#### RESOLUTIONS

**(1)** 

<u>RESOLVED</u>: That upon the recommendation of the RTM Library Museum & Arts Committee, in accordance with Section C1-3 (4) of the Town Charter, the appointment of Holland Dunn, Carole Orland, and Keith Ruskin; and the reappointment of Julie Belaga and Marianna McCall to serve as Trustees of the Westport Public Library for a four year term beginning July 1, 2013 is hereby approved.

(2)

<u>RESOLVED</u>: That upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance, the Town of Westport (the "Town") hereby appropriates the sum of Three Hundred Twenty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$320,000) to fund the Capital and Nonrecurring Expenditures for the costs associated with the replacement of the existing tennis courts at Staples High School, including the installation of six (6) new courts with nets and fencing and administrative, financing and other soft costs (the "Project").

Section 1. As recommended by the Board of Finance and for the purpose of financing Three Hundred Twenty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$320,000) of the foregoing appropriation, the Town shall borrow a sum not to exceed Three Hundred Twenty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$320,000) and issue general obligation bonds for such indebtedness under its corporate name and seal and upon the full faith and credit of the Town in an amount not to exceed said sum for the purpose of financing the appropriation for the Project.

Section 2. The First Selectman, Selectmen and Finance Director are hereby appointed a committee (the "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 and to execute Continuing Disclosure Agreements for the benefit of holders of bonds and notes.

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 (3) 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 true 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 Selectmanand 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 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 bondcounsel, and may be consolidated with the issuance of other Town bond anticipation notes. The 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 enacted herein.

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 any capital fund for the Project with the proceeds of the bonds or notes to be issued under the provisions hereof. 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 or other parties, grants, gifts and contributions in aid of further financing the Project. Once the appropriation becomes effective, the First Selectman, or other appropriate official of the town, is hereby authorized to spend a sum not to exceed the aforesaid appropriation for the Project and is specifically authorized to make, execute and deliver any contracts or other documents necessary or convenient to complete the Project and the financing thereof.

Section 9. The 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.

(3)

<u>RESOLVED</u>: That upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance and a request by the Director of Public Works, the sum of \$135,000 from the Capital & Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund (C&NEF) Account to purchase a backhoe to replace a 21 year old, 1992 machine is hereby appropriated.

<u>RESOLVED:</u> That the RTM Moderator appoint a Special Committee of the RTM to work with the WPCA and the Department of Public Works to recommend revisions to the WPCA rules and procedures regarding the petitioning and installation of sanitary sewer extensions, and that such Committee include at least one member of the Public Works, Health and Human Services and Environment Committees, and that such Committee report back to the RTM and be disbanded upon the discretion of the RTM Moderator.

(5)

<u>RESOLVED</u>: That upon the recommendation of the Board of Finance, the Town of Westport (the "Town") hereby appropriates the sum of \$95,000 for the costs associated with the engineering and design of two extensions of the existing sewer lines, the first of which is an extension of approximately 2,500 feet in the North Bulkley Avenue area and the second of which is an extension of approximately 3,750 feet in the Old Road vicinity (the "Project").

Section 1. As recommended by the Board of Finance and for the purpose of financing \$95,000 of the foregoing appropriation, the Town shall borrow a sum not to exceed \$95,000 and issue general obligation bonds for such indebtedness under its corporate name and seal and upon the full faith and credit of the Town in an amount not to exceed said sum for the purpose of financing the appropriation for the Project.

Section 2. The First Selectman, Selectmen and Finance Director are hereby appointed a committee (the "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 and to execute Continuing Disclosure Agreements for the benefit of holders of bonds and notes.

Section 3. The Bonds may be designated "Public Improvement Bonds" or "Sewer 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 (3) 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 true 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 Selectmanand 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 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 bondcounsel, and may be consolidated with the issuance of other Town bond anticipation notes. The 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 enacted herein.

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 any capital fund for the Project with the proceeds of the bonds or notes to be issued under the provisions hereof. 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 or other parties, grants, gifts and contributions in aid of further financing the Project. Once the appropriation becomes effective, the First Selectman, or other appropriate official of the town, is hereby authorized to spend a sum not to exceed the aforesaid appropriation for the Project and is specifically authorized to make, execute and deliver any contracts or other documents necessary or convenient to complete the Project and the financing thereof.

Section 9. The 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.

An RTM library committee meeting was held at the library jointly with the representatives from the Library to interview candidates to fill, and to vote for, the 5 vacancies that existed to the Library Board of trustees. As dictated by town law, half the candidates must be approved by library trustees and half by the RTM Library committee.

The voting took place on May 13, 2013.

It was previously agreed to advertise, and interview the candidates jointly: with 3 candidates subsequently approved unanimously by the RTM committee and 2 by the library committee.

