribution, the ARC, as determined by the actuaries. It will still leave an unfunded liability of \$7.6 million because we have not been fully funding the ARC every year. The ARC for OPEB is only computed once every three years. This is based on figures from June 30, 2007. Everyone expects the ARC has grown since then which will have increased the cumulative unfunded liability. This will continue to put pressure on future operating budgets. I think we've heard that before. The latest ARC calculation for the period ending June 30, 2010 is expected shortly. There were six members present. The committee voted unanimously to recommend that the RTM approve \$1.2 million.

Members of the Westport electorate - No comment

Ms. Flug read the resolution and it was seconded by Mr. Rubin.

RESOLVED: That upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance and a request by the Finance Director, the sum of \$1,200,000 to the Pension Budget

Account (OPEB Plan Funding) for the remaining fifty percent (50 percent) cost of the Town of Westport's planned contribution to the OPEB Trust Fund for 2010-11 fiscal year is hereby appropriated.

Members of the RTM

Mr. Mandell:

If none of us got up and spoke for one moment about spending \$1.2 million, it would be a sad occasion. This is just the beginning of what we have to spend. If any of you sitting here wonder why some of us have been fiscally conservative or frugal with our money, this is it. There's no one else in the audience and I hope someone is watching on television because we restored at least \$25,000 so you can be hearing this even at 11:45 p.m. Our taxes are going to be going up and up and up because we have this obligation. We made a commitment to our employees going back for years and we must take care of it. From this point forward, we must address how we deal with pensions. We must find a way to control it. We must find a way to control the taxing of our public because my constituents, I don't know about yours, they are telling me that they don't want to be paying much more in taxes. That's why I have been frugal. I think we have to be very careful as we move forward. I am going to support \$1.2 million, \$2 million next year and who knows what the ARC is going to be because that is going to be our obligation. We are under the gun. We have to deal with it so let's be careful.

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously. 31-0.

The meeting adjourned 11:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia H. Strauss
Town Clerk



by Jacquelyn Fuchs
Secretary

ATTENDANCE: May 3, 2011 Budget meeting #2

DIST.	NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	NOTIFIED MODERATOR	LATE/ LEFT EARLY
1	Diane Cady	X			
	Matthew Mandell	X		X	Arr. 8:45p.m.
	Elizabeth Milwe	X			
	Judith Starr	X			
2	Linda Bruce	X			Arr. 7:50 p.m.
	Michael Guthman	X			
	Jay Keenan		X	X	
	Sean Timmins	X		X	Arr. 7:55 p.m.
3	Amy Ancel	X			Arr. 8:30. Left 11:10.
	Robert Galan	X			
	Bill Meyer	X			
	Hadley Rose	X			
4	Jonathan Cunitz, DBA	X			
	Gene Seidman	X			
	George Underhill		X	X	
	Jeffrey Wieser	X			
5	Barbara Levy	X			
	Richard Lowenstein	X			.
	Paul Rossi	X			
	John Suggs	X			
6	Joyce Colburn	X			
	Paul Lebowitz	X			
	Catherine Talmadge	X			
	Christopher Urist	X			
7	Arthur Ashman, D.D.S.	X			Left 11:10 p.m.
	Allen Bomes	X			Arr. 8:00 p.m.
	Jack Klinge	X			
	Stephen Rubin	X			
8	Wendy Batteau	X			
	Heather Cherry	X			Arr.7:40 p.m.
	Michael Rea	X			
	Lois Schine	X			
9	Eileen Flug	X			
	Kevin Green, Ph. D.	X			
	Velma Heller, Ed. D.	X			
	John McCarthy	X			Left 11:10 p.m.
Total		34	2		

Attachment 1**Roll Call Vote: Account #810-01 Restoration of \$70,000. Parks and Recreation.**

