



**TOWN OF MANSFIELD
TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
Monday, July 26, 2010
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
AUDREY P. BECK MUNICIPAL BUILDING
7:30 p.m.**

AGENDA

	Page
CALL TO ORDER	
ROLL CALL	
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	1
PUBLIC HEARING	
1. Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances (Item #8, 07-12-10 Agenda)	57
OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL	
REPORT OF THE TOWN MANAGER	
REPORTS AND COMMENTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS	
OLD BUSINESS	
2. Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances (Item #8, 07-12-10 Agenda)	59
3. Community/Campus Relations (Item #3, 07-12-10 Agenda)	77
4. Community Water and Wastewater Issues (Item #4, 07-12-10 Agenda)	83
5. School Building Project (Item #1, 07-15-10 Agenda)	99
NEW BUSINESS	
6. Proclamation in Recognition of Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office	101
7. Memorandum of Agreement, Tolland-Mansfield Probate District	103
DEPARTMENTAL AND COMMITTEE REPORTS	107
REPORTS OF COUNCIL COMMITTEES	
PETITIONS, REQUESTS AND COMMUNICATIONS	
8. M. Hart re: Thank you	117
9. M. Hart re: Appointment to Mansfield Conservation Commission	119
10. District Meeting – Public Hearing – Regional School District Number 19	121
11. PZC Proposed Regulation revisions regarding Political Signs	123
12. Special Town Meeting - July 12, 2010 – Minutes	125

13.	U.S Census Bureau re: Thank you	127
14.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Parking restrictions reasonable, defensible" – 07-07-10	129
15.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Letters to the Editor" – 07-09-10.....	131
16.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Letters to the Editor" – 07-10-10.....	133
17.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Showdown pits landlords against parking ordinance" – 07-10-10.....	135
18.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Storrs center plan to get \$4.9M boost" – 07-10-10.....	137
19.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Letter to the Editor" – 07-12-10.....	139
20.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Editorial: Emergency response is town responsibility" – 07-13-10	141
21.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Three local towns to benefit from energy funding" – 07-13-10.....	143
22.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Officials: Storrs center project will happen" – 07-13-10	145
23.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Voters give parking plan the green light" – 07-13-10	147
24.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Letter to the Editor" – 07-16-10.....	149
25.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Tour de Mansfield Saturday" – 07-16-10.....	151
26.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Ethics board is criticized in Mansfield" – 07-19-10.....	153
27.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Seeing Mansfield by bike" – 07-19-10	155
28.	<u>Chronicle</u> "Mansfield OKs new political sign rules" – 07-20-10	157

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL

FUTURE AGENDAS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

REGULAR MEETING – MANSFIELD TOWN COUNCIL

July 12, 2010

DRAFT

Mayor Elizabeth Paterson called the regular meeting of the Mansfield Town Council to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Audrey P. Beck Building.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Haddad, Keane, Kochenburger, Lindsey, Moran, Paterson, Paulhus, Ryan, Schaefer

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Haddad moved and Mr. Ryan seconded to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2010 meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Revisions to the Ordinance Establishing a Fee Schedule for Fire Prevention Services

The Town Clerk read the legal notice for the public hearing. Deputy Chief/Fire Marshal John Jackman briefly reviewed the proposed changes which now include the fee schedule provisions as newly authorized by the Connecticut Fire Prevention Code. The code is applicable to all buildings, structures and uses except for one and two family dwellings. Council members requested clarification as to which agencies would be exempt from the fees. Mr. Jackman noted that Town agencies are exempt and that the threshold for any entity is that it must be regulated by the Code.

No members of the public commented and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Haddad moved and Mr. Schaefer seconded to move Item 5, Swearing in of Fire Captain, as the next item of business.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL

Inge Marie Eigsti, Wormwood Hill Road, spoke in favor of the two school or three school options and encouraged the Council to look at the research regarding small schools.

Michael Lynch, Coventry Road, spoke in support of the two school or three school options commenting that the education of our children has a direct impact on all our lives.

David Stern, Davis Road, spoke to the support and services his son received for his special needs and talents at the Vinton School. Mr. Stern questioned whether or not a larger school would have been able to provide the same.

Matvey Soklvsy, Storrs Road, spoke against the one school option for the following reasons: the state will not continue to support funding, three empty buildings will be expensive to maintain, one school is not as educationally flexible as smaller schools are and in larger schools some children may not receive the attention they require.

Jane Goldman, Wormwood Hill Road, urged support for the two school or three school options. (Statement attached)

Lida Bilokur, Wormwood Hill Road, commented on the services for the Town's seniors. (Statement attached)

Mike Sikoski, Wildwood Road, commented on the FOI complaints lodged against the Ethics Board and heard by the Freedom of Information Commission. (Statement attached)

Jon Hand, Bundy Lane, spoke in support of many of the points made by previous speakers regarding the need for small schools. Mr. Hand commented that although he is not sure it is the best time to undertake a major project, if the decision to build is made he would be in support of the three school option.

Ric Hossack, Middle Turnpike, called for the resignation of the Ethics Board and if they refused called on the Town Council to dissolve the Board and appoint new members.

Jay Rueckl, South Eagleville Road, spoke in favor of the concept of small virtual neighborhood schools. Mr. Rueckl commented that in these schools a sense of community and belonging would develop since the students and parents would get to know each other.

Betty Wassmundt, Old Turnpike Road, asked the Council not to abdicate their responsibility to provide fiduciary oversight. (Statement attached)

Mark LaPlaca, Jonathan Lane, restated the following points that have been made during the school building discussion: Option A is more expensive than the one school option, if two schools are built only one vacant property will remain, the decision is for the next fifty years therefore flexibility needs to be built into the plan and Option E will provide cost savings and community schools. Mr. LaPlaca suggested the Council investigate ways to reduce the cost of Option E.

John Hodgson, Chaffeeville Road, thanked the Board of Education for listening to citizens. Mr. Hodgson supports small schools for small kids and noted some of the benefits of smaller schools.

V. REPORT OF TOWN MANAGER

Report attached.

Town Manager Matt Hart suggested Council members might want to discuss Items 11 and 13 under Petitions, Request and Communications.

Mr. Hart also commented that this is an exciting time for senior services in the Town and that excellent progress has been made with the hiring of a new coordinator and social worker.