All applicants were interviewed and voted upon on May 13, 2013.

But because an RTM quorum was not present, a follow-up meeting was held by the RTM committee for additional discussions, and another vote on June 5th with committee members that could not attend the May meeting.

Approved by the RTM committee for the Library Board were:

- 1. Holland Dunn
- 2. Carole Orland
- 3. Dr. Keith Ruskin

The vote was unanimous 6-0. Voting on the meeting held June 5, 2013 were:

Dr. Arthur Ashman, Melissa Kane, John Suggs, Wendy Batteau, Catherine Calise, and Cornelia Olsen.

As part of the June 5th meeting, an active discussion was had pertaining to future procedural aspects of this process. Two written opinions are attached for the record:

one by a library board member, and the other by an RTM member (non voting), who was present.

Respectfully submitted, Dr Arthur Ashman, Chairman

RTM Appointment of Libr#AC5385.txt Subject: RTM Appointment of Library Trustees Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2013 9:09 PM

From: Dick Lowenstein <bankside@juno.com>

To: <aashman@optonline.net>, <maguthma@optonline.net> Conversation: RTM Appointment of Library Trustees

Arthur,

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to express my views on the subject. And, Mike, your presence was very helpful and appreciated by me.

As much was said, I thought it would be useful -- at least for me -- to put my current views in writing. Publicity to attract trustee candidates should make it clear that the RTM appoints half the Library trustees. When both the Board and the RTM are in the same appointment time frame (like right now), it makes sense to have a single agreed-to press announcement. Both the Library and the RTM (via the Town Clerk?) should receive the resumes/applications. Anyone who is interested and wants to be interviewed should be given that courtesy. The Library should never first vet candidates as being acceptable and therefore eligible for interviews. As a matter of practice, the Library Director should not be present when the RTM is interviewing or voting on candidates. The Board-appointed trustees, of course, can do as they want when they are acting alone. The RTM Library Committee must notice all its interview and candidate-selection meetings, though they should be executive sessions. Any RTM member can attend and participate, as is the rule for all RTM executive sessions. when RTM-appointed trustees leave the Board during the year, the Library Board must notify the RTM Library Committee, so an RTM-only interview process can begin. (Mike, I reread Town Charter Section C34-1 Appointment of Library Trustees. It says simply that Town-appointed trustees shall constitute 50% of the Library voting trustees, without any reference or suggestion that this applies only to the beginning of the year. Most of the time this is not a problem. However, if, for example, the trustees approved a labor agreement and half the voting members were not

Town-appointees, the validity of the vote could be called into question.)

Feel free to comment to me and to share this email with others.

Dick Lowenstein

Appointment of Library T#AC536B.txt
The final step in the process is the interview. The interview process has evolved to be a collaborative effort between the RTM Library Arts and Museum Committee and the Library Governance and Nomination Committee. Members of both committees interview candidates in a joint meeting. This makes it possible for candidates to be interviewed once rather than twice at separate sessions. Following the interviews, each committee votes separately on candidates. The conduct of each committee so vote is set by that committee. Both bodies have informally agreed that only those who have attended all of the interviews may vote.

¥ The Library Director has traditionally been present during the interviews but does not participate in the questioning. She speaks only to answer a question about Library process that might arise or the candidate's past participation in the library. I understand that your concern is that the Directoros presence might somehow shape the outcome. Perhaps the way to deal with this is to have her attend the interviews with the concurrence of the RTM committee members.

\$ Finally, as regards the number of Trustees elected by each body, I mentioned the other night that the number had to be equal at the start of the fiscal year. I was citing the Library by-laws, which are as follows:

- 3.6 Election by the Town of Westport. Up to 10 Trustees shall be elected or re-elected by the Representative Town Meeting of the Town of Westport in accordance with its rules, policies and procedures, including any restrictions that may be imposed on candidates, including but not limited to the age and residency of the candidate.
- 3.7 Election by the Board of Trustees. Up to 10 Trustees shall be elected or re-elected by the current Board of Trustees. Up to 10 Trustees shall be elected of re-elected by the current Board of Trustees. Such election or re-election generally shall take place at the Annual Meeting. Unless otherwise authorized by the affirmative vote of at least 75% of all current Trustees, one of the 10 Trustees elected by the current Board of Trustees shall be the person serving as the active and current President of the Friends of the Westport Library, who shall not be subject to the restrictions imposed by Section 3.9 below but whose term shall end on the last day of the Fiscal Year during which his or her term as President of the Friends of the Westport Library ends.
- 3.8 Equal Number of Trustees. At the beginning of each Fiscal Year, the number of all current Trustees elected and re-elected under Section 3.6 above shall be equal to or greater than the number of all current Trustees elected and re-elected under Section 3.7 above.

