

RTM Meeting
March 6, 2012

The call

1. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Historic District Commission, to amend Chapter 38-24 of the Code of Ordinances of the Town of Westport by adding the property and building(s) located at 42 Compo Road North as a historic property. (First reading. Full text available at the Town Clerk Office)
2. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance, to approve a request by the Superintendent of Schools for an appropriation of \$152,000 (with bond and note authorization) to the Educational Facilities Fund (EFIF) Account, CMS Roof Recoating.
3. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance, to approve a request by the Superintendent of Schools for an appropriation of \$145,931 from the Capital & Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund (C&NEF) Unassigned Fund Balance to the Capital & Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund (C&NEF) Account, School Bus: Hybrid to purchase a hybrid electric diesel fuel school bus.
4. To take such action as the meeting may determine, upon the recommendation of the First Selectman to approve an ordinance adopting Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 4-124i through 4-124p as amended, providing for the formation of a regional Council of Governments; authorizing the town to join such Council when duly established; designating the First Selectman as the representative of the Town of Westport on such Council; and authorizing the Representative Town Meeting to designate an alternate representative from its members for a two-year term or until the next election of the RTM. (Second reading, full text available in the Town Clerk office.)

Minutes

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 or ATT 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 by Mr. Miggs Burroughs

Invocation, Miggs Burroughs:

Thank you, Eileen, for inviting me. it is an honor to be here. I chose a nursery rhyme as an invocation. Some of you may have heard this. It has been used as an interpretation of a metaphor for leading a purposeful and productive life. "Row,

Row, Row Your Boat”, this is my reinterpretation from others I have heard. It's just 18 words:

Row, row, row your boat,
Gently down the stream;
Merrily, merrily, merrily, merrily,
Life is but a dream.

Row, row, row your boat: Rowing is a deliberate act. It requires effort. Like any job, it requires that you show up for the job of rowing. When you are rowing, you are the captain of your ship, of your boat. You determine the direction, the destination, the speed, the quality of the trip. It's your boat. You can't row my boat. You can't row your parents' boat. You can't row your kids' boat. You can't row your uncle's boat. It's your boat to row. Gently down the stream: Not aggressively up the stream. Gently down the stream is a much nicer, more productive way to live a life. It doesn't mean there aren't controversies and squabbles like there might be here, perhaps. But, generally, as an attitude, you row gently down the stream. A friend of mine once said, "The harder you push against a wall, the harder it pushes back." I think Ted Turner said, "If you don't like the way the wind is blowing, just change your sails. You can't change the wind." Merrily, merrily, merrily, merrily: The alternative to that, I guess, is angrily, angrily, angrily, angrily. It's really hard to say. It's much better to do it merrily. Find the joy in life. Do what you enjoy. Enjoy what you do. I know this sounds sort of Pollyannaish but, it's a nursery rhyme! It's just an ideal. Find the joy in things you do. It's much better than approaching things with anger and resentment that we tend to do. The last part is "Life is but a dream". A dream is a state of mind where anything is possible. You can do anything. You can be anything. You can change anything and life can be that if you choose to row your boat in the right direction. That's it. Thanks.

There were 29 members present. Mr. Timmins, Mr. Floyd, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Suggs, Ms. Feller, Dr. Ashman, and Ms. Cherry notified the Moderator that they would be absent. Mr. Mandell and Mr. Keenan notified the Moderator that they would be late.

There were no corrections to the minutes of February 6. If anyone finds anything, please let Jackie, Hadley Rose or Patty Strauss know.

Announcements

Mr. Rose:

I would like to offer our condolences to Ms. Cherry who lost her father-in-law within the last day, which is why she's not here this evening. Our best to her.

Birthday greetings, it is a light month. We have Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Rose. Happy birthday to us.

The next RTM meeting is right here, April 3 at eight o'clock in the auditorium.

Upcoming RTM meetings;
Finance Committee, March 13, at 7:30, room 309.

Health & Human Services, 201, March 14, 7:30 p.m.

RTM announcements

Bill Meyer, district 3:

What town do you think in Fairfield County has the most people over 60? Westport, 24 percent; Wilton, 19 percent; Darien, 16 percent; Weston, 17 percent. Why are we lucky? Because we have a fantastic Senior Center thanks to Jack Klinge. We are having a Friends of the Senior Center concert on the 18th. I want to congratulate Jack. He just got us a \$10,000 grant from AT&T. We have all these things going. He's got 11 different restaurants bringing food.

Next: Arthur Ashman, every week, he's up here. What does he say? Jazz. I went to this last week, it was fabulous. This is the best jazz. How many people have been to Bourbon Street? What a bunch of wild people. This is the best jazz outside of Bourbon Street. Art will be back next time to pitch it.

Jack, congratulations for all you have done.

Jack Klinge, district 7

I will acknowledge Bill's gracious comments. I don't do nearly as much as he said I do. There is a concert March 18 at two o'clock at the Senior Center. Doors open at one o'clock. In February, we had an overflow crowd of some 225 people so I'm now announcing for public consumption that the Fire Marshal suggested we limit it to about 175. You'd better get there early or you might not get a seat next Saturday. I have a totally new surprise announcement that I didn't think to make tonight but, thanks to Steve, I'm going to add a public service announcement. As you probably know, I'm on the Board of Director of Safe Rides which is the Staples student run and operated program which provides safe rides home for kids Saturday nights from their destinations around town as a last resort if nothing else is available. We are a non-profit. We only succeed based on donations. The kids run four cars every night with a driver, a navigator and other kids back at the base station including one adult. I just got a lovely donation check tonight from PAL for \$1,250. That will go towards providing more and better services for our kids in town. Thank you, Steve, and thank PAL.

Dick Lowenstein, District 5:

This is my semi-annual reminder about the library book sale. The next one will be a week from this coming Saturday starting at nine o'clock at the library. I wanted to address everyone here in the audience, particularly those who may be watching at home tonight, tomorrow and the day after on streaming. The sale starts on March 17 and runs for four days. We welcome everybody and hope you'll come. It's a lot cheaper to buy a book at the library than it is to download one and you can give it away when you finish reading it.

The secretary read item #1 of the call - To amend Chapter 38-24 of the Code of Ordinances of the Town of Westport by adding the property and building(s) located at 42 Compo Road North as a historic property. (First reading.)

Presentation

Frances Henkels, Chair, Historic District Commission:

On behalf of the commission, I would like to recommend to you that you amend the ordinance to include this property at 42 Compo Road North. This property is across the road from Winslow Park, the Compo Road portion. It is a saltbox turned perpendicular to the road. Our historic research into the property indicates it is not as old as I thought it would be. Apparently, the core structure was an outbuilding to the sanitarium before Winslow Park was created and in the 1940's added onto and converted into a house. We believe it to be a fine example of a colonial revival converted into a saltbox, very authentically done, I would say. The owner, a widow, Claire Everhart, has come before us and requested the property be designated so that it can be preserved for the benefit of all of us in Westport. It should be pointed out that her husband, they lived in the house since 1964, was a Broadway actor, Rex Everhart. He since passed away in 2000. We commend Mrs. Everhart for coming forward and requesting this designation for the house and we urge you to approve it.

Mr. Rose:

We will not have a committee report this evening. That will be at the next meeting in April. Typically, on a first reading we don't have any comment but, obviously, the public is always entitled to comment at RTM meetings

Members of the Westport electorate - No comments

Mr. Rose: Thank you Mr. Henkels.

The secretary read item #2 of the call - To approve a request by the Superintendent of Schools for an appropriation of \$152,000 for the Coleytown Middle School Roof Recoating. By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously.

Presentation

Elliott Landon, Superintendent and Nancy Harris, Assistant Superintendent:

We are here tonight for two items. The first of which is our hypalon roof replacement at Coleytown Middle School and the second is a hybrid bus. With that, I would like to introduce Nancy Harris who will talk to both issues.

Nancy Harris, Assistant Superintendent:

We are requesting funding for the recoating of the Coley Middle School hypalon roof system. It is a series of high pitched roofs on Coley Middle that are were installed in 1994. Unfortunately, our architect was tied up in a meeting that started at seven o'clock. I had expected him to come to be able to answer any technical questions, so, I apologize. This roof, as I said, installed in 1994, came with a 15 year warranty. It is out of warranty. It has been reviewed by the Selectmen's Maintenance Committee and found to be in need of repair or replacement. I have engaged Silver Petricelli and Associates to review the roof, as well. They found that it does either need to be repaired or replaced. The recommendation is to recoat it which will allow for an additional 10 year warranty. Right now, it's a rubberized type of material. It's the white roofs on the school. The texture and the materials are getting thinner and thinner. At a certain point, we will no longer be able to repair it and it's getting close to that point. If you think of the material as it wears away, it almost starts becoming like cheesecloth so that it will no longer be watertight and it's rapidly approaching that point; although, we are still, we keep Silktown Roofing on retainer to maintain all of our roofs. The budget was included in your materials including architectural fees. We are anticipating \$151,131; therefore, we are asking a funding request be approved of \$152,000. If the RTM grants the approval, we will have Silver Petricelli develop the bid specifications, go out to public bid. We will have Silver Petricelli do the pre-qualifications for the roofing companies. There are a limited number of firms that can handle this type of material. The original material, the hypalon itself, is no longer made but there are several other companies who make a similar product that can go over those roofing areas.