VI. REPORTS AND COMMENTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Ryan, chair of the Finance Committee, reported the Director of Finance has prepared a summary of COMP time and he is very comfortable with the policy. The information will be made available to all members at a future meeting.

Ms. Keane asked that a copy of the job description for the Senior Center Social Worker be provided to the Council at the next meeting.

Mr. Paulhus thanked Mr. Clouette for moderating the Town Meeting held earlier that evening. He also noted that the Finance Committee, one of the three Council Standing Committees, does provide financial oversight.

Ms. Moran clarified that elderly persons who have put their property in trust but still live there would not be subject to the approved Ordinance Regarding Off Street Parking on Residential Rental Property. She also stated the ordinance does not require people to cut trees larger than 12" but rather, trees of that size do not have to be cut to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Haddad questioned whether or not speakers should be invited to the July 15th Special meeting on the School Options and an opportunity for public comment added to the agenda.

Mr. Haddad moved and Ms. Keane seconded to add the question to the agenda as the Item 9a. Motion passed unanimously

Mayor Paterson submitted emails from Bill Caneira, Anna Cranmer, John and Karin Rickards, Chandra Lownes, and Louanne Cooley to be included in the public comment record. (Statements attached)

VII. OLD BUSINESS

2. Revisions to the Ordinance Establishing a Fee Schedule for Fire Prevention Services

Ms. Keane moved and Mr. Kochenburger seconded to refer the ordinance to the Ordinance Development and Review Subcommittee. The Subcommittee will consist of Ms. Keane, Ms. Lindsey and Mr. Kochenburger and will report back at the next regular Council meeting.

Motion passed with all in favor except Mr. Ryan who voted nay and Mr. Schaefer who abstained.

3. Community/Campus Relations

Town Manager Matt Hart and Mayor Paterson will be meeting with UConn's Interim President Austin to discuss Spring Weekend and other issues. They will also reach out to Mr. McHugh, President of the UConn Board of Trustees, to arrange a meeting.

Mr. Haddad requested information detailing how UConn reports student involvement in incidents at Spring Weekend. Are UConn guest identified as outsiders or part of the student population?

4. Community Water and Wastewater Issues

Mr. Hart reported that he had checked the water levels earlier in the day and that the Fenton water flow was quite low and the Willimantic water flow was low but not as low as the Fenton.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

5. Swearing in of Fire Captain

The Town Clerk swore in Willard Cornell as a Fire Captain for the Town of Mansfield. Fire Chief Dave Dagon congratulated Fire Captain Cornell noting that he offers a tremendous amount of experience. Chief Dagon commented that the selection was made using an internal merit based process and that there were three very strong candidates for the position. Chief Dagon also thanked Charles Cosgrove for serving as Acting Fire Captain. Mayor Paterson also offered the thanks of the Council to Mr. Cosgrove and congratulations to Fire Captain Cornell.

6. Open Space and Watershed Acquisition Grant

Mr. Haddad moved and Mr. Moran seconded to approve the following resolution: Be it resolved that Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager of the Town of Mansfield, be and hereby is authorized to execute on behalf of the Town of Mansfield, an Open Space and Watershed Land Acquisition Grant Agreement and a Conservation and Public Recreation Easement and Agreement and with the State of Connecticut for financial assistance to acquire permanent interest in land known as the Dorwart Property. Mansfield OSWA 253, and to manage said land as open space pursuant to Section 7-131d of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Motion passed unanimously.

7. Small Town Economic Assistance Program (STEAP) Application for Storrs Center Parking Garage Controls and Equipment, and Parking Signage.

Mr. Schaefer moved and Mr. Paulhus seconded, effective July 8, 2010, to authorize the Town manager to submit an application in the amount of \$498,000 to the Small Town Economic Assistance Program to fund systems control equipment for parking structure equipment and controls and parking wayfinding signage associated with the Storrs Center Project.

Including some suggested wording changes by the Town Manager the motion was amended to read:

Mr. Schaefer moved and Mr. Paulhus seconded, effective July 12, 2010, to authorize the Town manager to submit an application in the amount of \$498,000 to the Small Town Economic Assistance Program to fund design and construction of parking structure equipment and controls and parking wayfinding signage associated with the Storrs Center Project.

The motion as amended passed unanimously.

8. Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administrative and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances.

Mr. Paulhus moved and Mr. Ryan seconded, effective July 12, 2010, to schedule a public hearing for 7:30 PM at the Town Council's regular meeting on July 26, 2010, to solicit public comment regarding the proposed "Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances."

Motion passed unanimously.

9. Freedom of Information Act Requests, Cases and Updates

Assistant to the Town Manager Maria Capriola, assisted by the Town Clerk, provided a report/update on the Freedom of Information requests received by the Town and distributed a handout categorizing the number of requests and approximate cost to the Town to process the requests. (Handout attached) Ms. Capriola also updated the Council on the three recently resolved Freedom of Information cases filed against the Town and the one pending case. Ms. Moran asked staff to compile the estimated time and cost to the Town to prepare for the Freedom of Information cases filed against the Town.

9a. Procedure for July 15, 2010 Special Meeting Regarding the School Building Project

Council member discussed options for additional public input and decided that the July 15th meeting would be a work session for Council members with the understanding that there will be additional opportunities for public input. Both the members of the Board of Education and the School Building Committee have been sent notice of the meeting and representatives will hopefully be available to answer any questions Council members might have.

The Town Manager will make arrangements to have the work session televised.