As to vacancies that may occur during the year, the Libraryos By-Laws provide:

3.12 Vacancies. Unless otherwise authorized by the affirmative vote of at least 75% of all current Trustees, any vacancy resulting from the death, incapacity, disqualification, resignation or removal of a Trustee shall be filled in accordance with Sections 3.6 and 3.7 above. If a vacancy is filled by election and installation prior to the next Annual Meeting, such service shall be on an interim basis, and such new Trusteeos term shall end on the last

The library will continue to follow its regular practice of notifying the chair of the RTM Library Arts and Museum Committee of any vacancy created by the resignation of a Trustee appointed by the RTM. Whenever a vacancy occurs, we assess the time and effort required to recruit, educate and interview prospective trustees. In some years (as in this past year), when both RTM and Board-elected Trustees resigned Page 2

Appointment of Library T#AC536B.txt part-way through the year, the mutual judgement was made that Library and Town (RTM) needs were being met by the remaining Trustees and vacancies were left to be filled until the next regular election. At other times, vacancies have been filled. Adhering to these rules has worked well as Board membership changes during the year.

I do believe that over the past several years, the Library Nominating and Governance Committee and the RTM Library Arts and Museum Committee have developed an efficient, coordinated process that makes best use of trustee applicant, library staff and committee member time and effort.

Please feel free to forward the email to others as appropriate.

Dick, letos keep the dialog open on this. Weore both after the same outcomes.

Mike

Carole Topol Orland

4-29-13

Personal Statement for Trustee Application

On my desk sits a yellow plastic printout with the words "Westport Library." It was given to me at the WL campaign focus group meeting, which I recently attended. It is a product of the library's 3-D printer but it is more than just a trinket. It is a reminder to me of the extent to which the mission, purpose and reach of our library has developed in the last few years. It is the product of technology that I could not have even imagined not long ago and the best example of our library not only remaining relevant, but being on the cutting edge of technology and learning.

The Westport Library served as my welcoming committee when I moved to town 11 years ago. Needing to study for an examination to complete reciprocity requirements in order to practice law in Connecticut, the beautiful building on the river caught my eye as a venue that where I could temper some of the anxiety of having to study for a test for the first time in more than 25 years.

Shortly thereafter, my son who was then a freshman at Staples High School, independently found his way to the library and for much of his high school career, spent his afternoons there. This was intriguing to me as I knew he wasn't there to read books since his severe learning issues made that almost impossible. Apparently he spent much of his time on the library's computer, but that too was interesting since had his own computer at home.

In preparing my statement, I have reflected on these two situations as they offer a? signpost to the broader questions you have posed. For a then 50 year old transplanted attorney and a 15 year old special needs high school student to be drawn into the same facility, is worth thinking about.

Many years lapsed before my interest in the library was rekindled through a personal connection. What I observed was astonishing. No longer was the library just a "warehouse for books." It was clearly a dynamic environment where technology, alternative learning opportunities and service to the public were central to its operations. This was an institution that had reinvented itself with a clear focus on serving and educating all aspects of the community. The welcoming qualities that had attracted my son and me were even more apparent and far reaching.

While there is always room for improvement, from my current perspective I feel that our library is in the forefront of innovation and learning and it is doing a remarkable job of serving all segments of our community. The technology pieces, such as the 3-D printer, appear to have attracted a wide age range of people. The programs I read about cover topics of interest to a diverse constituency.

As for future goals, I have come to understand the importance of renovating the library building. In addition to attending the focus group meeting, I have met with Maxine Bleiweis and have sat in on two board meetings. To meet its goal, the campaign will require financial and time commitments from the trustees, who must act as ambassadors to the community. It will require more than just fundraising. The community will need to buy into the fact that the library is relevant to their lives. They will need to be exposed to what it has to offer. It will require more than an Internet posting or a mailing. For example, I recently suggested to my husband that he attend TedMed. He found it very interesting but it's not something he was likely to sign up for had I not brought it to his attention. Personal involvement is so important in generating interest for the library and once people are interested, the dollars are likely to flow. And once those dollars are put to good use, the library will be even more spectacular. I believe that I have the interest, initiative and incentive to help make this happen.

## Carole Topol Orland

6 Keenes Road | Westport, CT 06880 | h: 203.221-8234 | c: 508-450-5411

Partner - Broder & Orland LLC, 2005 - present

Carole Topol Orland is a founding member and partner at Broder & Orland LLC. She has been practicing family and matrimonial law for more than thirty years and has extensive experience representing clients in Fairfield County and throughout Connecticut in matters involving all aspects of family and matrimonial law, including divorce, alimony, child support and custody and the division of assets. Carole has handled some of the most complex and high networth cases in Connecticut. Clients seek her counsel in developing pre-nuptial and post-nuptial agreements, negotiating fair divorce settlements, mediating divorces and, when necessary, vigorously advocating on their behalf in litigation.