Committees report

Finance and Education Committees, Allen Bomes, district 7:

Ms. Harris presented it to the committees and she pretty much said the same thing. So, I am not going to read the report. I will just give you some highlights. The Finance and Education Committees met last Thursday, Feb. 28. Just a couple of points: The cost to recoat it, the hypalon roof, is approximately three dollars a square foot. It's 35,000 or so square feet. If we didn't recoat it, the next step, which would come probably next year, would be to put in a totally new roof which would be seven dollars a square foot. That would be a 15 year life versus the 10 year life for recoating. So, we are saving approximately \$140,000 and lose five years. It seems like a pretty good deal. Again, we heard that the Maintenance Committee recommended it. We have Mr. Rubin and Mr. Klinge on the committee. They strongly recommend it. A little bit of good news, in the last five-year capital forecast from the Board of Education, the cost was \$100,000 more so, it is actually going to be \$100,000 less than what was expected last year. Both committees voted unanimously to approve, to recommend the RTM approve this request. I just mention that the Education Committee did not have a quorum so they issued only a sense of the meeting approval.

Members of the Westport electorate - No comments

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 Superintendent of Schools the sum of \$152,000 (with bond and note authorization) to the Educational Facilities Improvement Fund (EFIF) Account, CMS Roof Recoating is hereby appropriated.

Section 1. As recommended by the Board of Finance and for the purpose of financing the foregoing appropriation, the Town shall borrow a sum not to exceed \$152,000 and issue bonds for such indebtedness under its corporate name and seal and upon the full faith and credit of the Town.

Section 2. The First Selectman, Selectmen and Finance Director are hereby appointed a committee with full power and authority to cause said bonds to be sold, issued and delivered; to determine their form, including provision for redemption prior to maturity; to determine the aggregate principal amount thereof within the amount hereby authorized and the denominations and maturities thereof; to fix the time of issue of each series thereof and the rate or rates of interest thereon as herein provided; to designate the bank or trust company to certify the issuance thereof and to act as transfer agent, paying agent and as registrar for the bonds, and to designate bond counsel. The committee shall have all appropriate powers under the Connecticut General Statutes including Chapter 748 (Registered Public Obligations Act) to issue the bonds and, further, shall have full power and authority to do all that is required under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and other applicable laws and regulations of the United States and the State of Connecticut, to provide for issuance of the bonds in tax exempt form, including the execution of tax compliance and other agreements for the benefit of bondholders, and to meet all requirements which are or may become necessary in and subsequent to the issuance and delivery of the bonds in order that the interest on the bonds be and remain exempt from federal income taxes, including, without limitation, to covenant and agree to restriction on investment yield of bond proceeds, rebate of arbitrage earnings, expenditure of proceeds within required time limitations and the filing of information reports as and when required.

Section 3. The Bonds may be designated "Public Improvement Bonds of the Town of Westport," series of the year of their issuance and may be issued in one or more series, and may be consolidated as part of the same issue with other Bonds of the Town; shall be in serial form maturing in not more than twenty (20) annual installments of principal, the first installment to mature not later than three years from the date of issue and the last installment to mature not later than twenty (20) years therefrom, or as otherwise provided by statute. The bonds may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at public sale upon invitation for first installment to mature not later than three years from the date of issue and the last installment to mature not later than twenty (20) years therefrom, or as otherwise provided by statute. The bonds may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at public sale upon invitation for bids to the responsible bidder submitting the bid resulting in the lowest interest cost to the Town, provided that nothing herein shall prevent the Town from rejecting all bids submitted in response to any one invitation for bids and the right to so reject all bids is hereby reserved, and further provided that the committee may sell the bonds, or notes, on a negotiated basis, as provided by statute. Interest on the bonds shall be payable semiannually or annually. The bonds shall be signed on behalf of the Town by the First Selectman and the Finance Director, and shall

bear the seal of the Town. The signing, sealing and certification of said bonds may be by facsimile as provided by statute. The Finance Director shall maintain a record of bonds issued pursuant to this resolution and of the face amount thereof outstanding from time to time, and shall certify to the destruction of said bonds after they have been paid and cancelled, and such certification shall be kept on file with the Town Clerk.

Section 4. The said committee is further authorized to make temporary borrowings as permitted by the General Statutes and to issue a temporary note or notes of the Town in anticipation of the receipt of proceeds from the sale of the bonds to be issued pursuant to this resolution. Such notes shall be issued and renewed at such times and with such maturities, requirements and limitations as provided by statute. Notes evidencing such borrowings shall be signed by the First Selectman and the Finance Director, have the seal of the Town affixed, which signing and sealing may be by facsimile as provided by statute, be certified by and payable at a bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of this or any other state, or of the United States, be approved as to their legality by bond counsel, and may be consolidated with the issuance of other Town of Westport bond anticipation notes. Said committee shall determine the date, maturity, interest rates, form and manner of sale, including negotiated sale, and other details of said notes consistent with the provisions of this resolution and the General Statutes and shall have all powers and authority as set forth above in connection with the issuance of bonds and especially with respect to compliance with the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and regulations thereunder in order to obtain and maintain issuance of the notes in tax exempt form.

Section 5. Upon the sale and issuance of the bonds authorized by this resolution, the proceeds thereof, including any premium received upon the sale thereof, accrued interest received at delivery and interest earned on the temporary investment of such proceeds, shall be applied forthwith to the payment of the principal and interest of all notes issued in anticipation thereof or shall be deposited in trust for such purposes with a bank or trust company, or shall be applied or rebated as may be required under the provision of law. The remainder of the proceeds, if any, after the payment of said notes and of the expense of issuing said notes and bonds shall be applied to further finance the appropriation made by the appropriation resolution enacted concurrently herewith.

Section 6. In each fiscal year in which the principal or any installment of interest shall fall due upon any of the bonds or notes herein authorized there shall be included in the appropriation for such fiscal year a sum equivalent to the amount of such principal and interest so falling due, and to the extent that provision is not made for the payment thereof from other revenues, the amount thereof shall be included in the taxes assessed upon the Grand List for such fiscal year and shall not be subject to any limitations of expenditures or taxes that may be imposed by any other Town ordinance or resolution.

Section 7. Pursuant to Section 1.150-2 (as amended) of the Federal Income Tax Regulations the Town hereby expresses its official intent to reimburse expenditures paid from the General Fund, or the Education Facilities Improvement Fund, or the Capital and Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund for the aforesaid project with the proceeds of the bonds or notes to be issued under the provisions thereof. The allocation of such reimbursement bond proceeds to an expenditure shall be made in accordance with the time limitations and other requirements of such regulations. The Finance Director is authorized to pay project expenses

in accordance herewith pending the issuance of the reimbursement bonds or notes.

Section 8. The Town of Westport, or other proper authority of the Town, is authorized to take all necessary action to apply to the State of Connecticut, and accept from the State, grants in aid of further financing the project.

Section 9. The said committee is hereby authorized to take all action necessary and proper for the sale, issuance and delivery of the bonds (and notes) in accordance with the provisions of the Town Charter, the Connecticut General Statutes, and the laws of the United States.

Mr. Rose:

It has been moved and seconded by Mr. Rubin to approve the resolution just read.

Members of the RTM

Stephen Rubin, district 7:

Very quickly, as a member of the Maintenance Committee, one of the things that they make me do which is not the most pleasurable thing in the world is to get on top of these roofs. For that, can you please reward me by voting in favor of this because it was a cold, windy day would we went up there. We found it to be certainly worth a 10 year warranty. We found it to be definitely financially sound. We definitely find it necessary and concur with the report that Nancy gave. Thank you and I hope we have full support.

Wendy Batteau, district 8:

I certainly support this remembering my days of dodging buckets of water flowing from the ceilings of the Coleytown schools and all the trouble that we've had. I'm just curious about the roofers we have on retainer. I know that this is a much larger deal than a retainer roofer would do but I'm curious about what we pay them and what level they actually go up to in terms of what activities they would do. I also urge everybody to vote for this.

Ms. Harris:

The roofing company, we go to bid on a time and material basis for roof repairs. I don't have the actual hourly rate; however, what we have bid for is roof repairs. So for instance, if a seam is coming apart, if someone has been doing work on the roof, for instance we had an occasion where someone was on the roof and punctured one of our roofs, so, they come in and they repair it. They are authorized and recognized by our various roofing companies so that it retains the warranties on those roofs where there are still warranties. But, I don't have the hourly rate for the time.

Don Bergmann, district 1:

Just a few questions. One was, Allen, you said you didn't have a quorum in the Education Committee. You had four. It's an eight person committee. Isn't that a

quorum? Could you tell me what the architectural fee is, Nancy, as part of that \$150,000?

Ms. Harris:

On the budget that I believe everyone received, hopefully, it was on the back of some of the materials, is the full budget. The subtotal for the construction is \$102,750. The general conditions is \$10,275; the overhead and profit is \$15,413; construction total is \$128,438; architect and design fees are \$4,850 administrative fees because they would be overseeing the construction work is \$2,000; printing legal notices \$3,000 and the contingency is \$12,644

Mr. Bergmann:

Another question: We now have a Facility Director as of December, Robert Woosley. Does he have an active role in these kinds of projects or will he have an active role in these kinds of projects? Ultimately, what I'm really asking is, the expenses that we pay for consultants and architects and so forth, is there any sense that he will cause those numbers to go down? This is sort of a general question not necessarily relating to this particular item.

Ms. Harris:

Certainly, our Director of Facilities has met with me and with Bill Silver of Silver Petricelli to talk through the scope of the plan. He will be responsible for day-to-day types of oversight; however, we always hire a design professional when there are technical issues for a project that needs to be bid and that carry warranties such as a roof warranties for 10 years. So, I do not anticipate that the professional and design fees, whether it be architectural or engineering, would be reduced. Certainly, having a Director of Facilities overseeing the entire facilities operation is very helpful.