IX. DEPARTMENTAL AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

No Reports

REPORTS OF COUNCIL COMMITTEES

No Reports

X. PETITIONS, REQUEST AND COMMUNICATIONS

10. N. Beets re: Joint Town/University Relations Committee Meeting
11. F. Baruzzi re: Negotiations with the Mansfield Education Association – Mr. Ryan volunteered to represent the Town Council at the meetings.
12. Planning and Zoning Commission re: 8-24 Referral; North Eagleville Road Sidewalks
13. Open Space Preservation Committee re: Open Space Bond Referendum - – By consensus the Council agreed to refer the recommendation of the Open Space Preservation Committee to the Finance Committee.
14. Press Release: Courtney, FTA Administrator Rognoff to Announce \$4.9 Million Transportation Grant for Storrs
15. Press Release: CT Alert Emergency Notification System Helps Safeguard Lives and Property
16. State of Connecticut Library re: Historic Documents Preservation Grant
17. University of Connecticut Library re: Handbook for Connecticut Boards of Finance
18. Liberty Bank re: 2010 Willard M. McRae Community Diversity Award
19. Chronicle "Editorial: Residents are right: Ban Spring Weekend" – 06-23-10
20. Chronicle "Mansfield voters OK \$33.7M budget again" – 06-23-10
21. Chronicle "Key meetings in Mansfield" – 06-26-10
22. Chronicle "Mansfield residents tell council to consider one-school option" – 06-29-10
23. Chronicle "Voters OK Four Corners funding" – 06-29-10

- 24. Chronicle "Mansfield nixes rescue fee ordinance" – 06-30-10
- 25. Chronicle "Cookies anyone?" – 07-01-10
- 26. Chronicle "Mansfield delays action on land acquisition" – 07-02-10
- 27. Chronicle "Editorial: We offer these threads, needles" – 07-06-10

XI. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL

Mike Sikoski, Wildwood Road, continued his comments regarding the Freedom of Information cases filed against the Town.

Ric Hossack, Middle Turnpike, stated that if the Council will not ask for the resignation of the members of the Ethics Board then they are in favor of closed government.

Betty Wassmundt, Old Turnpike Road, stated she does not believe the Finance Committee provides fiduciary oversight as the meetings are run by Town staff. Ms. Wassmundt commented on the Freedom of Information cases she filed against the Town and alleged that the Council did not set up an effective Ethics Board.

XII. FUTURE AGENDAS

Mr. Haddad moved and Mr. Schaefer seconded to add to the July 26, 2010 meeting further discussion on the Board of Ethics and a vote of confidence for the Ethics Board.

Motion passed unanimously.

By consensus the Council agreed that the Mayor and Town Manager will discuss the most appropriate way to address an email received by members concerning a personnel issue previously discussed in executive session.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Paulhus moved and Mr. Schaefer seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

Motion passed unanimously.

Elizabeth Paterson, Mayor

Mary Stanton, Town Clerk

School Board recommendation

From: **Goldman, Jane** (jane.goldman@uconn.edu)

Sent: Sun 7/11/10 3:00 PM

To: TownCouncil@mansfieldct.org (TownCouncil@mansfieldct.org); PatersonE@mansfieldct.org (PatersonE@mansfieldct.org); HaddadG@mansfieldct.org (HaddadG@mansfieldct.org); DeniseKeane2009@gmail.com (DeniseKeane2009@gmail.com); PeterKochenburger@yahoo.com (PeterKochenburger@yahoo.com); LindseyM@mansfieldct.org (LindseyM@mansfieldct.org); Morantt@earthlink.net (Morantt@earthlink.net); PaulhusCR@mansfieldct.org (PaulhusCR@mansfieldct.org); bonbill@charter.net (bonbill@charter.net); Schaefer, Carl (carl.schaefer@uconn.edu)

Dear Members of the Mansfield Town Council:

Re: Elementary Schools

I am writing to you to strongly support the recommendation of the Mansfield Board of Education to build two new elementary schools with the sites for the new schools to be determined by further analysis.

In terms of decision making, I would like to point out the connection between your need to make a decision about school size and the current emphasis in the State and in Mansfield on RBA (Results-Based Accountability). As we design projects and write grant applications in Mansfield we are asked to follow the guidelines for RBA. While this focus is on planning, I believe that we also need to look at the other end of the process and as we make decisions use the available data that document best practices in similar situations. In regards to elementary schools, the data on school size clearly document the advantages to both children and to their teachers of enrollment in a school of about 300-400 children as compared to a larger school of about 700 children.

Thus, I believe that the recommendations of the Board are based on solid research regarding optimal school size for elementary school children and strongly encourage you to support the option of building two new elementary schools in Mansfield.

In addition, as a taxpayer in Mansfield I believe that providing a high-quality education for all of our children is one of the most important responsibilities of the Town and I am willing to accept a slight increase in taxes, as needed.

Jane Goldman
360 Wormwood Hill Road
Mansfield Center

July 12, 2010

TO: Mansfield Town Council

FROM: Lida Bilokur

I am disturbed by the following continuing manipulative and deceptive treatment of the Town's seniors by the Town Manager and the Director of Human Services.

1) Seven years ago, the Town Manager and the Director of Human Services hired a Senior Services Coordinator who lacked the minimal qualifications for the job. Although she only had a Bachelor's degree, they put her in a supervisory role over the Licensed Clinical Social Worker in the Wellness Center.

Local health care professionals were astonished by this transgression.

2) For the next six years, the Town Manager and the Director of Human Services ignored seniors' and employees' complaints about the dysfunctional management of the Senior Center. They also ordered the complaining employees to attend a workshop on dealing with difficult people.

3) In 2009, at the recommendation of the Director of Human Services, the Town Manager proposed to cut back the Senior Services Social Worker position from full-time to half-time, thereby forcing her to retire. This cutback was adopted by the Town Council despite the petition that was signed by over 100 seniors who opposed this cutback. This cutback was a great loss to seniors and the Wellness Center.

4) Earlier this year, the Town Manager and the Director of Human Services tried to confiscate essential space in the Senior and Wellness Centers. They didn't even consult the Mansfield Senior Center Association or the Commission on Aging. Kevin Grunwald presented this plan to the Senior Center staff as a "done deal;" workers measured space to be re-modeled in the Senior Center; and the Town Manager lamely explained that "it was a conceptual idea."

5) I am disturbed by the Town Manager's latest manipulative and deceptive treatment of the Town's seniors. He claimed at the last Town Council meeting that the newly hired Senior Services Social Worker only provides case management without "crossing the line" into counseling. That's absurd and impossible. It also doesn't change the fact that "counseling" is still a job duty listed in the job description.

When the Town hired Barbara Lavoie, Matt Hart told the Town Council that Barbara "is aware of our interest in licensure." and "she intends to pursue licensure." By state law, all social workers who provide counseling must be licensed or pursuing licensure as Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW).

I am giving you a copy of a letter from Steve Karp, Executive Director of the Connecticut Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers as well as a copy of the state

statute on clinical social work licensing. You can see that state law requires a clinical social worker to be licensed in order to provide counseling.