#### Honors and Awards

- Martindale-Hubbell® AV® Preeminent ™ Rated Lawyer highest possible rating in both legal ability and ethical standards, earned through a strenuous peer and judicial review procedure.
- Designated "Top Lawyer in Family Law and Matrimonial Law" by Westport, Greenwich, New Canaan/Darien and Fairfield Magazines.

#### Professional Associations and Memberships

- · Fairfield County Bar Association, Family Law Section, 2003 Present
- Connecticut Bar Association, Family Law Section, 2003 Present; Executive Committee, 2003 2010
- Association of Family and Conciliation Courts, 2012 Present

#### Pro Bono Activities

- Special Master, Family Division, Stamford and Bridgeport Superior Courts, 2005 Present
- Mentor-on-Call Program Volunteer, Statewide Legal Service, 2012 Present
- Volunteer Attorney Program, Stamford Superior Court, 2012 Present

#### Presentation and Publication

- Bench Bar Symposium on Professionalism, Fairfield & Connecticut Bar Associations, State of Connecticut Judicial Branch, 2011 - Panelist
- "Getting Divorced The Separation Agreement in Plain Speak," FCBA Newsletter, Winter 2013

#### Bar Admissions

- Connecticut, 2003
- New York, 1997
- District of Columbia, 1996
- Massachusetts, 1977
- U.S. District Court, 1979

#### Past Employment

- · Fitzmaurice & Siegel, Stamford, CT, 2003 2005
- Wolfson Keenan Cotton & Meagher, Worcester, MA, 1984 2002
- Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Assistant District Attorney, Worcester, MA, 1979 1984

#### Education

- New England School of Law, Boston, Massachusetts, 1977 J.D.
- Boston University, 1974 B.A. Honors: cum laude

#### Community Activities

- Westport Library Great Gatsby Committee 2012 2013
- Near & Far Aid Gala Committee and Auction Sub Committee Chair 2012 2013
- Beechwood Arts Organization, Patron 2012 Present

#### Personal

- · Married to Burton I. Orland; Mother of two adult children and proud grandmother
- · Interests include Design and Art; Dance; Sports; Boston Red Sox

For those whomregularly frequent the Library, its physical infrastructure, staff and services are commonly viewed as an ordinary, yet priceless feature of their lives. For others, the Library, often in hindsight, represents a single or, perhaps, a variety of isolated stages within their lives - attending Mother Goose Time with young children and registering a child for their first library card to picking up one of *The New York Times*' bestsellers, or escaping for a moment of solitude. Regardless of the intent, the Library remains a constant and consistent source of quietsustenance. It never judges the level or intent of an individual's interaction and it reliably rises to meet you where you are. Its staff provided ependable information to assist in the navigations of life's path and the free programing provide opportunities for all individuals to engage intellectually, creatively and personally with other members of the community. In short, the Library accepts every individual along with their frailties without judgment and offers the residents of Westport countless opportunities to engage and find their unique voice within the community. There is no other place quite like it.

As times change, however, and the future of physical books appears uncertain, the traditional interpretation of librariesis experiencing a period of introspection and transformation. I believe the key objectives for the Westport Library's future are dual-fold. First, the Librarysimply needs to 'keep-onkeeping-on' and continue its longstanding push for bold and innovative programming and services. I believe, only through constantly challenging the traditional view of a Library can it remain nimble enough to truly serve. Secondly, the Library should continue to engage demographics that do not currently or traditionally support the institution. On a basic level, this might mean casting a wider net for fundraising appeals, or targeting select demographics with more-tailored approach. On a slightly more engaged level, this could mean launching a multi-tiered marketing/fundraising campaign, which directly challenges the historical view of libraries and reframesinstitution in the mind of the constituents. More specifically, formal grant appeals could be made to nontraditional funding sources so that different programming and population outreach (young child, senior citizens, entrepreneurs, etc.) could receive their own selfrenewing streams of funding. Furthermore, direct appeals could be made to key community, regional or national individuals and institutions which emphasize not only the services provided by the Library, but also the key role the Westport Library plays in the current and future of community of Westport. As Westport continues to grow and change in terms of demographics, it is critical the Library plays a key role in both reflecting these changes, but also serving as a key center of the community.