Mr. Bergmann:

A question for Steve Rubin of the Maintenance Committee: At the Board of Finance meeting, they asked whether or not the Maintenance Committee ever gave written reports of their results. At that time, one wasn't in place. Is that done? Is there 'we support this' in writing?

Mr. Rubin:

Written reports are made on everything we do and has been for almost 12 years now. Those reports are submitted to the First Selectman. Our committee is a First Selectman's committee so the answer is yes.

Mr. Bergmann:

This is a maintenance matter under Connecticut funding support, you mentioned in the write up, so it is not available for getting Connecticut support. Could you just generally, for my benefit, give me some kind of sense of maintenance versus capital and how that falls in. This is a capital expenditure because of why? Warranty? Or because it goes to a capital project? I'm just curious.

Ms. Harris:

Traditionally, the projects that get put into the Board of Education's capital forecast are \$100,000 or more. The funding process and what vehicle is used to fund is always the funding bodies in conjunction with the Finance Director of the Town's choice. So, for instance, as we are requesting the funds, we are not saying it should be paid out of cash or bond or BANs or any of those things. Traditionally, that is always the funding bodies in conjunction with the Town's Finance Director.

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously.

The secretary read item #3 of the call - To approve a request by the Superintendent of Schools for an appropriation of \$145,931 to purchase a hybrid electric diesel fuel school bus. By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously.

Presentation

Ms. Harris:

This request is a request specifically to the town to front fund part of the cost of a hybrid bus. This is part of a federal congestion mitigation air quality initiative funneled through the State of Connecticut Department of Transportation. We applied for and were awarded one of the grants to experiment with a hybrid bus. That hybrid bus would be used as part of our fleet and it would replace one of the regular buses that is scheduled to be purchased for the 2012/2013 school year. The grant provides the difference between the cost of regular diesel bus and the cost of the hybrid diesel bus is a which amounts to \$63,584. Under the terms of the grant, what would happen would be that the town would purchase the bus. Similar to construction grants, we're required to make a commitment to front 100 percent of the money. At the point where the bus is ordered, received, and paid for, the grant funds of the \$63,584 would be reimbursed to the town. It would be deposited back into the account that it was purchased from. The other terms of the grant would be to enter into a two year lease with our current service provider, which is Dattco. The lease would create two equal payments made to the town by Dattco in the amount of \$41,173.50 per year paid at the beginning of each year so that, once the bus was received in July or August, Dattco would pay the town the first \$41,173.50. The bus would be put in service. The following September, the remaining \$41,173.50 would be paid. The terms of the lease would show an intent to transfer title at the end of the two-year lease for an amount \$452.90 which is the estimated cost of fronting the cash, initially. It gives us an opportunity, along with some other selected towns, New Canaan being one of them, who applied for this grant and were awarded it to experiment. It gives us the chance to, this particular hybrid generates power not by plugging it in but by using the brakes. So that every time the bus hits the brakes, and if you've ever been behind the bus, you know they do that a lot as they stop at all of our bus

stops so, that generates the power. Obviously, it has a diesel fuel tank so that if there are some problems, it can also run on the diesel. And so, we are requesting the opportunity to try this hybrid bus out.

Committees report

Finance and Education Committees, Mr. Bomes:

The report pretty much says exactly the same thing. We met again last Thursday, the 28th, both committees. The only thing that I want to add is that all the money is coming out of the Capital and Nonrecurring Fund and all that is going to go back into the Capital and Nonrecurring Fund. Again, both committees voted unanimously and, again, the Education Committee did not have a quorum so they only gave a sense of the meeting approval.

Members of the Westport electorate - No comments

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 Superintendent of Schools, the sum of \$145,931 from the Capital & Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund (C&NEF) Unassigned Fund Balance to the Capital & Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund (C&NEF) Account, School Bus: Hybrid to purchase a hybrid electric/diesel fuel school bus is hereby appropriated.

Members of the RTM

Velma Heller, district 9:

I think it's important to make a correction at this time. I was out of town at the time of this meeting when the meeting was held. I believe that members of the committee were unaware that, while we have had nine members on our committee, we have now only eight. So, Hadley, I may be giving you a problem as to how we handle this because there is no question that there was a quorum.

Mr. Rose: According to RTM rules, there would be a quorum.

Dr. Heller:

According to our rules, therefore, I don't know if that makes what they did a sense of the meeting whether it makes it legit.

Mr. Rose: It doesn't matter.

Dr. Heller:

Whatever the case, I want you to know I will support this resolution because I think it's the kind of thing we should be doing. In terms of the future, I think it's the way we should be thinking about energy, about costs, overall. I think the way it works out financially it's good for the town. I support it.

Mr. Rose: Thank you Mr. Bergmann for pointing that out.

Dewey Loselle, district 5:

It's more of a question for the future. This bus we are buying, it is, basically with other people's money. The question would be, in the future, if this is an experiment that we think is successful by however we measure that, are we planning to buy buses in Westport that would be like double the cost each year?

Dr. Landon:

It would be my hope and expectation that we would not be buying buses that cost us double every year; however, we are committed to being as green and environmentally friendly as possible. Witness the fact that we did make a commitment to low sulfur fuel in our school buses and they do run on low sulfur fuel. If we can determine that the long term cost more than offsets the increase of more expensive equipment, which is environmentally friendly. We will certainly make that commitment being fiscally responsible and very cognizant of our need to keep our expenses low.

By show of hands, the motion passes unanimously.

The secretary read item #4 of the call - To approve an ordinance adopting Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 4-124i through 4-124p as amended, providing for the formation of a regional Council of Governments; authorizing the town to join such Council when duly established; designating the First Selectman as the representative of the Town of Westport on such Council; and authorizing the Representative Town Meeting to designate an alternate representative from its members for a two-year term or until the next election of the RTM.

Presentation

First Selectman Gordon Joseloff:

Close enough for government work. I'll start Mr. Moderator while you're fixing that. Good evening members of the RTM and members of the public. This is an exciting night. It is exciting because you just took a vote to innovate in Westport, innovate with a hybrid bus. Now you have the opportunity to innovate in a form of government. It's a form of government that you've heard a lot about. It's a form of government that's been in existence in the State of Connecticut, for several decades, elsewhere in the state but it's new for this region. I guess it's about nine years ago that my predecessor, Diane Farrell, when she served as chair of the Metropolitan Planning Organization also spearheaded an effort to transform the Southwest Regional Planning Agency into a Council of Government. It's an idea obviously, those of you who were here last month have heard me espouse on it. It's an idea whose time has come. We do have a PowerPoint presentation. I don't want to repeat a lot of what was said. Some of you had it as members of the P&Z committee. Some of you got that PowerPoint presentation today, an awful lot of information. The bottom line is this is good for Westport. It's good for the region. Is it going to come about? I'm not quite sure. It's going to be a

while but the RTM has an opportunity tonight to make a statement; to make a statement that says you've done your homework; you've evaluated the proposal; you've seen what's happened elsewhere in the state; you've rejected such notions that it's a return to county government, that it's a new tax structure for the region; you've, hopefully, latched onto the idea that efficiencies in inter-cooperation, in planning for future, are the way to move ahead in this very crowded region of the state, a region that as you all well know and I know are the funding body or the ATM of the State of Connecticut. Here we are one of the last two regions in the state to still be in this Regional Planning Agency form of planning. I have with me in the auditorium tonight to answer some of your questions, Dr. Floyd Lapp who will join me to go through the presentation, I hope fairly quickly, because there is a lot of information. Dr. Lapp is the Executive Director of the Southwest Regional Planning Agency. We are honored to have the First Selectman of Weston, Gail Weinstein, with us tonight. We're happy to have an welcome one of the Westport representatives on the SWRPA Board, Jeff Jacobs. We have Craig Lader who is a Senior Transportation Planner with the Southwest Regional Planning Agency. You don't hear a lot about SWRPA. You don't hear a lot about the Metropolitan Planning Organization which I took over the chair in December. The MPO really is a federally mandated body which oversees transportation planning and expenditure of federal funds in the State of Connecticut. I don't have to tell you that, as we look at the decades ahead, that we are going to become more congested. We are going to become more saddled with wants and needs that we can't pay for singly, that we have to do together. A lot of the questions that come up about this. a couple that came up in the Ordinance Committee, I just want you to know, as you've seen in your packet, there will be an amendment presented tonight that I am fully in support of. It's fairly minor. It makes the word change in the Designated Representative:

If the CEO of Westport is unable to attend a COG meeting, the RTM **shall** appoint someone to act in his place.

It goes from *may* to *shall*. The other is a sunset clause. This authorization to join a COG will expire with the expiration of this session of the RTM. I certainly don't want you to commit future RTM members to something that they haven't had a chance to vet. Really, it's until the end of this term that this authorization will remain in place. With that I will invite Dr. Lapp to come forward and go through some of these slides with you. I will be at his side. Later on, when it comes to RTM questions, I will be happy to answer some of your questions.

Dr. Floyd Lapp, Executive Director, Southwest Regional Planning Agency:

It's a pleasure to be with you. I do want to make it very clear in keeping with the prior slide that, as we mentioned to the subcommittee and the P&Z last week, this is what we call a due diligence report. I am not here to speak for or against.