DIST.	NAME	ABSENT	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
1	Diane Cady		X		
	Matthew Mandell		X		
	Elizabeth Milwe		X		
	Judith Starr			X	
2	Linda Bruce		X		
	Michael Guthman		X		
	Jay Keenan	X			
	Sean Timmins		X		
3	Amy Ancel			X	
	Robert Galan		X		
	Bill Meyer		X		
	Hadley Rose		X		
4	Jonathan Cunitz, DBA		X		
	Gene Seidman		X		
	George Underhill	X			
	Jeffrey Wieser		X		
5	Barbara Levy		X		
	Richard Lowenstein		X		
	Paul Rossi		X		
	John Suggs		X		
6	Joyce Colburn		X		
	Paul Lebowitz		X		
	Catherine Talmadge		X		
	Christopher Urist		X		
7	Arthur Ashman, D.D.S.		X		
	Allen Bomes		X		
	Jack Klinge		X		
	Stephen Rubin	recused			
8	Wendy Batteau		X		
	Heather Cherry			X	
	Michael Rea			X	
	Lois Schine		X		
9	Eileen Flug		X		
	Kevin Green, Ph. D.			X	
	Velma Heller, Ed. D.		X		
	John McCarthy		X		
Total			28	5	

Attachment 2

Roll Call Vote: Account #151-01 Restore \$75,000 to Finance Department budget

DIST.	NAME	ABSENT	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
1	Diane Cady		X		
	Matthew Mandell			X	
	Elizabeth Milwe		X		
	Judith Starr			X	
2	Linda Bruce		X		
	Michael Guthman		X		
	Jay Keenan	X			
	Sean Timmins		X		
3	Amy Ancel			X	
	Robert Galan		X		
	Bill Meyer		X		
	Hadley Rose		X		
4	Jonathan Cunitz, DBA			X	
	Gene Seidman		X		
	George Underhill	X			
	Jeffrey Wieser		X		
5	Barbara Levy		X		
	Richard Lowenstein		X		
	Paul Rossi			X	
	John Suggs		X		
6	Joyce Colburn		X		
	Paul Lebowitz		X		
	Catherine Talmadge		X		
	Christopher Urist		X		
7	Arthur Ashman, D.D.S.		X		
	Allen Bomes		X		
	Jack Klinge		X		
	Stephen Rubin		X		
8	Wendy Batteau		X		
	Heather Cherry			X	
	Michael Rea			X	
	Lois Schine		X		
9	Eileen Flug		X		
	Kevin Green, Ph. D.		X		
	Velma Heller, Ed. D.		X		
	John McCarthy			X	
Total			26	8	