Washington, DC

17 Edgewiner Hillside, Westport, CT 36886 M: (917) 363-8525 - fr DumHolland@gmail.com

**EDUCATION** 2001-2003 HARVARD UNIVERSITY Cambridge, MA Masters, Government Relations 1993-1997 UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA Athens, GA BA, Journalism; Presidential Scholar, Dean's List EXPERIENCE 2009-2013 AURORA ADVISORY New York, NY Principal Lead consulting engagements and manage philanthropic portfolios for individuals, foundations and 501(c)(3) organizations, including sector experience in the areas of judicial reform, regional and global healthcare systems, international development, arts and culture, interreligious engagement and education. Regularly present at conferences and forums on philanthropic marketplace and issue-specific initiatives. 2008-2009 APOLLO PHILANTHROPY PARTNERS, LLC New York, NY Consultant Managed consulting engagements and portfolios for individuals, organizations, and foundations, including grantees from Gates, Carnegie, and Atlantic Philanthropies. Established philanthropic platform, including marketing materials, outreach and communications. 2005-2008 NEW YORK PRIVATE BANK & TRUST New York, NY Vice President and Senior Philanthropic Advisor Structured philanthropic advisory platform for UHNW clients, 501(c)(3) organizations and bankers. Developed and maintained relationships and philanthropic portfolios: trusts, transfers and foundations. AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2003-2005 Singapore Regional and Government Affairs Manager Directed 2005 USSFTA Review for U.S. commercial interests, USTR and U.S. Embassy. Coordinated the Chamber's US regional commercial response for Tsunami-affected areas. Designed 2004 Non-Tariff Trade Barriers: ASEAN Survey and an award-winning HIV/AIDS program. Developed advocacy platforms for 15 industry-specific committees, including: Financial Services, Government and Regional Affairs, Defense, Cultural Relations, Energy, Environment, 1T/Telecom. JOHN F. KENNEDY PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY AND MUSEUM 2002-2003 Boston, MA Forum Series Manager Directed Forum Series, featuring Foreign Dignitaries, U.S. Cabinet Officials and Presidents. Managed national initiatives including, Seeking Common Ground: Human Rights and Civil Rights and Combating AIDS: Human Rights Perspective including forums, advocacy, press and marketing. Coordinated media for print and broadcast outlets, including: CNN, NY Times and Boston Globe. BOSTON LYRIC OPERA 1999-2002 Boston, MA Patron and Program Manager Directed over 350 events, including Carmen on the Common, the largest outdoor event in the city's history and 2000 Egyptian Season with Boston Symphony Orchestra, Boston Ballet and MFA. ROBERT F. KENNEDY MEMORIAL 1997-1999 Washington, DC Event Director and Deputy Chief of Staff Coordinated corporate and NGO involvement of RFK Domestic Youth Programs in DC, LA and SF. Directed RFK Book Awards with Chairs Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and John Seigenthaler, and RFK Human Rights Awards, including award process, selection and ceremonies.

# • Directed events for 1996 Campaign cycle for POTUS and VPOTUS, including 1997 Convention. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1995-1997

 Marathon Runner, Thai Kickboxing, CFP/CTFA Candidate, Save the Children Newborn Survival Board, Christ & Holy Trinity School Board.

53<sup>RD</sup> PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL COMMITTEE/ DNC

Assistant to National Director / Liaison to Inaugural Director

| J. | panels, we reserve the right         | to re-estimate any addition | nal parts ar | not be seen without removal of components and/or and labor. If we feel additional parts or labor are The job will not resume until an agreement is made. |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--|
| •  | You may be able to charge t details. | his purchase on a John De   | eere Power   | Plan charge account. Ask your Sales Rep for  |
|    | Customer signature                   | Date                        | •            | Undercarriage Scrap disposed by: Customer Dealer   |

The WI Clark Company is grateful for the opportunity to earn your business.



BACK UP MATERIA RTM ITEM #\_\_\_\_

February 7, 2013

Hadley C. Rose, Moderator Representative Town Meeting 14 St. George Pl Westport, CT 06880

RE: Agenda Item Request pursuant to Section C5-6C of the Town Charter

Dear Mr. Rose:

Yesterday, I received a petition request signed by Dr. David R. Brown, 65 Bulkley Ave N, lead petitioner, from at least 20 electors of the Town of Westport, for the RTM to place an item on an upcoming Representative Town Meeting agenda, pursuant to Section C5-6C of the Town Charter, involving a request to review and recommend revisions to the existing policies and procedures guiding the Department of Public Works (DPW) in its management of the Town's sanitary sewer extension program. Copies of the petition pages are enclosed.

At least 20 electors' names have been verified for acceptance of this petitioned request. Pursuant to Section 5-6C of the Town Charter, please consider placing this matter on the agenda of the RTM at a future meeting.

Sincerely,

Patricia H. Strauss

Town Clerk

Cc: Gordon F. Joseloff, First Selectman

Ira Bloom, Town Attorney

Patrici Atlanss

Gail Kelly, Assistant Town Attorney

Stephen Edwards, Director, Public Works

Tel 6,2012

Dear M5 Steams Town Club.