I'm just saying that this is an objective, factual, commentary that I am going to offer. If I do it right, you will not be able to tell whether I am for or against, pro or con on the issue. Before you is the little table of contents of where we are in the current structure, what we've found by the way of operating scenarios, where we'd like to go and the FAQs are knocking down a whole pile of mythology that,

unfortunately, surrounds this issue. So, here is 1947 to the present: Connecticut had the wisdom to abolish county government as you well know and establish in its place in the 1950s, 15 Regional Planning Agencies, also known as RPA's. Up until the mid-60s and into the early 70's, that was the predominant form of regional organization. As you can see, in 1965, there was an option to create a Council of Elected Officials. Then in 1971, the Council of Governments, a CEO option and a COG option. Over the last 40 years or so, of the now current 14 Regional Planning Organizations, because last year there was a merger, 12 have opted for becoming either a CEO, three of those, or a COG, nine of those. This map simply depicts the three forms of regional structure by color. The predominant color being the nine COGs, three being the CEOs or Council of Elected Officials, leaving the two Regional Planning Organizations, SWRPA in the Southwestern corner and Central Connecticut, just south of the capital region. This simply shows, in tabular form, those 14 structures, again, the two RPA's, nine COGs and the three CEOs. Here's how we are organized currently. SWRPA staff, right in the middle, doing the things that are enumerated on the exhibit with a mere \$1.5 million budget, largely Federal DOT funds, 80 to 85 percent, most of the balance made up by state funds from those two agencies, DEEP and OPM. The eight member municipalities contribute about \$121,000 of the \$1.5 million budget. On one side you see the SWRPA or RPA board, 22 volunteers from the eight member municipalities and the type of work that we do. On the other side, although we are united, is the Regional MPO primarily focused on transportation. Just as an aside, 50 years ago, the Federal Government established MPO's as a way of allocating their funds from the federal to the state on down to the subdivisions of the state, counties, but in our state, regions. That's simply shows you in org. structure what the last slide showed you in the column format. There are the two organizations, again, in the center. The Executive Director, the SWRPA staff off to the right, and off to the left of various bodies. In the case of the MPO's, it's the eight elected officials as you see in the lower left corner.. There are three transit districts; Westport has one, Norwalk has another and Stamford the third. In the upper left corner, SWRPA is served by eight P&Z appointees and various other points of appointment, chief elected, local legislators, etc. What we did almost two years ago, a living laboratory, field work, rather than reading books about the subject. Mr. Joseloff who was then Vice Chair of the MPO along with Jeb Walker, First Selectman of New Canaan at the time, the Chair of the MPO, the Chair and the Vice Chair of the RPA and yours truly, the five of us went out and met with the four regional organizations that you see there at Litchfield Hills in the central Naugatuck Valley and Housatonic Valley and in south-central. We visited two CEOs, two out of three, and two of the nine COGs. Our objective was to find out what's going on here. Are they happy with this structure? What are the advantages and disadvantages? These are the findings, all objectively determined, highly positive; leadership in place where it belongs with the chief elected officials; leadership by the CEOs having the value added in the form of greater prestige, attention, importance to the organization and, the good news, volunteerism still preserved since each municipality selects membership and alternate

membership to a Regional Planning Committee, an RPC. They do volunteer review of referrals and planning related matters. What most of the people that we met with appreciated was one monthly meeting. All business comes under one roof at one time; all regional planning all transportation issues. The skill sets of these CEOs worked well because, as CEOs, they deal with budgets, as you well know, and dealing with the regional structure budget, which is far less than the municipal budgets, to many of them was just a piece of cake. Be they volunteers or professionals who we met with, they all expressed satisfaction with this new structure. They felt it was manageable and promoted collegial operations. So the operating scenarios that we look at should the Southwest Regional Planning Agency become a Council of Governments, you'd have the non-transportation regional planning matters that SWRPA currently performs; the agency finances, the organizational administration and the transportation planning matters, previously performed by the MPO, all under the same roof, as I mentioned. The good news is you'd have regional organization and coordination. The representation, by statute, as you know, we have eight municipalities in southwestern, so the eight municipal chief elected officials would each have a vote, one vote per representative. There would be eight volunteers appointed from each of the eight municipalities making up this Regional Planning Commission that we mentioned and then there'd be any number of other volunteer participation opportunities through whatever committees or study groups that the COG wanted to promote. The comprehensive planning would be very much what we all know of here at the municipal level in Connecticut or at the regional level. Every 10 years, the updated Plan Of Conservation and Development, any number of functional planning activities be it environmental, housing, economic development, and as I mentioned previously, the whole referral activity. The representation for this Regional Planning Commission would be one representative per municipality with one vote each and, unfortunately, the statute requires an RPC rep would be a member and appointed by the municipal Planning and Zoning Commission with the concurrence of the municipality's appointing authority. This, again, similar to what we showed earlier with the RPA, is the organizational structure. The COG in the center and centered below it, the elected group, the volunteer group and from that springing out any number of committees as you can clearly see on the diagram. So what are the advantages and benefits, based on what we found? On the left column are the categories, chief elected official involvement. I think you can read that as we leave it up on the screen. The second measurement was one of efficiency and the third, municipal autonomy. As Mr. Joseloff pointed out, we did send a copy of all this to you today. On the challenges and concerns, questionable advantages were mentioned, the claim of, perhaps, additional work by CEOs and Regional Planning Commissioners, although in the field, that did not come up at all, proved to be very manageable, as we mentioned earlier, and the challenge to justify conversion to the COG when the current organization is working well, I think when we presented to the P&Z, a SWRPA Board Member in the spirit of due diligence said, 'If it ain't broke don't fix it,' his point of view. On the shifting of power and roles, one vote per COG member, the claim is there might be some

reapportionment and balance of power. I hasten to add, as the staff Executive Director, I say this objectively because it can be documented, in the 5 1/2 years of minutes of RPA meetings that I've attended and MPO meetings that I have attended, both groups operate remarkably well through consensus. I cannot recall any down to the wire votes like we might have up in Hartford or in Washington DC. It's not that type of thing. The one vote per COG member effectively results in some reapportionment of balance of power. That was the response to that one. So, there are these top 10 COG FAQs. I'm going to pass the baton to Mr. Joseloff because of his opening remarks this evening and last week at the P&Z Committee of the RTM and back when we met with the P&Z on January 12, I think he eloquently expounded on these and the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. Joseloff:

Thank you Dr. Lapp. I will go through these very quickly. Some of you have seen them before.

- Would a COG foreshadow a return to county government? No. Anyone, I'll try to say this politely, who espouses that point of view just hasn't done their homework. You can discount that notion. A COG is not a government and does not have any authority to perform governmental functions. Twelve of the regions have had this for 30 years and they have not reverted to county government.
- Will the COG be a taxing authority? No Connecticut state statute does not provide a COG any authority to levy taxes. Can that change if the state legislature authorizes it and I haven't heard anybody suggest that they would. It's a possibility. Parenthetically, we already have the ability to authorize taxing districts. We have a number of them in Westport, local taxing districts as I mentioned at the last RTM meeting where neighborhoods get together and they agree to plow and maintain private roads and they tax their neighbors and they create a special taxing district.
- Will there be a way for current SWRPA representatives to participate? Yes. As you heard Dr. Lapp say, the regional planning commission may create any subcommittee it deems appropriate; volunteer members may be appointed by the RPC to such committees. I mentioned to you that Jonathan Steinberg said he would sponsor an effort to, in effect, make the legislation that currently requires an appointed or an alternate member of the current Planning and Zoning Commission to be a member of this RPC; that would modify it to make it in effect what it is now that the Planning and Zoning Commission can appoint an appointee to represent them if they so desire. That is not the case at the moment.
- Will the voting procedures be different for a COG? . Simple majorities of voting memberships will constitute quorums, similar to SWRPA and the MPO. Simple majorities of members present at meetings will be required to approve voting measures similar to SWRPA and the MPO.
- Will the state be able to use this proposed structural change to force consolidations of regions? Regional boundaries are currently determined by the Office of Policy and Management. State government can mandate consolidations if they wish regardless of regional structure. The Department of Homeland Security, as a matter of fact, did divide the State of Connecticut into five regions. I serve as the MPO representative to region one. Region one includes southwest Connecticut and also the Bridgeport Area region. I think there are 14

communities of first responders who comprise district one of the Homeland Security District. So that was a state mandate. Could they do it? They could. The legislature will have a role in determining some of that.

- Will local Planning and Zoning Commissions have a diminished role in the COG? No. Since RPC membership is to be comprised only of P&Z Commission members, there are no seats at the table for appointees from other legislative bodies. You do not, at the current moment, have representation on SWRPA except for me with the MPO. You have appointees, as good as they are, who are not elected officials. They are appointed by me and by the Planning and Zoning Commission to represent you. That's one step away from being directly accountable to you and to the taxpayers.
- Will the COG appoint members to the RPC? No. State statute requires that: the RPC will be comprised of local P&Z members.
- Will the workload for COG members and RPC members increase? Maybe. Certain COG members may have additional work, especially if they are in a leadership role. However, COG members in other regions have not reported increased workloads. RPC members may have additional work related to their responsibilities to attend RPC meetings and, in some instances, COG meetings. When Gail Weinstein had a meeting with her Planning and Zoning Commissioner and a couple of members and her Board of Selectmen and some interested members of the public, repeatedly came up and it came up in our own Planning and Zoning Commission that these people are volunteers like you are and like I was, are overworked. We have many night meetings and they felt that having to attend another night meeting would be an imposition and would be a work load that they couldn't handle. Actually, one of our P&Z members voted to abstain on recommending to you and the P&Z Commission voted against approving a COG. Her abstention was based on not being able to attend nighttime meetings in Stamford. That's an interesting take. It's personal inconvenience as opposed to looking to, is it good for the region? Is it good for Westport? I attended a meeting last night of the SWRPA Board in Stamford. I attend, as I do monthly, an MPO meeting Thursday mornings in Norwalk. I manage to get it all in. It's additional work, but I'm not shy about taking on additional work. I feel it's important that Westport be represented, that we have a voice at the table. I think my track record of attendance, perhaps, not like some other CEO's is pretty good. Simply because I want to be there. I want to know what's being talked about and I want our views to be represented.
- Will a proposed COG impact "home rule"? No. The COG does not and will not have any authority over local decision-making processes. On a regional basis, a COG has the same referral responsibilities as a Regional Planning Organization such as SWRPA. It does not allow the COG to impose mandates or restrictions on what Westport or any other member can do. It's a streamlining of government in the county. What we did not say is that five of the eight legislative bodies have to approve becoming a COG. Frankly, I don't expect on this round, I'd be surprised, if five of the eight approved it but if the RTM tonight takes this step, this will gain some attention. I hope that you approve it. I hope, if and when that you do, that the attention is directed towards... so what does the RTM in Westport know that we don't know? Maybe we need to take a second look at this. It's that kind of thing where, again, I'm not suggesting and none of the other CEO's would suggest doing something that's going to harm their municipality. Can we get along and do things without a COG? Absolutely. Is it going to cost us

any more money to have a COG? No. But it's just a more efficient, streamlined way of doing things and I think the proof is in the pudding.