2011-2012 Westport Budget

ACCOUNTS FOR:	2011 REVISED BUD	2012 DEPT RQST	2012 SEL ADJUST	2012 SEL RQST	2012 BOF ADJUST	2012 BOF REC	2012 RTM ADJUST	2012 RTM REC
GENERAL FUND								
General Government								
110 R T M	39,142	39,142	0	39,142	0	39,142		
120 Selectmen	244,317	236,991	(600)	236,391	0	236,391		
132 Probate Court	15,910	15,910	0	15,910	0	15,910		
140 Registrars	119,774	104,634	(250)	104,384	250	104,634		
142 Elections	141,754	91,477	0	91,477	0	91,477		
150 Board of Finance	1,600	1,600	0	1,600	0	1,600		
151 Finance Department	769,532	755,531	0	755,531	(75,000)	680,531	75,000	755,531
152 Audit	161,600	169,200	0	169,200	0	169,200		
153 Personnel	242,079	239,134	(500)	238,634	(50,000)	188,634		
154 Assessor	430,093	428,758	0	428,758	0	428,758		
156 Tax Collector	292,696	292,653	0	292,653	0	292,653		
157 Information Technology	681,403	698,980	(10,000)	688,980	(75,000)	613,980	41,000	654,980
<i>157 Information Tech. Capital</i>	<i>50,050</i>	<i>45,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>45,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>45,000</i>		
158 Board of Assessment	1,725	1,725	0	1,725	0	1,725		
170 Town Attorney	758,567	758,267	0	758,267	0	758,267		
180 Town Clerk	363,462	361,220	(7,525)	353,695	0	353,695		
181 Historic District	55,107	55,107	0	55,107	0	55,107		
182 Conservation	326,168	326,161	(3,850)	322,311	0	322,311		
<i>182 Conservation Capital</i>	<i>1,200</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>450</i>		
185 Planning & Zoning	523,282	524,353	(21,000)	503,353	0	503,353		
187 Zoning Board of Appeals	26,440	26,440	(2,000)	24,440	0	24,440		
Total Gen. Govt. Operating	5,194,651	5,127,283	(45,725)	5,081,558	(199,750)	4,881,808		
<i>Total Gen. Govt. Capital</i>	<i>51,250</i>	<i>45,450</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>45,450</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>45,450</i>		
Total General Government	5,245,901	5,172,733	(45,725)	5,127,008	(199,750)	4,927,258		
Public Safety								
210 Police	7,404,901	7,482,923	0	7,482,923	0	7,482,923		
<i>210 Police Capital</i>	<i>182,500</i>	<i>121,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>121,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>121,500</i>		
214 Police Vehicle Maint.	313,492	336,508	(1,000)	335,508	0	335,508		
216 Dog Warden	119,642	122,695	(1,000)	121,695	0	121,695		
218 Emergency Medical Service	1,174,826	1,144,475	(2,500)	1,141,975	0	1,141,975		
Total Police Dept. Operating	9,012,861	9,086,601	(4,500)	9,082,101	0	9,082,101		
<i>Total Police Dept. Capital</i>	<i>182,500</i>	<i>121,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>121,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>121,500</i>		
Total Police Department	9,195,361	9,208,101	(4,500)	9,203,601	0	9,203,601		
220 Fire Department	7,521,378	7,609,872	(80,428)	7,529,444	0	7,529,444		
<i>220 Fire Department Capital</i>	<i>105,380</i>	<i>153,525</i>	<i>(38,385)</i>	<i>115,140</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>115,140</i>		
221 Water Service-Fire	990,000	1,035,000	0	1,035,000	0	1,035,000		
225 Building Inspection	284,665	287,165	(12,000)	275,165	0	275,165		
<i>225 Building Inspection Capital</i>	<i>430</i>	<i>28,366</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>28,366</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>28,366</i>		
235 Public Site & Buildings	78,950	78,951	0	78,951	0	78,951		
250 Emergency Management	35,270	38,561	(300)	38,261	0	38,261		
<i>250 Emer. Mgmt. Capital</i>	<i>14,000</i>	<i>15,000</i>	<i>(1,021)</i>	<i>13,979</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>13,979</i>		
Total Fire Dept. Operating	8,910,263	9,049,549	(92,728)	8,956,821	0	8,956,821		