Enclosed please fin a petition for the RTM. under 10-4 of the west part Town we sequest that this matter is brought before the RTM. Thank you for your assistance in this

matter.

David R Brown ScD 65 Balkley Ave (N) Westport Ct. Westport Ct.

NPAWLET@aol.com

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions. (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <u>Signature</u> $\bigcap$ | Address           | Email            |      |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------|
| Sharon ANNE Herovitz       | - 64 Cent         |                  |      |
| petoin / Mas /             | 7 Ma              | yther line       |      |
| MOONE FLIZAGETA CLARESSA   | TWORE LAT /       | myfaj Lane       |      |
| LILLIGAT VIOLATION         | COKI              | 185 GFR.         | West |
| M.C. M.C. D.               | <u>.</u> <u>G</u> | VIOLET LANE, WS: | 2 ,  |

I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me <u>February 6</u>.

2013 and that it contains signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of this town.

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions. (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| Signature         | Address         | <u>Email</u>     |   |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|---|
| 7 DENNIS ST       | ANLEY, NOVAK L  |                  |   |
| Lamis Word        | 134 OLD RD.     |                  |   |
| LAUREN A.         | GROSNER L       |                  |   |
| 1 Julian          | 5/12/ 106 Oct   | 1 Road           |   |
| 10 Joek 9 72 2 24 | 2 63 Bulkle.    | 7 Am. N. (Th     | emas Y. Howard)   |
| MARION:           | SHERMAN HOWARD  |                  |   |
| Marat             | This 63 Bulke   | of AE N Mari     | on S. Fourne  |
| GEORGE G.         | VALENTINO VI    | 2 La             |   |
| Dolores ?         | 4. Va Pentino 7 | 0 Bulkle         | Lave Month  |
|                   |                 | I, Patricia H.   | Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport,  |
| (-                | 5.              | certify that the | nis petition page was filed with me February 6, t it contains signed names of electors, |
|                   |                 | whose name:      | s appear on the last completed registry list of   |
|                   |                 | this town.       |   |
|                   |                 | Cate             | iii HAtlauss  |

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions. (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

|         | Signature    | Address     | Eı         | nail  |
|---------|--------------|-------------|------------|---|
|         | DAVID ROBER  |             | en Ave (V) | NPAULE (@ACL, COM   |
|         | JOHN F       |             |            |   |
| ISA ANN | STEINBERGU   | U J         | The Speech | John Suggs @ gmail. com   |
| 3       | PATRICIA     | ANNE PARDON |            | Charles on 5  |
| JA      | NET M. AHADI | O 2 ARRIV   | AGE.       |   |
| ~       |              | 1 / 15      | 134 m R    | l, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport  |
|         |              |             |            | certify that this petition page was filed with me February 6, 2013 and that it contains signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of |
|         | STANLEY E.   | KUBIN V     |            | Patrice H Straus  |

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions.
   (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <b>Signature</b> | Address      | <u>Ema</u>  | <u>il                                     </u> |
|------------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| JUM Al Shy       | spared 3 ALP | INE LANE    | Barleycato/alos.com                            |
| Sunch E BI       | ETH!         | Kley Ace IV | sbrown@Wesport. 12. ct. us                     |
| x Main Vitz      | 1455         | yalar.      | Latz lauja Cargenali, com                      |
|                  | V            |             |  |
|                  |              |             |  |

I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me February 6, 2013 and that it contains \_\_\_\_\_\_ signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of this town.

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions.

  (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <u>Signature</u> | Address          | <u>Email</u>     |                                       |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Margueret        | Mereklir 17 adan | is Farm Rel WIST | · Werdy winkles                       |
| MARGUERITE       | Y. WINKLER       | •                | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|                  |                  |                  |                                       |
|                  |                  |                  |                                       |
|                  |                  |                  |                                       |

I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me February 6, 2013 and that it contains \_\_/\_ signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of this town.

Vature HAttaus

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions.

  (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <u>Signature</u> | Address               | <u>Email</u>         |   |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---|
|                  |                       |                      |   |
| 2) Madle (1)     | they was 100 OIN ROAD | JCROENER QGMAII: COM |   |
| 00               | O'                    |                      | _ |
| WILLIAM J. G     | EOSNER JR. V          |                      |   |
|                  |                       |                      |   |
|                  |                       |                      | - |
|                  |                       |                      |   |
|                  |                       |                      | _ |
|                  |                       |                      |   |
|                  |                       |                      |   |

I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me <u>February 6</u>, 2013 and that it contains \_\_\_\_\_ signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of this town.

tucia H Straus

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions.