With that, I'm going to let the committees report on their findings and to propose the amendment, perhaps. We'll go to the public and I hope we'll hear from a couple of the people who came here to talk about it and also I'm looking forward to the RTM debate.

Committee reports

P&Z Committee, Matthew Mandell, district 1:

RTM P&Z Committee Report on Westport converting to a Regional Council of Governments ("COG") March 1, 2012. The Committee met on Tuesday February 28th at 8 p.m. Attending - Committee: Don Bergmann, Diane Cady, Heather Cherry, Hope Feller, Jay Keenan, Paul Lebowitz, Gil Nathan, Lois Schine, Matthew Mandell (Chair). Numerous other RTM members attended and participated. No members of the public or press were there, other than a photographer for a picture of the meeting. Proposing adoption of the ordinance which would pave the way for Westport's participation in the COG was Westport First Selectman Gordon Joseloff, also Chair of the South West Regional Planning Agency's ("SWRPA") Metropolitan Planning Organization. Also attending were Floyd Lapp, Executive Director of SWRPA and Jerry Ellis, Chair of SWRPA. The issue in front of the RTM is whether Westport should change from SWRPA to a COG. Currently we are a member of SWRPA, an RPA, which has two parts. The first part is the Board of Directors of SWRPA, a 22 person Board responsible for all SWRPA activities other than those dealing with transportation. This 22 person Board comprises volunteers appointed by the respective eight SWRPA towns. The second part is The Metropolitan Planning Organization ("MPO") an eight member board which deals mainly with transportation issues. The vast majority of the budget of SWRPA, approximately 85 percent, is devoted to transportation issues. The MPO comprises the eight elected chief executive officers of the eight member towns. The COG, provided for in Connecticut General Statutes 4-124i through j, essentially reorganizes these two parts of SWRPA and creates an organization headed by the elected chief executive officers of the eight member communities for our region, Greenwich, Darien, New Canaan, Stamford, Norwalk, Wilton, Weston and Westport. Mr. Joseloff reiterated what he had said to the full RTM a month ago, that moving to a COG would create efficiencies by consolidation, that no money would be saved, but that time and effort could be saved under a COG structure. He felt that a COG would get more recognition at the state level and that CEOs advocating for funding and change as a COG would get more respect. He was candid in saying that it was just his feeling and when questioned by RTM members he, again, said this was conjecture and not fact. He also said he felt more comfortable working with this newer form of organization to discuss possible mergers of services with or among any of the eight member towns, e.g. police or fire dispatch, but could not point to specific instances of this being the case. Mr. Lapp reviewed a PowerPoint, which all the members had received prior to the meeting. It outlined specifics about a COG, what it is and also what it is in comparison to SWRPA. Mr. Lapp was not there to advocate for the COG. He was there to explain and answer questions, but it was

clear he felt the COG would indeed create efficiencies in staff time and effort. He could not point to any specific action the COG could do better than SWRPA, but did stress that a COG structure would result in more available staff time to address substantive, rather than procedural activities, such as preparations for the many meetings of both the SWRPA Board and the MPO. He did say that the many other towns that had converted to a COG structure found it worked well. Mr. Ellis, while again there to give facts, also supported the move to a COG, though he said that SWRPA had recently been working to make the two parts, the MPO and the SWRPA Board work more closely together and that that effort had been bearing fruit. He said there was nothing holding SWRPA back from acting more like a COG, but while remaining in the SWRPA format. At a prior P&Z Commission meeting, at which the COG issue was discussed, a member of SWRPA, Jay Tepper, appeared and spoke in opposition to joining the COG. Mr. Tepper had been invited to attend the RTM Committee meeting, but had a conflict with his own P&Z meeting. He is a P&Z member. It is expected that Mr. Tepper will attend the full RTM meeting. I don't know if he is here tonight. There was a vigorous two hour Q&A. A major point which was not answered is what has SWRPA not been able to do that a COG would be able to do. Related to that was the apparent fact that the COG form would have substantially the same powers, or absence of powers, as the SWRPA form. Westport's representation within a COG would change from three of 22 representatives on the Board of Directors to one of eight for the COG. Essentially a one percent difference in representation. Mr. Lapp made it clear that most votes are not along town or party lines. One question unanswered was whether SWRPA could hire a lobbyist as it seems a COG can. This is to be answered prior to the full RTM meeting. Also requested was a "matrix" of pros and cons of moving from SWRPA to a COG since that was only tangentially presented in the PowerPoint. This too is to be presented prior to the RTM meeting. We did receive this information in the last couple of days but I will have to say it was frustrating trying to get this information from the staff. What was answered clearly was that efficiencies of time and effort by the SWRPA staff would be achieved in a COG. There would be no taxing or other form of government coming from this move, just transportation issues and planning would be covered in a COG. It would also seem a COG might have more clout in advocating for the region and may have more access to grants and funds. It was noted that of the 14 regions in the state, 12 have already converted from an RPA to a COG or Council of Elected Officials. The RTM Committee had sent out emails and made phone calls to the seven other communities in our region seeking their position and time table on their conversion to a COG. A spreadsheet of answers was put together and presented with the responses received. No other SWRPA town in our group has acted, as yet. The RTM Committee received a copy of a letter from the Westport Planning and Zoning Commission to the First Selectman commenting upon their vote of 4-1-1 not to support the move to a COG. The Committee along with remaining other members of the RTM discussed the issue at hand. The following reflects that discussion:

1. A majority felt there would be no harm to moving to a COG, some actively advocated for the change.
2. Some members felt it would, indeed, give the region more clout.
3. Some members felt that there was nothing wrong with SWRPA or present situation.
4. A COG was not a move to county government or a taxing authority.
5. Members felt the Westport P&Z Commission's reasons not to join the COG were not persuasive. While acknowledging the time demand issue, members thought not joining due to having to supply a standing member of the commission to serve on the COG Planning Council, due to lack of time, was something that simply had to be overcome. While not a fact, it is anticipated that legislation to modify that rule and allow an appointed member would be proposed
6. There still was missing information and opinions that would be forthcoming.
7. There was not a consensus as to whether or not the responses received from the seven member towns meant that their conflicting views expressed could be interpreted either way. It could be viewed as a toss up.
8. That essentially moving forward to a COG was as one member put it "a leap of faith" worth taking.

On a motion offered by Ms. Schine and seconded by Mr. Bergmann, the committee voted 6-0-2 to recommend to the full RTM that Westport join the COG. In favor: Bergmann, Cady, Cherry, Lebowitz, Nathan, Schine; Opposed: none; Abstains: Feller, Mandell. Keenan left before vote. It should be noted that the abstentions were to allow more time for missing information to be gathered and presented. Reporter, Matthew Mandell (Chair).

Ordinance Committee, George Underhill, district 4:

I took action minutes. The RTM Ordinance Committee met on February 29, 2012, with a full quorum present and voting. The proposed ordinance: The proposed ordinance would adopt Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 4-124i through 4-124p as amended, for the formation of a regional Council of Governments (COG), authorize the Town to join such Council when duly established, designate the First Selectman as the representative of the Town on such Council, and authorize the RTM to designate an alternate representative from its members. Discussion and recommendation: The RTM Ordinance Committee reviewed the above-described ordinance at its February 29, 2012 meeting, which Assistant Town Attorney Gail Kelly also attended. The committee voted unanimously to recommend that a sunset clause be added to the ordinance, and then voted unanimously that, subject to that recommendation, the proposed ordinance is ready for consideration by the RTM. The committee also discussed, but did not vote on, whether the ordinance should be modified to allow the RTM to appoint any elected official of the Town of Westport as the alternate representative. Respectfully submitted, The RTM Ordinance Committee, George Underhill, Reporter. Those voting in favor: myself, Lee Arthurs, Don Bergman, Allen Bomes, Eileen Flug, Chair. Absent: David Floyd.