2011-2012 Westport Budget

ACCOUNTS FOR:	2011 REVISED BUD	2012 DEPT RQST	2012 SEL ADJUST	2012 SEL RQST	2012 BOF ADJUST	2012 BOF REC	2012 RTM ADJUST	2012 RTM REC
<i>Total Fire Dept. Capital</i>	119,810	196,891	(39,406)	157,485	0	157,485		
Total Fire Department	9,030,073	9,246,440	(132,134)	9,114,306	0	9,114,306		
Total Public Safety Operating	17,923,124	18,136,150	(97,228)	18,038,922	0	18,038,922		
<i>Total Public Safety Capital</i>	302,310	318,391	(39,406)	278,985	0	278,985		
Total Public Safety	18,225,434	18,454,541	(136,634)	18,317,907	0	18,317,907		
Public Works								
310 Engineering	764,135	762,597	0	762,597	0	762,597		
<i>310 Engineering Capital</i>	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000		
320 Highway	1,530,020	1,546,762	0	1,546,762	0	1,546,762		
<i>320 Highway Capital</i>	42,500	30,500	0	30,500	0	30,500		
321 Equipment Maint.	320,603	320,603	0	320,603	0	320,603		
<i>321 Equip. Maint. Capital</i>	2,500	0	0	0	0	0		
322 Road Maintenance	1,106,815	1,094,000	0	1,094,000	0	1,094,000		
324 Street Lighting	250,000	250,000	0	250,000	0	250,000		
332 Solid Waste Disposal	2,300,286	2,264,024	0	2,264,024	0	2,264,024		
350 Building Maint.	1,188,635	1,191,154	0	1,191,154	0	1,191,154		
<i>350 Building Maint. Capital</i>	0	40,700	0	40,700	0	40,700		
352 Building Custodians	315,688	315,465	0	315,465	0	315,465		
<i>352 Building Cust. Capital</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0		
360 Property Maint.	21,000	21,000	0	21,000	0	21,000		
361 P&R Property Maint.	323,297	324,412	0	324,412	0	324,412		
<i>361 P&R Prop. Maint. Capital</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0		
370 Tree Maintenance	96,244	96,244	0	96,244	0	96,244		
Total Public Works Operating	8,216,723	8,186,261	0	8,186,261	0	8,186,261		
<i>Total Public Works Capital</i>	45,000	72,200	0	72,200	0	72,200		
Total Public Works Department	8,261,723	8,258,461	0	8,258,461	0	8,258,461		
Health								
410 Health District	458,729	458,759	0	458,759	0	458,759		
412 Health Services	3,700	3,700	0	3,700	0	3,700		
Total Health	462,429	462,459	0	462,459	0	462,459		
Human Services								
510 Youth Services	253,225	254,912	0	254,912	0	254,912		
520 Social Services	302,436	301,329	0	301,329	0	301,329		
530 Senior Services	404,669	407,748	0	407,748	0	407,748		
<i>530 Senior Services Capital</i>	750	0	0	0	0	0		
Total Human Services Operating	960,330	963,989	0	963,989	0	963,989		
<i>Total Human Services Capital</i>	750	0	0	0	0	0		
Total Human Services	961,080	963,989	0	963,989	0	963,989		
Library								
750 Library Board	4,031,725	4,076,798	0	4,076,798	0	4,076,798		
751 Library Pension	112,785	138,017	0	138,017	0	138,017		
Total Library	4,144,510	4,214,815	0	4,214,815	0	4,214,815		