Let's drop the duplicitous pretense and contradiction. We all know that the Senior Services Social Worker is supposed to provide counseling. We need a licensed clinical social worker to provide counseling to seniors who are coping with emotionally difficult situations.

Kevin Grunwald, who has a Master's in Social Work, is not qualified to provide the 100 hours of clinical supervision Barbara needs to get licensed because he is not a Licensed Clinical Social Worker.

I hope that the Town Council will assure that the Town Manager and the Director of Human Services cease and desist these manipulative and deceptive maneuvers on seniors.

In my opinion, the Town Manager and the Director of Human Services really do need "adult supervision." The Commission on Aging periodically raises a meek voice, and the Mansfield Senior Center Association is busy providing socializing and recreation opportunities for seniors. That leaves the Town Council members as the responsible adults here. You have been stepping up to the plate, and I am very grateful to you.



2139 Silas Deane Highway
Suite 205
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
(860) 257-8066

Sherry Ostrout, MSW, CMC, President
Stephen A Karp, MSW, Executive Director
naswct@conversent.net

April 8, 2009

Mansfield Town Council
Town of Mansfield
2 South Eagleville Road
Storrs Mansfield, Connecticut 06268

Dear Council Members:

I am responding to an inquiry from a Mansfield resident as to the roles of clinical social workers and the importance of licensure. In Connecticut, social workers who practice clinical social work must be licensed as a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) or be in an exempt group (see below). Clinical social work licensure (LCSW) requires a Master degree in Social Work (MSW), 3000 hours of clinical social work experience, 100 hours of supervision by a licensed clinical social worker (LCSW), and a passing score on the nationally recognized Clinical Exam of the Association of Social Work Boards.

The exemptions in the law are for social work interns practicing as part of their graduate studies, new MSW graduates working toward their LCSW's under professional supervision by a licensed clinical social worker (LCSW), certified school social workers working in their capacity as a school social worker, nursing home social workers, and persons practicing under a different license (for example, a clinical psychologist).

A clinical social worker is required to be licensed (LCSW) in order to independently perform the following functions:

- Evaluating and assessing clients' mental health needs and personal well being. This means the licensed clinical social worker is qualified to determine the nature, cause and progression of a mental health problem, the persons and situations involved in the problem, and what is needed to resolve the problem.
- Intervening on mental health needs for the purpose of solving the person's problem(s)
- Providing mental health treatments with individuals, couples, and families who have impairments, including mental, emotional, behavioral, developmental and addictive disorders
- Providing counseling, psychotherapy, behavior modification and mental health consultation.

If a social worker (or any other non-licensed person) is performing any of the functions listed above and does not hold a LCSW or is not in an exempt category, he/she is practicing clinical social work without a license. This means that he/she is practicing clinical social work illegally, in violation of CT General Statutes Sec. 20-195m – 20-195r. In the event of an incident or complaint against an unlicensed clinician, both the employee who is practicing without a license and an employer who knowingly employs unlicensed personnel in violation of the statute are at risk of being held liable.

There are a number of key advantages to an agency having clinical social workers (LCSW) on the staff as follows:

1. A licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) can practice clinical social work independently or within an organizational structure.
2. A licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) can supervise MSW's working toward their license. This helps to attract new MSW graduates as employees.
3. Under Connecticut law, a licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) is legally required to provide confidentiality to their clients of information related to their mental health diagnosis and treatment. The confidentiality law covers both written clinical records and oral or written communications with other people. Confidential information can be shared with other licensed clinicians on a need-to-know basis for providing diagnosis and treatment. These protections under the social work confidentiality law do not exist for employees who are not licensed clinical social workers or who do not work directly under the supervision of a licensed clinical social worker.
4. Consumers have added protection by being treated by a licensed clinical social worker. In the event of an allegation of improper or unethical practice, a client can pursue a complaint through the established complaint process at the Connecticut Department of Public Health.
5. Having staff who are licensed clinicians tells consumers that they are being served by workers who have met rigorous practice standards, including passage of a nationally recognized exam.
6. Licensed clinical social worker (LCSWs) are recognized as health care providers under most major private health insurance plans, Medicare and HUSKY and, therefore, are eligible to collect fees for their service from these third-party payers.

For services with seniors, it is particularly helpful to have a licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) on staff with adequate hours to provide clinical services. The senior population has a higher rate of Depression than other age groups. Licensed clinical social workers (LCSWs) can diagnose and treat Depression. Seniors also experience losses to a greater degree such as death of a loved one and declining health that restricts activities. Counseling from a licensed clinical social worker can help a senior successfully cope with these losses.

Mental health issues in the senior population too often go undiagnosed due to a lack of availability of a qualified licensed mental health provider. Because of these issues, we recommend that community based social service programs serving the seniors include licensed clinical mental health staff of which licensed clinical social workers (LCSW) are especially qualified. Unfortunately, there is a shortage of licensed clinical social workers (LCSWs) who have experience working with seniors and continuing education credits in geriatrics, so the Town of Mansfield is fortunate to have such an employee. I would think the Town would want to maximize the hours this employee dedicates to services with the seniors, particularly because the ranks of seniors are increasing due to the aging of "baby boomers".

It is important to note here that not all social work practice is clinical social work, and therefore, in need of a licensed clinical social worker. Information and referral, casework (not including mental health counseling), administration, and program coordination are all functions often performed by social workers without coming under the definition of clinical social work.

I trust that this letter is of assistance to you in your efforts to understand the importance and legalities of having licensed clinical social work staff.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Karp, MSW
Executive Director

*Cited in Stephen H. Karp's letter
to the Mansfield Town Council, April 8, 2009*

CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES
CHAPTER 383b
CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS

Sec. 20-195m. Definitions. As used in subsection (c) of section 19a-14, section 19a-18, sections 20-195n to 20-195q, inclusive, and this section:

- (1) "Licensed clinical social worker" means a person who has been licensed pursuant to this chapter;
- (2) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Public Health;
- (3) "Department" means the Department of Public Health; and
- (4) "Clinical social work" means the application, by persons trained in social work, of established principles of psychosocial development, behavior, psychopathology, unconscious motivation, interpersonal relationships and environmental stress to the evaluation, assessment, diagnosis and treatment of biopsychosocial dysfunction, disability and impairment, including mental, emotional, behavioral, developmental and addictive disorders, of individuals, couples, families or groups. Clinical social work includes, but is not limited to, counseling, psychotherapy, behavior modification and mental health consultation.