Members of the Westport electorate

Jeff Jacobs, district 9:

As Gordon Joseloff indicated, for the past 6 1/2 years, I have been one of Westport's representatives on the SWRPA Board. Parenthetically, for those of you with long memories, it was my privilege to serve as this RTM's representative to serve on the Westport Public Library Board of Trustees for two terms and, in addition, I was an RTM spouse for three terms when my wife, Debbie Rath, served on this body... In the interest of full disclosure. Yes there are efficiencies. I just want to make this very human and very real for those of you in this room. We are at a disadvantage. There is a reason why 12 other regions in the state have moved to COGs. Yes we have the MPO. The eight mayors and First Selectman get together and deal with transportation issues but 22 of us representing eight towns without a clear voice, without a distinct voice and, basically, without any political clout try to deal with all the regional planning issues. Yes, we have flooding in Westport. That's not a surprise to anyone in this room. Yes, that's a regional issue because the Saugatuck and the Aspetuck Rivers don't just begin and end here in Westport. So, how can we remedy flooding? Our neighbors in Westchester County got the US Army Corps of Engineers to come and do a survey. Other parts of the state have been very efficient at getting funding. But, you know what? When I call up a senator's office, Representative Himes office, I don't get the kind of the attention that I would get if our First Selectman made the call, if the Mayor of Norwalk made the call, if the First Selectman of Greenwich made the call. These people have a great deal more clout, a great deal more effectiveness in making the case. So, it's not just that there is an efficiency in combining the two meetings into one, combining the two boards into one. We are looking to do a better job in regional planning. Right now, we are stymied. Twenty-two volunteers who get together once a month, as hard as we try, we can't push the regional planning ball the same way the MPO, the First Selectmen, can push the transportation ball. If we put this under one roof where they belong, we could coordinate regional planning with transportation. The staff works for both groups already. We could do things like transit-oriented development; we could do things like flooding; we could do things that need a regional solution but we don't have the resources to do it right now. So, I want to thank the two committees for voting for this and I hope that you all will take the action tonight to approve this because once we can get five municipalities to do this, we can move to a COG like 12 other parts of the state have done and like most of the rest of the country have.

Point of information, Mr. Mandell:

You are saying Westport electorate. We would also like to hear from the SWRPA people who are members of the public.

Mr. Rose:

I'm sure they will be permitted to if they want to come up. I am not excluding them. First we go to the Westport electorate.

Michael Calise, Westport:

I would like to comment on what I consider to be a major defect in the makeup of the COG and that is the requirement that an elected member of the Planning and Zoning Commission be on the COG Board in each community. We have seven members on the Planning and Zoning Commission in Westport. Their workload frequently is quite heavy. To require that one of them be a member of COG, I think, takes away from their responsibilities here in Westport. It puts in additional pressure on them as individuals and I think Mr. Joseloff's comment about the fact that it is his opinion that they should be willing to participate and put in the amount of time because it is important, overlooks the fact that, in the case of Mr. Joseloff, being First Selectman is his only position. In the case of the P&Z members, they are elected citizens who they have other responsibilities in life, their jobs, other kinds of things that do not allow them to have as much time as a paid elected official has. The fact that Mr. Joseloff mentioned that, at some point it may be changed, even further highlights that defect in requiring P&Z members attend and be a part of this. I think the majority of P&Z members are against this primarily because this requirement would be an additional burden on their schedules.

Mr. Rose:

We have a couple of officials here who have come from SWRPA from local towns. Are there any objections to having them speak before the body?

Gail Weinstein, First Selectwoman, Town of Weston:

Thank you, Mr. Moderator, and thank you members of the RTM for allowing me to speak today. I am a little tired because last night I had to present our budget to the Board of Finance. One of the questions that they asked me over and over again is, 'What are you doing to think outside of the box to keep our taxes down and help us save money?' I'm sure this is the same question that you hear here in Westport. We've already cut everyone that we could potentially cut. We have already made those changes to the town government and, if we plan on saving any more money, we have to start being a little bit more creative here. Really, the conversations that have been taking place between all of the First Selectman, is that it certainly makes sense to start looking at combining services, sharing services, regionalizing some of the operations that we all have to perform. We know we can save money if we can do that. That is something that has to be on the forefront of all of our minds. Unfortunately, though, not one of our towns truly has the staff capability to deal with these issues. Gordon and I have been talking, I would say, for well over a year of the potential for shared services between our two towns, given the fact that most people feel that Westport and Weston are, essentially, sister cities. It certainly makes sense to talk about increasing the shared services that we already have. Right now, we already share a health district with you guys and we share a regional paramedic with Wilton. So, regionalization and shared services is something that we are doing and it is something that has the potential to save us even more money. Going to a COG would allow us to utilize staff that is currently busy dealing with over 30 members

to do something that would bring efficiency, not only to our regional structure, but also to the municipal structures, as well. And that is something that I am looking forward to. If you go to the Harford County COG or any of the other COGs, they do a lot of shared services. They do a lot of joint purchasing, a lot of services that are managed by their Counsel of Government that we simply can't do. That is something that is incredibly important as we look to the future because, as we know, as the years go on and on, it is going to be more and more difficult to keep those budgets down and those mill rates down, when we have all done such a great job year after year. There is going to come a point when the nondiscretionary spending is going to continue to drive those costs up. This is really the only way that we have left to start keeping taxes down. Without that COG structure that is in place that gives us this opportunity to, number one, to have those conversations and two, to have staffs that can efficiently do that for us something that we desperately need. Second of all, when we go to our meetings, we have actually two agendas that are on our agenda. We have an MPO agenda and a non-MPO agenda. This is because there are so many issues, as chief elected officials in neighboring towns that we need to discuss. I find it incredibly frustrating that we don't have any meat as a group to really make decisions on anything that is discussed on the non-MPO agenda. A perfect example of this is I was concerned about what is happening with travel and tourism. There was some concern that our dollars that were allocated to the Fairfield County region were either a) not getting here or b) not being used efficiently. So, we had that discussion but it was on the non-MPO agenda and there was nothing that we could do to really act as a formal group to move forward with that. If we want to be able to effect economic development down in Fairfield County, if we want to bring jobs here, if we want to be able to keep our taxes down, we have to have a formal structure in place that allows us to have those conversations as well as having staff time to help make that work. Because what happens otherwise, can we make these conversations happen otherwise? Yes. We have a monthly First Selectman's meeting with all the First Selectman in Fairfield County but what happens? This week I'm busy with my budgets. Next week, Gordon is busy with something else and time just goes by because we just simply can't allocate that time efficiently enough. I also think it's important when you're talking about different municipalities joining together that there is a neutral party that actually evaluates the situation because, obviously, I am very attached to what is happening in Weston and have to protect my interests in Weston. Gordon is interested in Westport and has to protect his interests in Westport. What if there is a decision as to where the regional facility should be located? Gordon may or may not be advocating for that to be in Westport and I may be in the same position for Weston. Who's going to determine what is really the best spot? So, we need to have a neutral party in there who can make that determination would be incredibly helpful. I just want to end up a clearing one misconception as far as, not really an misconception, I just want to add one statement regarding the RPCs. According to the current state statutes, the RPC member does need to be a Planning and Zoning Commissioner; however, the one thing that hasn't been mentioned is that you can also elect an alternate. That

alternate does not need to be a Planning and Zoning Commissioner. One of the things that we have done both in COG meetings, because we are very busy, and also at the subcommittee meetings that we deal with, that are made up of volunteers such as yourselves, and we have had those meetings via conference calls, we've had people be able to call in, so one evening a month, if you share the responsibility with two, that is six meetings a year that you are talking about and if some of this can be handled by conference calls, is it a little bit more time? Yes, but a little bit more time. We are not talking about something onerous that will take over someone's life. Thank you once again. I am really incredibly proud of Gordon who has been a truly wonderful leader to all of us in our region and now you guys in Westport have the opportunity to also take the lead on this. I am excited to see what happens tonight so, thank you.

Jerry Ellis, Chairman of SWRPA:

First of all, let me commend you on the enthusiastic review and due diligence that you have done on this topic starting with your P&Z Subcommittee of the RTM, that we met with last week, and this meeting tonight. The questions that you have asked have been good ones. You have tried to get to the bottom of this issue to fully understand it and get a full grasp of exactly what is at stake here. I offer, in light of that, Mr. Mandell indicated in his reading, which when he first started reading I thought, my heavens, is he really going to read all of that, and I'm glad that he did because I think, in our enthusiasm to talk the other night, I by no means indicated whether I was for the COG or not for the COG. My role as Chairman of SWRPA has been a role of developing a due diligence process that was to find objective information and collect information. We set up three subcommittees which I believe Floyd reviewed with you. One was to develop a scenario on how a COG could be managed, on how it could be governed and how it would actually operate. That committee consisted of some of our SWRPA members. I was not on it. I purposely did not put myself on any of those committees. Gail Weinstein was on it as well as Bill Brennan and a couple of our other board members. We had another task force that dealt with the attributes of shifting to a COG and their role was to come up with a list which Floyd went over when he did his presentations. We also set up a committee to go over the concerns or the challenges and he also went over those. Jay Tepper led that effort. I want to make it clear that we don't have a vote in this. We don't have an advocacy position in this. Our role as SWRPA Board members, has really been to develop a due diligence process that would give our First Selectmen and Mayors who were members of the MPO as much objective information to make the decision that they need to make to represent you adequately and for us to really get to the bottom of exactly what a COG could be and not be. In no way have we ever tried to represent a plus or a minus. I had made that point the other night that I was not there to advocate. As Chairman, I was filling in for someone else. As Chairman of SWRPA, I really wanted to represent my board to you all. I want to go on the record to say that there must have been a miscommunication somewhere. I did not advocate for the COG. I did not advocate against the COG. I merely was trying to get due diligence and get the information out so you all