2011-2012 Westport Budget

ACCOUNTS FOR:	2011 REVISED BUD	2012 DEPT RQST	2012 SEL ADJUST	2012 SEL RQST	2012 BOF ADJUST	2012 BOF REC	2012 RTM ADJUST	2012 RTM REC
Parks & Recreation								
810 P&R Administration	522,550	521,332	0	521,332	(70,000)	451,332	70,000	521,332
<i>810 P&R Admin. Capital</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0		
812 Guest Services	212,886	212,711	0	212,711	0	212,711		
820 Maintenance & Develop.	437,611	442,959	0	442,959	0	442,959		
830 Boating	178,600	178,600	0	178,600	0	178,600		
<i>830 Boating Capital</i>	11,500	12,900	(1,000)	11,900	0	11,900		
831 Parks Maint.	329,942	370,369	0	370,369	0	370,369		
<i>831 Parks Maint. Capital</i>	0	30,000	0	30,000	(10,000)	20,000		
832 Golf	796,036	799,385	0	799,385	0	799,385		
<i>832 Golf Capital</i>	20,000	79,000	0	79,000	0	79,000		
833 Athletic Fields Maint.	329,313	290,810	0	290,810	0	290,810		
<i>833 Athletic Fields Maint. Capital</i>	49,500	0	0	0	0	0		
834 Tennis	68,225	67,400	0	67,400	0	67,400		
835 Skating	34,163	36,500	0	36,500	0	36,500		
836 Beach & Pool	249,474	251,710	0	251,710	0	251,710		
<i>836 Beach & Pool Capital</i>	0	2,000	(1,000)	1,000	0	1,000		
838 Miscellaneous Programs	913,725	958,189	0	958,189	0	958,189		
<i>838 Misc. Programs Capital</i>	7,000	0	0	0	0	0		
840 Memorial & Veterans	8,400	8,400	0	8,400	0	8,400		
Total Parks & Rec. Operating	4,080,925	4,138,365	0	4,138,365	(70,000)	4,068,365		
<i>Total Parks & Rec. Capital</i>	<i>88,000</i>	<i>123,900</i>	<i>(2,000)</i>	<i>121,900</i>	<i>(10,000)</i>	<i>111,900</i>		
Total Parks & Recreation	4,168,925	4,262,265	(2,000)	4,260,265	(80,000)	4,180,265		
Miscellaneous								
901 Pensions	9,172,650	10,599,918	(450,000)	10,149,918	0	10,149,918		
902 Insurance	8,670,182	9,700,355	0	9,700,355	(22,500)	9,677,855		
903 Social Security	1,000,000	1,030,000	(10,000)	1,020,000	0	1,020,000		
905 Unemployment Comp.	55,000	80,000	0	80,000	0	80,000		
907 Earthplace	81,560	81,560	0	81,560	0	81,560		
911 Miscellaneous	373,000	330,850	(235,000)	95,850	0	95,850		
915 Transportation Services	281,158	281,158	0	281,158	(40,000)	241,158		
917 Reserve: Salary Adjust.	245	159,750	(26,625)	133,125	0	133,125		
921 Employee Productivity	8,500	7,000	0	7,000	0	7,000		
925 Accrued Vacation	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000		
Total Miscellaneous	19,647,295	22,275,591	(721,625)	21,553,966	(62,500)	21,491,466		
Other Financing Uses								
941 Transfer to Sewer Fund	355,800	434,425	0	434,425	0	434,425		
942 Transfer to Other Funds	0	500,000	(500,000)	0	0	0		
Total Other Financing Uses	355,800	934,425	(500,000)	434,425	0	434,425		
Debt Service								
951 Interest on Bond	1,041,245	948,166	0	948,166	0	948,166		
952 Bond Anticipation Finance	6,000	79,000	(39,000)	40,000	0	40,000		
953 Bond Principal Payments	2,004,820	2,038,093	0	2,038,093	0	2,038,093		