Sec. 20-195n. Licensure requirements. (a) No person shall practice clinical social work unless such applicant has obtained a license pursuant to this section. Applicants for licensure as a clinical social worker shall: (1) Hold a doctorate or master's degree from a social work program accredited by the Council on Social Work Education or, if educated outside the United States or its territories, have completed an educational program deemed equivalent by said council; (2) have three thousand hours post-master's social work experience which shall include not less than one hundred hours of work under professional supervision by a licensed clinical or certified independent social worker; and (3) pass the clinical level examination of the American Association of State Social Work Boards or any other examination prescribed by the commissioner. On and after October 1, 1995, any person certified as an independent social worker prior to October 1, 1995, shall be deemed licensed as a clinical social worker pursuant to this section, except a person certified as an independent social worker on and after October 1, 1990, shall not be deemed licensed as a clinical social worker pursuant to this chapter unless such person has satisfied the requirements of subdivision (3) of this section.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the commissioner may grant a license by endorsement to an applicant who presents evidence satisfactory to the commissioner that the applicant (1) is licensed or certified as a clinical social worker in good standing in another state or jurisdiction whose requirements for practicing in such capacity are substantially similar to or higher than those of this state, and (2) has successfully completed the clinical level examination of the Association of Social Work Boards, or its successor organization. No license shall be issued under this subsection to any applicant against whom professional disciplinary action is pending or who is the subject of an unresolved complaint.

Sec. 20-195o. Application. Exemption. Renewal. Fees. (a) Application for licensure shall be on forms prescribed and furnished by the commissioner. Each applicant shall furnish evidence satisfactory to the commissioner that he has met the requirements of section 20-195n. The application fee shall be two hundred fifty dollars.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 20-195n concerning examinations, the commissioner may issue a license without examination, prior to January 1, 1998, to any applicant who offers proof to the satisfaction of the commissioner that he met the requirements of subdivisions (1) and (2) of section 20-195n and was an employee of the federal government with not less than three thousand hours postmaster's social work experience prior to October 1, 1986.

(c) (1) Each person licensed pursuant to this chapter may apply for renewal of such licensure in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of section 19a-88. A fee of one hundred fifty dollars shall accompany each renewal application. Each such applicant shall furnish evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner of having participated in continuing education. The commissioner shall adopt regulations in accordance with Chapter 54 to (A) define basic requirements for continuing education programs, (B) delineate qualifying programs, (C) establish a system of control and reporting, and (D) provide for waiver of the continuing education requirement for good cause.

(2) A person licensed pursuant to this chapter who holds a professional educator certificate that is endorsed for school social work and issued by the State Board of Education pursuant to sections 10-144o to 10-149, inclusive, may satisfy the continuing education requirements contained in regulations adopted pursuant to this section by successfully completing

professional development activities pursuant to subsection (1) of section 10-145b, provided the number of continuing education hours completed by such person is equal to the number of hours per registration period required by regulations. For purposes of this subdivision, "registration period" means the one-year period during which a license has been renewed in accordance with section 19a-88 and is current and valid.

Sec. 20-195p. Disciplinary action. Grounds. The commissioner may take any action set forth in section 19a-17 if the license holder fails to conform to the accepted standards of the social work profession, including, but not limited to, the following: Conviction of a felony; fraud or deceit in obtaining or seeking reinstatement of a license to practice clinical social work; fraud or deceit in the practice of social work; negligent, incompetent or wrongful conduct in professional activities; emotional disorder or mental illness; physical illness, including, but not limited to, deterioration through the aging process; abuse or excessive use of drugs, including alcohol, narcotics or chemicals; willful falsification of entries in any hospital, patient or other record pertaining to social work; violation of any provision of this chapter or any regulation adopted hereunder. The Commissioner of Public Health may order a license holder to submit to a reasonable physical or mental examination if his physical or mental capacity to practice safely is the subject of an investigation. Said commissioner may petition the superior court for the judicial district of Hartford-New Britain to enforce such order or any action taken pursuant to said section 19a-17. Notice of any contemplated action under said section 19a-17, of the cause therefore and the date of hearing thereon, shall be given and an opportunity for hearing afforded as provided in the regulations adopted by the commissioner.

Sec. 20-195q. Use of title. Certain activities not prohibited. (a) No persons, except those licensed pursuant to this chapter, shall (1) use the title "licensed clinical social worker" or any initials associated with such titles, or (2) advertise services under the description of a licensed clinical social worker as defined in section 20-195m.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit: (1) A student enrolled in a doctoral or master's degree program accredited by the Council on Social Work Education from performing such work as is incidental to his course of study, provided such person is designated by a title which clearly indicates his status as a student; (2) a person holding a doctoral or master's degree from a program accredited by the Council on Social Work Education from gaining social work experience under professional supervision, provided such activities are necessary to satisfy the work experience required by section 20-195n and such person is designated as "social work intern", "social work trainee" or other title clearly indicating the status appropriate to his level of training; (3) a person licensed or certified in this state in a field other than clinical social work from practicing within the scope of such license or certification; (4) a person enrolled in an educational program or fulfilling other state requirements leading to licensure or certification in a field other than social work from engaging in work in such other field; or (5) a person who is employed or retained as a social work designee, social worker, or social work consultant by a nursing home or rest home licensed under section 19a-490 and who meets the qualifications prescribed by the Department in its regulations from performing the duties required of them in accordance with state and federal laws governing those duties.

Sec. 20-195r. Use of title by certain person employed by the state in the classified service prior to October 1, 1996. Nothing in sections 20-195 to 20-195q, inclusive, shall prevent any person employed by the state prior to October 1, 1996, with a title in the social work series of the classified service from using a title in such series to describe or perform his duties in the course of his employment with the state.

Help Wanted

Help Wanted

**PART-TIME SENIOR SERVICE
SOCIAL WORKER
TOWN OF MANSFIELD**

Great career opportunity! We are searching for a talented and energetic professional to provide social work services through our Senior and Wellness Center. Responsibilities include providing counseling, case management and supportive services to our senior population. This is a 20 hour/week position. The successful candidate will have familiarity with seniors and issues related to aging, excellent communication skills, and a proven ability to work in a multi-disciplinary team environment. A master's degree in social work, psychology or a related field is required, and licensure is preferred. Salary range is \$26.13/hr - \$33.09/hr., with a pro-rated benefits package.