  (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <u>Signature</u> | Address          | Email                                 | _  |
|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|----|
| . HARY PAUL      | - WALKER-FERENCE |                                       | -  |
| - Lange          | a Wilker-Terence | 195 Newtown Trooke                    |    |
| 1004             | Ellin.           | 74 Congrit St                         |    |
| MARY H. CA       | LAND _           |                                       |    |
|                  |                  |                                       |    |
|                  |                  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | L. |
|                  |                  |                                       |    |

I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me February 6, 2013 and that it contains signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of this town.

Yatura Hattause

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions.

  (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <u>Signature</u> | Address         | <u>Email</u>   |
|------------------|-----------------|--|
| Koßek            | Do Stotles L    | sa Car Commun  |
| RACHEL           | LE MONA TAPFAR  | Caliny pa  |
|                  | R. CONARCK Y    | Freder Fol   |
| JEAN             | L. SIHONS L     | , Janua Jane   |
| 3 Wilde          | (115 DEC) dicin | 27   |
| GWENDOLLYN       | 7. WALDRON -    | I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me <u>February 6</u> .  2013 and that it contains 5 signed names of electors, |

whose names appear on the last completed registry list of

Specifically we ask the RTM to review the policy's and recommend revisions to DPW's current practice of:

- The use of unverified and uncertified signed sewer petitions.
- The lack of stated expiration dates applied to the sewer petitions.
   (Because these petitions lack expiration dates, the ones being processed now actually go back 13/15 years. As a result current homeowners are finding themselves expected to bear the sewer installation costs with or without their consent solely based on petitions signed by previous homeowners who have long ago moved away, or in some cases even died.)
- The lack of clear explanation on the actual sewer petitions that the full costs will be born by homeowners within 200 feet of the targeted street along with an estimation of the anticipated costs.
- The lack of financial hardship provisions for impacted residents.
- The questionable acceptance of signatures of homeowners living on private roads towards the vote tally's for homes on public streets.
- The current confusion around which rule of required signatures are to be followed. (Note: The Current Rules require over 73% approval level from the homeowners involved before a recommendation can go forward. The Older Rules required 51%. Because unverified and uncertified petitions from up to fifteen years back are only now being brought forward by the DPW it is not at all clear if the petitions should be required to have over 73% or 51% of homeowners signatures.)

The DPW sewer petition program is not working. And we respectfully request that the RTM review the program and make policy recommendations to fix it.

| <u>Signature</u>       | Address        | Email  |
|------------------------|----------------|--|
| ANNE F. L<br>Ana Lucia | EVINE H Raufi  | rid Rol.   |
| (34~13                 | ROBERT, P. PRE | LEVERGREEN DUE   |
| Beth BETTY             | JANE HELLER    | The Tree Dy.   |
| They last of           | PHYLLIS L.B    | sender La.   |
| D. Forth               | 11 Call        | w8d  |
| UTE FISK               |                | I, Patricia H. Strauss, Town Clerk of the Town of Westport, certify that this petition page was filed with me February 6.  2013 and that it contains signed names of electors, whose names appear on the last completed registry list of |

### Strauss, Patricia

From: NPAWLET@aol.com

**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2013 10:36 AM

To: NPAWLET@aol.com; Joseloff, Gordon

Cc: Kassen, Shelly; Haberstroh, Charles; # TOW-RTM Mailing List; Strauss, Patricia; Edwards, Stephen

Subject: Re: Letter relative to sewer extension

If you are having trouble opening the letter it is in the body of this e-mail.

David Brown

Letter:

Honorable Gordon F. Joseloff
First Selectman
Town Hall Westport, Connecticut
The Board of Selectman, Water pollution Authority
Town of Westport

Re: December 12 Public Hearing and subsequent actions

Dear Mr. Joseloff:

I want to clarify Sydney and my concerns relative to the Sewer extensions proposed by the Department of Public Works. We both attended the informational meeting on February 4 led by Steve Edwards and Bryon Thompson. The meeting was helpful with ample time for questions. Thank you for suggesting it.

In general sewers increase nitrogen flow into Long Island sound and should be minimized. On the other hand there is a need for sanitary sewers in certain neighborhoods. If reliable and functional, septic systems are available they are the preferable method for disposing of sanitary wastes.

In 2002 or 2004 an engineering study of the Westport sewers system resulted in the requirement that connections to the sewer be mandatory when new sewers are installed. I understand from a comment by Steve Edwards at the Feb, 4 "informational meeting" that there had been "voids" in the sewer system because they were operating at less than capacity. Therefore mandatory connections are now required. That rule change increased the overall costs to all residents. Now, in addition to the access charge, each is responsible for use fees and the costs connecting to the sewer. Those costs are incurred irrespective of the homeowners need for the service.