could make your decision. I will also address a couple of practical issues to keep in mind. I made a point the other night that one of the most important things for you to do is to really understand as much of what it is that we have uncovered to date and to be able to evaluate that. A couple of key things to keep in mind. Approximately 80 percent of our budget and our activities in SWRPA are accounted for by mandatory studies that the government requires us to do. In business terms, that our baseline business. That's what we're in business for. We have a 20 percent leeway to do things we think might be interesting like environmental, like take a look at housing issues, which we've done, take a look at other aspects that affect quality of life. When we think about a \$1.5 million budget, 80 percent of it is accounted for when the fiscal year even clicks off so that leaves us a 20 percent latitude that we can do something else with. So, whether it's a COG or whether it's an RPA, that is still going to be the issue. That is still going to be what the baseline business is all about. I want to emphasize that I really commend you for taking this much time to look at this. One of the other things to keep in mind, also, is what Gordon talked about and what Gail talked about in terms of regionalization. It's one of the things that we are trying to look at on SWRPA. What is happening is that we know we can be more powerful as a group of eight towns as opposed to individual towns. What we're doing in SWRPA right now is that we're trying to consolidate and overlap as much of what we do with the MPO. This has never really been done before. We have a strategic plan in place. Mr. Mandell alluded to this in his comments which I appreciate him making on that topic. We've actually tried to integrate more effectively with the MPO, SWRPA and the MPO. One thing we learned in our analysis of the COG is the idea of even coming together. We've got this three legged stool: staff, appointed members of SWRPA Board of Directors and the MPO. It's cumbersome even taking a look at it from a management standpoint. It could be perceived a cumbersome operational model. Not a lot of businesses work that way. That doesn't mean it shouldn't exist. It just is. What we've tried to do is try to integrate that so we can operate more like a COG which would be more streamlined. So, we are already taking steps, learning our lessons from doing the research on COG to be able to overlap more definitively and distinctively with the MPO. If I could leave you with anything this evening, I would say that our role has been to come and try to present objective and unbiased information to you. We ask that you consider it. We ask that you ask questions, that you try to understand it and then you vote what you think really ought to be done. We'll be glad to answer any questions. Again, I want to reiterate that the role of the SWRPA Board is not one of advocacy. It's one of due diligence. It's one of objective research and analysis and we present as much of the facts as possible. So, the only other thing that I can say in closing, Gary, it's good to see you. I'm sorry you've left our fine town to come up here.

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

RESOLVED: That upon the recommendation of the First Selectman, the ordinance adopting Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 4-124i through 4-124p as amended, providing for the formation of a regional council of

governments; authorizing the town to join such council when duly established; designating the First Selectman as the representative of the Town of Westport on such council; and authorizing the Representative Town Meeting to designate an alternate representative from its members for a two-year term or until the next election of the RTM is hereby approved. (Second reading, full text is as follows.)

Regional Council of Governments

Adoption of state law; Authority to join: The Town of Westport hereby adopts Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 4-124i through 4-124p, as amended, providing for the formation of a regional council of governments, and does hereby join such regional council of governments when and as such council is duly established in accordance with said statutes, upon the adoption of said statutes by not less than sixty percent of all municipalities within the Southwestern Connecticut planning region as defined by the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management or designee, and upon certification by the Secretary or designee that a regional council of governments has been duly established.

Designated Representative: The First Selectman shall represent the town on the regional council of governments. In addition, the Representative Town Meeting may appoint one of its members as an alternate representative to the regional council of governments, which alternate shall serve a term of two (2) years or until the next election of members of the Representative Town Meeting.

Mr. Rose:

It has been moved and seconded by Mr. Rubin to approve the resolution just read. We have been told that there are two amendments that have been proposed. I am going to have Eileen read those now because I think we might be able to get unanimous consent on both of them. Just give the substitutions please.

Ms. Flug:

The first amendment is in the second paragraph, Designated Representative. It is change the word "may" to "shall" so that the full text will say:

The First Selectman shall represent the town on the regional council of governments. In addition, the Representative Town Meeting ~~may~~ shall appoint one of its members as an alternate representative to the regional council of governments, which alternate shall serve a term of two (2) years or until the next election of members of the Representative Town Meeting.

Mr. Rose:

Second, Mr. Bergmann. Can we get unanimous consent to amend this? Any objections? [No.] It is amended. Can you read the sunset clause, please.

Ms. Flug:

The second amendment proposed by the administration is a sunset clause. This would be the third paragraph to the ordinance. It would read:

Sunset Clause

This ordinance shall expire on November 19, 2013 unless a regional Council of Governments is duly established in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Sections 4-124i through 4-124p.

Mr. Rose: Seconded by Mr. Rubin.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comments

Mr. Rose:

Seeing no comments from the Westport electorate, I am going to ask for unanimous consent for this, as well. There is an objection so, we can debate it.

Members of the RTM

Mr. Lowenstein:

When I read the report of the Ordinance Committee saying that there would be a sunset clause, I was curious as to why there was no date and then tonight I found out there was a date. The date picked, November 19, 2013 is approximately 19 months from today. You know, an elephant takes two years to have a baby. Here we are in just 19 months saying that this thing will expire.

November 19 is two weeks after the election in 2013. In my opinion, there is no way any executive in any town who is elected in November of 2013 will be able to recommend to his or her legislative body that they should approve a COG ordinance. I can understand why there is a desire to have a sunset clause. We don't want this to sit on the books for 20 years while we are still waiting; although I don't think this is going to happen. I would be agreeable to changing the date to make sure there is a sufficient change of executives in the eight towns involved and those executives have had a chance to digest and understand what is being proposed and then to propose to their own legislatures that this thing be approved or not approved. Therefore, I would **move to amend the amendment to change the date from 2013 to January 1, 2018**. Nineteen months is not time to do anything, really. That's almost non-existent. I cannot accept a date of November 19, 2013.

Seconded by Mr. Bill Meyer.

Mr. Lowenstein: I would be agreeable to unanimous consent on that one.

Mr. Rose: We'll debate it.

Members of the Westport electorate – no comments

Members of the RTM

Mr. Mandell:

When Eileen emailed me and said it was a sunset clause and explained it, I said that makes a lot of sense. It's our decision, it's this body's decision that's making it. We are not passing it off to another body to say that you are beholden to us on this decision. While we took a large amount of time on this, Mr. Ellis commended

us on it, it was about two months. My view is if the other towns can't get off the stick and do it within the next 19 months then it should just die under its own weight. So, they've got a call to them, Weston, if you want to do this, then start doing it. But, I think that's the way it should stay. I think a sunset clause makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Bergmann:

This matter did not come up at the P&Z Committee meeting but it did come up at the Ordinance Committee. I believe it was Lee Arthurs who raised the point and I think it's an excellent point; in fact, we weren't quite sure what the right time was. We talked about different periods of time. I think this is an excellent time period in the sense that, number one, the First Selectman strongly supports it, I believe, which is a good thing as a starter and, secondly it will put pressure on the other towns have and thirdly it's a very reasonably picked date. I think those three reasons, frankly, are compelling. That's why I would oppose the proposal by Dick Lowenstein and would want to go back to the other amendment.

Lee Arthurs, district 8:

I think the other point we should think of on this is we are giving a reasonable amount of time for the other towns to pass so, we adopt the COG in approximately 18 months. Nothing says that if four towns pass it including us by then and then in January the following year, another town passes that we could just pass it again. We just don't feel like we want to be out there with other towns not making movement forward but nothing precludes us from having this vote at this time and voting it again and being the fifth town at that time.

Jonathan Cunitz, district 4:

I don't think it's our right or responsibility to try and pressure other towns to make their decisions. I think each town, on their own, has that right. I would suggest a compromise because the political implications of the process of process of possibly some new officials coming into office in the fall of 2013 makes sense to me. So my compromise is **simply extending the sunset date for one year more than it is proposed in the amendment.** That should be sufficient time for the other communities to make their decisions one year from the original amendment date.

Mr. Rose:

This is the last amendment. This will cut off the amendments at this point.

Seconded by Mr. Meyer.

Members of the Westport electorate - No comment

Members of the RTM [debating the amendment to extend the sunset clause until November 19, 2014.]

Ms. Schine:

I agree with the original date, 2013, because I think that so much research has been done and we have seen a lot of it. We've heard it presented before our P&Z Committee. We've heard it presented before the P&Z Commission. You've seen the slideshow. You've seen our report. I think, if the other towns are interested, they don't have to do as much work as we did. They can read what we've done. That should help them make a decision. So, 2013 is probably okay.

Mr. Lowenstein:

I'd like to pose two questions. The first question, maybe the First Selectman can answer. Of the eight CEOs, for the eight towns are they all up for election in 2013 or are some of them on a four-year term and will still be in office after 2013? The second question is since Mr. Mandell claims that Mr. Joseloff up proves of this, I would like Mr. Joseloff to explain why he approves it.

Mr. Rose:

The correction [from the audience] was that Mr. Bergmann said Mr. Joseloff approved of it, not Mr. Mandell. He didn't say he disapproved of it.

Mr. Joseloff:

Dick, your question was how many are on four-year terms? I am and I believe the Mayor of Stamford are the only two of the eight who are on four-year terms. Dick's question was are they all going to come up? Yes. Your second question was, I stated that at the outset simply because this RTM has studied it and I don't like to commit future RTM's or Board of Selectmen or Selectmen to certain things. They certainly will be aware. They can review it. At the same time, having said that, 2014 is an interesting idea. As I say, I hope that a favorable vote by the RTM will get the attention of some of the other municipalities who, frankly, I think have not given this the full attention that it deserves. I will support the 2013 but I can recognize that a little leeway of 2014 might be permitted also.