Please submit resume and official application electronically to www.mansfieldct.org

(employment application) and

HR@mansfieldct.org (resume) or via hard copy to Town Manager's Office

4 South Eagleville Road, Mansfield, CT 06268

Open until filled. EOE/AA

The Chronicle

Nov. 21-22, 2009

The town manager has taken the time to give his interpretation of the FOI complaints that were lodged against the ethics board and a heard by the foic commission, so I would first like to address those.

First of all I, as a complainant was unable to prepare for all the falsehoods that were stated at this hearing and If calling a few people untruthful brings on lawsuits for slander so be it , as I have e mails, documents and witnesses for any claims I am making. I decided to accept the findings of the hearing officer as we felt we had hopefully gotten our point across and two out of the three complaints were found as violations. One of the findings brought myself in as a respondent, it was stated and also mentioned in the town managers interpretation to you, that I had voted to add the Item to the October 15th agenda, I did not, all the others were in favor and there was no other vote taken, it was then recorded by the secretary that all were in favor, it was also stated to the hearing officer that I as Chair of the ethics board set the agendas, and refused to add a discussion of secretary to the agenda , discussion of secretary had not come up prior to that meeting and the secretary, was setting the agendas and sending them out. I have several emails to back this statement. Some of these e-mails contain confidential information about a complaint that was received so I am unable to just hand them, over. That leads me off to another point, These e-mails, contained the names of the respondents of a complaint that was lodged, As some of you know early on in my tenure as chair of the ethics board I was requesting to Have Mr Hennick of the foic come and give his presentation, I had already attended his seminar and felt that this board and all town board

members would benefit from this. I had set a seminar up with Mr Hennick for the Ethics board but it would not be allowed by town management. .This is a quote from a town management email to me " From my discussions with Mr. Hennick, he does not claim to be an ethics expert, nor would his FOI presentation extend to issues of importance to the Ethics Board"

Had this training seminar been allowed to happen as I was requesting, members would have been aware that e-mails by public agencies are subject to foi and communications to a quorum excluding meeting agendas and schedules constitutes a public meeting, that additions cannot be made to special meetings etc.

Further in the town managers interpretation, and the findings of the foic it says that the complaint of an unnoticed meeting following the october 29th meeting had no merit. This is another example of a few of these people being untruthful, discussions of board issues happened, and it was not as the chair stated" discussion of the need to comply in the future with the FOI act, regarding the posting of agendas and minutes,, as there had never been a problem with either of these issues, and if it had been "small talk" it would not have been necessary for the chair to emphatically state "folks folks we got to stop this".

It was also stated by several respondents and their witness that the chair "refused to set a 2009 meeting schedule" That is an outright lie, discussion was had during our meetings at the end of 08 and early 09 about scheduling meetings, we, the board as a whole decided that as we were working on revising the code and scheduling was a conflict with several board members, sabbaticals, working at the prison etc, and after consultation with the town clerk and secretary it was determined we could continue holding special meetings, AT NO TIME DID I,, AS CHAIR REFUSE TO SET A REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE! All who had stated that are outright liars.

Further untruths were told about the executive session of the sept 17th meeting, it was stated that it was to discuss a dissenting opinion from the chairman, regarding the findings in a complaint, and an email criticizing the recording secretary. First of all the email was a simple statement asking that the secretary refrain from presenting things to members of the board as evidence unless they were requested. She had emailed to all board members a legal opinion from the town attorney from a few years prior, I was and still am under the assumption that legal and ethical can be two different balls of wax and some things that might be unethical might not be illegal.

Therefore that legal opinion was only to influence the boards decision before hearing evidence on the complaint. I had addressed the issue with the town manager. And I will give you his response if your interested.

Also in that sept 17th meeting there was an action taken, the secretary stated to the board that I had "LAWSUITS" against the town, the board requested that the secretary give them all documentation that she had regarding these "lawsuits". The board then made an official FOI request with the town clerk and at the next meeting these documents were distributed to the board. There are no minutes to show that the board voted to request these documents. This was all done in that executive session. When these documents were presented at the next meeting I was there and had asked that this be discussed in executive session and was rebuffed that these were public documents and would be discussed publically. Meeting minutes show this. They continued the discussion of these documents, the issue was not the documents but my "performance" I call your attention to section 1-200 (6) of the general statutes. executive sessions means a meeting of a public agency at which the public is excluded for one or more of the following purposes. (a) discussion

concerning the appointment, employment, performance, evaluation, health or dismissal of a public officer or employee, provided that such individual may require that discussion be held at an open meeting.... I am of the belief that when discussing my "performance" on the board, it was required, especially when I had requested so, that it be done in executive session. The purpose of this executive session as stated by these individuals was discussion of the ethics complaint, not to discuss the appeals of citations I had. And that's what they were appeals, not as stated by the secretary to the board as LAWSUITS.

Before this gets any longer I will now get onto the next foi topic.

In the town managers report to you regarding foi complaints he informs you that complaint 2010-242 regarding the w-2 forms, the hearing was held on 7/06 and I did not attend. I had not received any notification of the hearing and have filed an appeal to reopen the case. If the appeal is denied I have been advised to submit the w-2 request again, let the town refuse and file another complaint. What the Town Manager has not given you is the reason for the request and what it entails. The request was for certain individual town employees that have town issued vehicles for

personal use. I had asked for the w-2s to see what it is costing the taxpayer for the personal use of these vehicles. The personal use is a taxable benefit that must be claimed on the individuals taxes, personal use would include to and from home, lunch and personal errands, bank, personal appointments etc. there seems to be no other documents available that would show the cost to the taxpayer for this type of use. I had, through the FOI mediator, offered to withdraw my complaint if the town management could produce some other document that could show these costs, I had also stated I was not interested in any other information on the w-2s and it could all be redacted. According to the foi Mediator that to was refused. Accordingly this particular case is not resolved yet.