2011-2012 Westport Budget

ACCOUNTS FOR:	2011 REVISED BUD	2012 DEPT RQST	2012 SEL ADJUST	2012 SEL RQST	2012 BOF ADJUST	2012 BOF REC	2012 RTM ADJUST	2012 RTM REC
Total Debt Service	3,052,065	3,065,259	(39,000)	3,026,259	0	3,026,259		
Total Selectman's Operating	64,037,852	67,504,597	(1,403,578)	66,101,019	(332,250)	65,768,769		
<i>Total Selectman's Capital</i>	<i>487,310</i>	<i>559,941</i>	<i>(41,406)</i>	<i>518,535</i>	<i>(10,000)</i>	<i>508,535</i>		
Total Selectman's Requested	64,525,162	68,064,538	(1,444,984)	66,619,554	(342,250)	66,277,304		
Education								
650 Board of Education	96,377,916	98,603,496	0	98,603,496	(250,000)	98,353,496		
651 BOE Rentals/Reimb.	0	0	0	0	0	0		
652 Aid to Pvt & Par	277,029	288,005	0	288,005	0	288,005		
653 BOE Pensions	0	0	0	0	0	0		
654 Debt Service-Long Term	13,946,326	13,712,305	0	13,712,305	0	13,712,305		
655 Debt Serv-Bond Anticip.	0	75,000	(3,000)	72,000	0	72,000		
Board of Education's Requested	110,601,271	112,678,806	(3,000)	112,675,806	(250,000)	112,425,806		
TOTAL GEN. FUND OPERATING	174,639,123	180,183,403	(1,406,578)	178,776,825	(582,250)	178,194,575		
TOTAL GEN. FUND CAPITAL	487,310	559,941	(41,406)	518,535	(10,000)	508,535		
TOTAL GENERAL FUND	175,126,433	180,743,344	(1,447,984)	179,295,360	(592,250)	178,703,110		
RAILROAD PARKING FUND								
219 Railroad Parking Operating	1,651,448	1,672,483	0	1,672,483	0	1,672,483		
<i>219 Railroad Parking Capital</i>	<i>70,000</i>	<i>55,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>55,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>55,500</i>		
TOTAL RAILROAD PARKING	1,721,448	1,727,983	0	1,727,983	0	1,727,983		
SEWER FUND								
Public Works								
330 Sewage Treatment	1,080,450	1,109,770	0	1,109,770	0	1,109,770		
<i>330 Sewage Treatment Capital</i>	<i>45,000</i>	<i>40,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>40,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>40,000</i>		
331 Sewage Collection Capital	549,204	506,969	0	506,969	0	506,969		
<i>331 Sewage Collection Capital</i>	<i>80,000</i>	<i>80,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>80,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>80,000</i>		
Total Public Works Operating	1,629,654	1,616,739	0	1,616,739	0	1,616,739		
<i>Total Public Works Capital</i>	<i>125,000</i>	<i>120,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>120,000</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>120,000</i>		
Total Public Works Department	1,754,654	1,736,739	0	1,736,739	0	1,736,739		
Miscellaneous								
901 Pensions	112,500	110,000	0	110,000	0	110,000		
902 Insurance	305,180	326,635	0	326,635	0	326,635		
Total Miscellaneous	417,680	436,635	0	436,635	0	436,635		
Other Financing Uses								
941 Transfer to Sewer Fund	280,000	280,000	0	280,000	0	280,000		

2011-2012 Westport Budget

ACCOUNTS FOR:	2011 REVISED BUD	2012 DEPT RQST	2012 SEL ADJUST	2012 SEL RQST	2012 BOF ADJUST	2012 BOF REC	2012 RTM ADJUST	2012 RTM REC
Total Other Financing Uses	280,000	280,000	0	280,000	0	280,000		
Debt Service								
951 Interest on Bond	761,701	717,042	0	717,042	0	717,042		
952 Bond Anticipation Finance	85,000	84,000	(4,625)	79,375	0	79,375		
953 Bond Principal Payments	1,638,000	1,670,929	0	1,670,929	0	1,670,929		
Total Debt Service	2,484,701	2,471,971	(4,625)	2,467,346	0	2,467,346		
TOTAL SEWER FUND OPERATING	4,812,035	4,805,345	(4,625)	4,800,720	0	4,800,720		
TOTAL SEWER FUND CAPITAL	125,000	120,000	0	120,000	0	120,000		
TOTAL SEWER FUND	4,937,035	4,925,345	(4,625)	4,920,720	0	4,920,720		
Total Gen. Govt. Operating	0	0		0		0		
Total Gen. Govt. Capital	0	0		0		0		
Total Police Dept. Operating	0	0		0		0		
Total Police Dept. Capital	0	0		0		0		
Total Fire Dept. Operating	0	0		0		0		
Total Fire Dept. Capital	0	0		0		0		
Total Public Works Operating	0	0		0		0		
Total Public Works Capital	0	0		0		0		
Total Health	0	0		0		0		
Total Human Services Operating	0	0		0		0		
Total Human Services Capital	0	0		0		0		
Total Library	0	0		0		0		
Total Parks & Recreation Operating	0	0		0		0		
Total Parks & Recreation Capital	0	0		0		0		
Total Miscellaneous	0	0		0		0		
Total Other Financing Uses	0	0		0		0		
Total Debt Service	0	0		0		0		
Total Selectman's Operating	#N/A	#N/A		#N/A		#N/A		
Total Selectman's Capital	0	0		0		0		
Board of Education's Request	0	0		0		0		