Dr. Heller:

We can think something to death and I think that's where we are going right now. I'm trying to think what makes good sense here. We have something that a variety of people have looked into in great depth. The committee has supported it. I think that thinking about whether a Selectman who is running for office or elected at some point does or does not have sufficient information, I would suppose that somebody who is running for office is somebody who studied the issues and who is fully aware of the issues. I don't think we postpone and postpone because something can become a hot political issue. I think the issue is, if we approve of this, if we believe that this is the right thing to do, if it makes sense, I think we should support it. I think what the committee originally suggested as a sunset date makes sense. I think there is no reason not to support that. I think we can go on and on and on and say how much longer do we need for people need to fill in the information that they need to have? I think

that this has been sufficiently vetted at this point, that we know what we're getting into and I think that anyone running for office would have studied it and have an awareness this so I think we should stick with the original sunset date.

Ms. Batteau:

I actually agree with Dr. Cunitz for the reasons Mr. Lowenstein described. Thinking back on what happens at the beginning of a session, particularly of the RTM session where, this time, for example, about one third of the membership changed over. I think it's probably not reasonable to expect, if it's a new selectman, rather than the current selectmen, I think it's probably not reasonable for him or her to make up a presentation. It would be the old RTM if it were in November. No, it would be the new one. It would be the December RTM meeting. I don't think it's necessarily reasonable to ask the Selectman to be familiar enough with this particular set of issues to describe it and explain why it should be enacted to perhaps a third again group of new members. We are all familiar with that. We vetted it but we've read document after document after document, had meeting after meeting and seen PowerPoints and read the PowerPoints and all that. The new RTM would not necessarily have had that. So, I would support the year because I don't think they need more than that. A year or even six months but not the 2013.

Jeff Wieser, district 4:

I sure wish we could vote on the whole issue before we worry about the date because I get the sense that we're all pretty much in favor of doing this. I think it's been specifically unstated but specifically up implied that we are the first of the eight towns to actually do this. So, it's a very good thing and the fact that we are doing this unanimously...

Mr. Rose: Jeff, I think you're getting ahead of yourself.

Mr. Wieser:

In fact, my sense is that people are generally in favor of this. The committee was very positive on it which indicates to me that the next RTM, when it is selected in two years, will be largely composed of a lot of people who are aware of the COG and I sort of think of this defensively in that, yes, I want to make this available so that other towns can join us but it might be three more towns that say yes this is a good idea. There might be three towns that come up with some things that we didn't think of and maybe they'll be a reason for us not to. So, having it for the new RTM to have the opportunity not to go along with it sort of seems like good defense. Nineteen months is a long time. I think 2013 is a great date. I think this is a good thing to do. I think we should get on with it.

Eileen Flug, district 9:

I agree with the date as proposed by the administration. There's no urgency. If this expires at the end of our term, there's no urgency for the new RTM to look at it at the very next month. It can wait six months or a year or two years. It means

that there is another town that hasn't adopted it either. So it's just still languishing. I think that right now is the moment that all of the other First Selectmen and the other towns are looking at this and thinking about and proposing it for their own legislative bodies and now is the moment they have to bring it forward. They have 18 months to do it. If it doesn't happen now, maybe people need to rethink the whole thing in a year and a half. So, I just think we should keep the date as proposed by the administration.

Mr. Lowenstein:

Two points: One thing is, regretfully, people who run for office are not always well informed. We know that for a fact. Second point, I would like to withdraw my amendment in favor of Dr. Cunitz's amendment and wish that my seconder will vote on his amendment.

The seconder withdraws

Mr. Arthurs:

I still support the 2013 date for the reasons that were said before. The other thing I'd like to point out is that we get to September or October of 2013 and it looks like the fifth town is coming, we can, at that time, vote to extend the days of the window for the last town to vote for it. We don't need to give an extra year to do that. We can do that with this RTM and this First Selectman at that time.

Mr. Rose:

We are going to vote on the amendment this will be changing the wording, changing the date from November 19, 2013 to November 9, 2014.

The motion fails 4-24-1. Those in favor: Lowenstein, Meyer, Cunitz, Batteau. Others opposed. Mr. Nathan abstains.

Mr. Rose: we are back to the original motion to accept the 2013 date.

Members of the RTM [addressing the 2013 date]

Mr. Meyer:

Steve, I think you agree with this. We are the oldest members here. Don't we always go with what the committees want? There was a unanimous committee vote. Second, we are a leadership town. This is leadership at its best. Banning plastic bags... The leading school system in the state... I've been in several RTM's, the seven Westport's in the United States. This is the best. Let's go for it.

A vote on the sunset clause to November 19, 2013: The motion passes 28-1. Mr. Lowenstein opposed.

Members of the RTM [discussing the original motion]

Mr. Bergman:

I, of course, do hope this passes very quickly but I wanted to comment on Michael Calise's comment and also the issue of the P&Z. We all know they work very hard and I certainly want to acknowledge that and their time constraints are very real but I do think there is the availability of the fact that, the structure is what they would do is elect one of their members as the representative of the RPC and they would pick one of their alternates, I think there are three, to stand in place of that person when that person can't attend. Frankly, I think that should work for them as well as acknowledging all the hard work the P&Z puts in and the time obligations they all incur.

Mr. Mandell:

I think it would be unfair not to say a few things on the record about the decision-making process and the pieces of information that went in. The report is one aspect of it but the RTM still has things to say and information did come in after the fact of the RTM committee meeting. I abstained on it seeking this new information and now that it's come in, it doesn't change my opinion of what we should be doing, which is, that we should be moving to the COG. I'm usually a skeptical individual. I wanted to see the information to make sure I did that before we moved, There are some things that people talked about that are issues and, as the other communities look at it, the concept that was left out of the PowerPoint that was brought in in the information that I got recently and, again, SW RPA staff, I hope you'll be more forthcoming in bringing information to the other communities in a quick and timely basis, that we are not waiting until the last minute to see it and that's what occurred here. But a couple of concepts were that we have a 22 person RPA which is the planning aspect of SW RPA and of the region. They are a voting body. They make decisions in terms of planning. What's going to be happening, we have the eight CEOs that are in the MPO and are still going to have eight in the COG. The 22 that is the decision-making body is now being switched and placed underneath the MPO which is now going to be the COG. So, from a group of 22 that actually have decision-making, voting privileges, they are now going to be the body which is going to be reporting up to the CEOs. While the CEOs may adhere to what they have to say, may move forward with it, they may not and the planning people will be relegated to a subordinate position when some people say may be a problem moving forward. We have to be careful of it. That's something, I suppose, that they should be looking at and as the other communities look at it, they should weigh that clearly. Some people talked about how too much power is being given to the first Selectman and said, 'Oh, we can't give Gordon that much power.' I said, 'We're not giving Gordon the power. We're giving the office the power.' You have to look at it that way. I have problems when people say that to me. It's the First Selectman. The First Selectman is going to be moving forward in the next two, 10, 15, 20 years. The RPA has been around for 50 years, so the COGs have been around for 50 years. So, these are some of the things that we needed to look at. Clearly, the thing that resonated with me was the decrease in the potential power of the people making the planning decisions going through the CEOs. It is a leap of faith. Diane Cady said it was a leap of faith and I buy that.

That's all I really wanted to say about it. That's on the record that we should be looking at it and making sure that our planning aspects are just as important as our transportation aspects moving forward.

Mr. Underhill:

I had the privilege, some years ago, of serving on SWRPA about four years. It was back in the early 90s. They were dead set on solving transportation problems. Here we are, 20-something years later, almost, and we're still talking about it. I think this is thinking outside the box. Someone brought that up. That's exactly what we're doing. We're being innovative. I give Gordon a great deal of credit for coming forward to push this through. We should support him.

Paul Lebowitz, district 6:

I rise in support of this amendment. SW RPA is the plastic bag of regional planning. Like plastic bags, the town of Westport should lead the way.

Mr. Rose:

Everybody has pretty much spoken in favor of this. Does anybody want to speak in opposition? [No.]

By show of hands, the motion passes 28-1. Opposed: Ms. Calise.

The meeting adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia H. Strauss
Town Clerk



by Jacquelyn Fuchs
Secretary

ATTENDANCE: March 6, 2012

DIST.	NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	NOTIFIED MODERATOR	LATE/ LEFT EARLY
1	Don Bergmann	X			
	Diane Cady	X			
	Matthew Mandell	X		X	8:50 p.m.
	Cornelia Olsen	X			
2	Catherine Calise	X			
	Jay Keenan	X		X	8:10 p.m.
	Louis Mall	X			
	Sean Timmins		X	X	
3	Jimmy Izzo	X			
	Melissa Kane	X			
	Bill Meyer	X			
	Hadley Rose	X			
4	Jonathan Cunitz, DBA	X			
	David Floyd		X	X	
	George Underhill	X			
	Jeffrey Wieser	X			
5	Dewey Loselle	X			
	Richard Lowenstein	X			
	Paul Rossi		X	X	
	John Suggs		X	X	
6	Hope Feller		X	X	
	Paul Lebowitz	X			
	Catherine Talmadge	X			
	Christopher Urist	X			
7	Arthur Ashman, D.D.S.		X	X	
	Allen Bomes	X			
	Jack Klinge	X			
	Stephen Rubin	X			
8	Lee Arthurs	X			
	Wendy Batteau	X			
	Heather Cherry		X	X	
	Lois Schine	X			
9	Eileen Flug	X			
	Velma Heller, Ed. D.	X			
	John McCarthy	X			
	Gilbert Nathan	X			
Total		29	7		