Then I have also filed another case and it is docketed. This revolves around a meeting that was held in this hallway with three members of the ethics board and a council member, where ethics board matters were discussed with a quorum of the board of ethics. I had tried to resolve this issue at the last board of ethics meeting prior to filing the complaint, but was not successful. If you are interested I believe mr hossack has a copy of the tape of that meeting.

The town managers report goes on to give you data

regarding time spent processing foi requests and revenue collected, If town staff is spending 15 hours a week processing foi requests I would suggest someone streamline the process. Many requests should not require but minutes. I have stated to you before, I walked into a neighboring town hall, requested a copy of the town managers contract, it was copied and handed to me in minutes, Mansfield has made a costly production out of this kind of thing, not surprising

July 12, 2010

To: Town Council

From: Betty Wassmundt

I want to discuss the proposed ordinance appointing the Town Manager as the authority for administration and fiduciary oversight of town finances.

I urge you to give careful thought to this and to discuss it. The Charter says "Council shall provide...etc." Please don't abdicate your duties and responsibility to the public who elected you. The public has only you to rely upon.

You have turned this proposed ordinance over to town management to develop. Well, you didn't really do that; you just did nothing and that is what happened. Management says that the Charter already assigns these duties to the Town Manager and the Finance Director so they propose the Town Manager as the authority. That's nice & neat for management and keeps everything "in-house" but provides **no oversight** from the public's point of view.

The Charter Commission clearly provided for the duties of the Town Manager and for the duties of the Finance Director in the Charter. Since this same Commission equally clearly provided that "The Council shall provide by ordinance the procedure for administration and fiduciary oversight of the Town finances.", it is self-evident that the Charter Commission **did not intend** this authority be given to either the Town Manager or to the Finance Director. This authority should be given to an independent person or committee accountable to the Council.

Remember, we, the public, have only you to look out for our interest. Since I've spent a good bit of time reviewing town spending, I'm convinced of the need for independent oversight. Please do the job you applied for when you ran for election. Do **not** pass this ordinance; don't even hold a public hearing on it.

I know that you all have a lot of work to do as a council member. I have got to think that if you once took charge and acted as a body, in the interest of the electorate, that your job would become much easier. Thank you.

Town Manager's Office
Town of Mansfield

Memo

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *MH*
CC: Town Employees
Date: July 12, 2010
Re: Town Manager's Report

Below please find a report regarding various items of interest to the Town Council, staff and the community:

Council Requests for Information/Council Business

- *UConn Guest Policy* – Per the request of Council, UConn's guest policy has been included in the packet as an attachment to the Community/Campus Relations business item.
- *Quality of Life Violations* – Council requested a breakdown between owner-occupied and rental properties included in the previously-distributed tabulation of quality of life violations. This information is also included as an attachment under the Community/Campus Relations business item.
- *Employee Compensatory Time Accrual* – In the recent past, citizens have expressed concern regarding the amount of compensatory time that a few key town employees accrue by working additional hours to coordinate and oversee special town events, such as *Celebrate Mansfield Weekend* and the *Tour de Mansfield* bike ride. We are fortunate to have many volunteers from the community who perform the bulk of the work to coordinate and put on these special events. However, some events are sponsored directly by the town and we need the assistance of our employees in order to ensure the events are successful. Management does monitor this issue and in our opinion the benefits to the community far outweigh the costs associated with the employee compensatory time earned to coordinate these special events.
- *Special Town Council Meeting, School Building Project* – I have distributed copies of the agenda for Council's upcoming work session on the proposed school building project. We will meet here in the Council Chambers at 6:30 PM this Thursday, July 15, 2010. Cherie and I will have additional information available, particularly some new cost projections that incorporate different revenue forecasts.

Departmental/Division News

- *Emergency Management*
 - Forecasters predict higher than average heat and humidity over the next several days for our area. Residents who may be sensitive to the heat are urged to take advantage of air conditioning, avoid strenuous activity, stay hydrated by drinking plenty of water, and to avoid hot foods and cooking during a heat alert. Taking lukewarm showers or baths and wearing light-colored, loose clothing also help beat the heat. The following Town facilities are air conditioned and will be open to any residents who are seeking relief from the heat: Mansfield Senior Center: 8:30-4:30 (M-F); Mansfield Public Library: M,F- 9-5; T,W, Th- 9-8; Sat.- 10-5; Mansfield Community Center: 5:30-10:00 (M-Sat.); Sunday- 8-9
 - On June 30, 2010, the State of Connecticut announced the opening of the registration website for CT Alert (www.ctalert.gov), the nation's first statewide emergency notification system (ENS) enabling Mansfield and Connecticut officials to communicate critical information to hundreds of thousands of Connecticut residents and businesses before, during and after emergencies. Please see item number 15 in your packet for more information.

Major Projects and Initiatives

- *Storrs Center Project* – Today Congressman Joseph "Joe" Courtney and Federal Transit Administration Administrator Peter Rogoff announced a \$4.9 million transportation grant for the Storrs Center project. This grant will support the construction of an intermodal hub as part of the intermodal transportation center, the design and construction of the Village Street that runs through the core of the project, as well as the walkway and streetscape enhancements, signals, lighting and signage, along Village Street. I would like to congratulate and acknowledge the efforts of staff members who prepared the grant submission, most notably Cynthia van Zelm, Lon Hultgren and Gregory Padick. With this grant, the Storrs Center project is the recipient of over \$23 million in state and federal funding – this is a tremendous accomplishment for Cynthia, the Mansfield Downtown Partnership and our community.

Member Organizations

- *Mansfield Downtown Partnership* - Storrs Center announced that a tenth letter of intent agreement has been signed with *Insomnia Cookies*. *Insomnia Cookies* is a unique business that offers fresh-baked cookies for late-night delivery. *Insomnia Cookies* has nineteen locations on or near college campuses; the Storrs location will be the company's twentieth store.
- *Windham Chamber of Commerce* - The Chamber will be hosting a gubernatorial candidate forum on Thursday, July 29 at 7:30 am at the Nathan Hale Inn & Conference Center in Storrs. Candidates running for governor will be asked questions about their policies and viewpoints. This is a great opportunity for citizens and businesses in the Eastern part of CT to voice their opinions about how the state should be run and to make informed decisions about who is best to serve as our next governor. Candidates include: Dan Malloy, Tom Foley, Oz Greibel and Michael Fedele. Cost is \$10 per person; a continental breakfast will be served for guests. The event is open to the public but you must register at www.WindhamChamber.com or by calling the Chamber at 860.423.6389. There is limited seating so please register early.