Petitions have been used to assess the community acceptance of the sewers. Prior to 2004, if 51% of the "Eligible Units" signed petitions for sewer extensions to their neighborhoods the installation was considered by public works. According my understanding from Steve's comments at the February 4 meeting, after 2004 the rules changed so that everyone was required to hook up and

pay usage fees that percentage of eligible units signing petitions was increased to 75%.

Increasing the number of petitions required for approval of the requests to 75% seems fair because the total <u>required</u> cost of connection and usage fees to every home owner was increased substantially over requirement of the access costs only. The difference is substantial over ten years with usage costs of \$400 /year and connection costs of \$3,000 to \$4,000 the homeowner would be asked to absorb a cost of \$7,000 to \$8,000. When the access charge is included, the cost would approach \$25,000 to \$30,000. That is a very high charge for families on fixed incomes. For Sydney and me it would be a 15 to 20% increase in our monthly fixed household expenses. Move-over the cost is not capped and could be much higher.

The Department of Public Works is in a difficult position because only one of the 5 petitions exceeds the 75% threshold. That is an "add on" to a proposed sewer and is not and extension of the present sewer. For the overall project petitions did not exceed 75%. On the other hand there are old petitions received before 2004, in part, that did exceed the original 51% requirement. The petitions are dated, some as old as 14 years. 'Signers' are no longer living in the house others have died in some cases the houses have been torn down and replaced. For others who may have signed the petitions circumstances have changed due to the economy and retirements. Some are widowed or ill. The cost of construction is no longer in the \$8,000 to \$9,000 range but has increased to nearly \$20,000.

Therefore reasonably accurate projections of costs are no longer possible. The costs are clearly higher than in the 1990s period. The homeowner has no way of knowing what they are committing to when signing the petition and agreeing to pay the total costs of the project because there is no cap to acceptable charges for the project. The process is that the town will place a lien on the property after bonding the project. That lien would have to be paid in full prior to use of the property as collateral for any other purpose such a nursing home expenses or refinancing of home loans 'underwater'. Clearly the problem is different if the assessment is \$20,000 versus \$8,000.

One key fact that is not clear is whether the connections will be mandatory or optional under the current project proposed by Public Works. If the connections are mandatory the 75% approval rate should control the decision. If the connections are optional and the only charge is the assessment of \$8,000 to \$10,000 for access, than grandfathering the 10 year old petitions seems may be acceptable. A process should be conducted that assures the current owner is aware of the petition and the potential financial liability. That should be done in a written letter that clearly states the financial burdens and places a cap on the costs.

This is our understanding of the project and the costs. If they are not correct please get back to me. Thank You for your concerns about this issue.

Thank you for your attention,

David and Sydney Brown 65 Bulkley Ave.North Westport CT.

CC. Steve Edwards



## WESTPORT CONNECTICUT

RECEIVED

MAY 6 - 2013

TOWN OF WESTPORT SELECTMAN'S OFFICE

#### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

TOWN HALL, 110 MYRTLE AVE.
WESTPORT, CONNECTICUT 06880

May 2, 2013

Mr. Gordon F. Joseloff First Selectman Town Hall Westport, CT 06880

BACK UP MATERIAL RTM ITEM #\_5

RE:

Request for Appropriation for Design

Bulkley Ave. North, Buttonwood Lane, Elizabeth Drive, Evans Court, Forest Drive, Long Lots Road, Mallard Lane, Maple Ave. North, Old Road, and Ulbrick Lane Contract #65

Dear Mr. Joseloff:

This office has received a number of petitions from residents of the above referenced areas seeking an extension of the public sanitary sewer system to service their neighborhoods. A preliminary review of the topography and wetland maps indicates that the areas can be serviced by a conventional gravity system. The Contract is made up of two areas; the first consists of the Bulkley Ave. North vicinity which will require approximately 2,500 lf of sewer to service twenty (20) properties. The second area consists of the Old Road vicinity and will require approximately 3,750 lf of sewer to service sixty-five (65) properties.

At this time, this office herein requests an appropriation and bond authorization for the necessary funds to complete the engineering design of the proposed extension. The costs associated with design of this sewer extension will be benefit assessed as part of the final sewer construction cost. An appropriation of \$95,000.00 is requested based on the following breakdown:

Engineering Fee \$ 66,300.00

Borings 20,000.00

Contingency (10%) 8,630.00

TOTAL \$ 94,930.00 SAY \$95,000.00

Respectfully,

Stephen J. Edwards
Director of Public Works

cc: Gary Conrad, Finance Director

G:\PW OFF\SEWER\CON65\design app

Approved for submission to the Board of Finance (5/22/13)

First Selection