Special Events

- *Mansfield Public Library*
 - On Tuesday July 13 at 7:00 PM, Eric Girardi will perform his show "Bending Gravity" at the Mansfield Public Library. Eric is a world-ranked yo-yo player, a juggler, a stiltwalker and more. He states that his objective is to "provide a one-of-a-kind breathtaking performance of object manipulation set to music." Eric also enjoys talking to kids about the importance of hard work, practice and finding something you love to do. His show is recommended for ages 5 and up.
 - On Tuesday July 20 at 2:00 PM, Kahana Hula will present their show "Make a Hawaiian Splash." This is an interactive program for all ages featuring music, stories and dance from beautiful Hawaii. Audience members will participate in sing-alongs, practice rhythmic skills and learn some Hawaiian hula. Because space is limited for this program, you must sign up in advance. Please call us at 860 423-2501 or drop in to the Library to reserve a free ticket.
- *Tour de Mansfield:* – The sixth annual Tour de Mansfield: Village to Village will be held this Saturday (rain date July 24). The 5, 20 and 40-mile rides will start and end at the Mansfield Community Center; the event will conclude with a barbecue. See www.mansfieldct.gov for more information.

Upcoming Meetings*

- Youth Service Bureau Advisory Board, July 13, 2010, 11:30 AM, Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Historic District Commission, July 13, 2010, 8:00 PM, Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Public Safety Committee, July 14, 2010, 3:00 PM, Council Chambers, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Zoning Board of Appeals, July 14, 2010, 7:00 PM, Council Chambers, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Special Town Council Meeting, July 15, 2010, 6:30 PM, Council Chambers, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Planning and Zoning Commission, July 19, 2010, 2010, 7:00 PM, Council Chambers, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Committee on Committees, July 19, 2010, 7:00 PM, Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Conservation Commission, July 21, 2010, 7:30 PM, Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Personnel Committee, July 26, 2010, 6:00 PM, Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
- Town Council, July 26, 2010, 7:30 PM, Council Chambers, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building

**Meeting dates/times are subject to change. Please view the Town Calendar or contact the Town Clerk's Office at 429-3302 for a complete and up-to-date listing of committee meetings.*

 Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Bill Caneira [wcaneira8614@charter.net] **Sent:** Sun 7/11/2010 11:44 AM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:  [comments-againstopionD-071210.doc\(63KB\)](#)

Hello,

I would once again like to express my opposition to School Building Project Option D in writing. I wrote this letter in response to comments made at your last (6/28) session, and reflecting over the past few months of meetings on the SBP.

Thank you again for your support and patience.

Bill Caneira
38 Candide Lane

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Anna Cranmer [annacranmer@hotmail.com] **Sent:** Sun 7/11/2010 11:05 PM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Cari Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: Please do not build a mega-school
Attachments:

Mansfield currently has a wonderful school system, and all of my neighbors with school-aged children have moved to this town because of it. Please do not eliminate the neighborhood school system for elementary school in Mansfield. The single school that has been proposed is far too big for an elementary school, even by large school standards, and will not provide the optimal learning environment for our children. Mansfield will no longer be as desirable a place to live and our property values will decline.

I realize that there are many budget constraints and have heard the arguments for the single school. I am unconvinced, however, that building the new mega-school, and relying heavily on state funding which may or may not come through, is the right decision at this time. While our current schools may be older, they are thriving because of the dedicated staff and motivated students, who are not lost in a sea of 750 students.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Anna Cranmer
33 Adeline Place
Mansfield Center, CT 06250

The New Busy is not the old busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Get started.](#)

School Building Project

From: **John Rickards** (j.k.rickards@sbcglobal.net)

Sent: Sun 7/11/10 12:00 PM

To: TownCouncil@mansfieldct.org; PatersonE@mansfieldct.org; HaddadG@mansfieldct.org;
DeniseKeane2009@gmail.com; PeterKochenburger@yahoo.com; LindseyM@mansfieldct.org;
Morantt@earthlink.net; PaulhusCR@mansfieldct.org; bonbill@charter.net; Carl.Schaefer@uconn.edu

Hi Everyone,

I am writing to express our strong opposition to the School Building Project. We concur with the views of Jeff Smith and Rudy Favretti as expressed at the June 28, 2010 meeting.

According to Jeff, the results of a 2006 report indicated that the current schools are in sufficiently good condition for use for the next ten years. That would give the Town and the State time to hopefully heal from the current economic recession or depression. At the minimum, it would give us time to see better what kind of economic situation lies ahead of us.

There is great uncertainty and instability now. The State is in terrible financial straits, one of the worst in the country, and we here in Mansfield should be sensitive to this rather than simply arguing that the State can give us money now for this Project. It seems preposterous to us that we are even considering demolishing viable schools and placing the materials in the dump and then building one or two new schools in their place in these economic times. Teachers are being laid off all over the country and jobless rates are excessively high. Everyone is cutting back and we are about to spend, spend and more spend.

As Rudy Favretti says, we should have a fix it attitude rather than a throw it away attitude. This is kind of modeling is better for our children to see in our community, the kind of modeling they may well have to follow in the future throughout this country. We have never opposed or voted down any budget item for the schools in our 30 years in Mansfield. But, in this case, we say NO TO THE SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT, WHETHER IT BE ONE OR TWO SCHOOLS. DO NOTHING PLEASE.

Sincerely,

John and Karin Rickards
51 Storrs Heights Rd.

Town Council Members,

07/08/2010

As a Storrs/Mansfield Parent of two children, ages 3 1/2 and 18 months, I am highly concerned with where our idea of an ideal elementary school is going. If the ideal school is the one that is the most cost effective, then why do we choose to live in a city where taxes are high to produce schools where education is supposed to be superior?

Three years ago, we purchased our home in the Goodwin Elementary school district because we wanted our children to attend a small town school with excellent education and low class numbers. Research has shown again and again that small schools give children a better education and a secure environment for both students and staff.

If we start putting "lower cost" before the importance of our children's education, families are not going to move here for the schools! Mansfield needs to listen to the parents of the children who will be attending the elementary school! If we do not put quality of education and overall well being of our children first, I believe that our school rankings will drop, graduation rates will be lower and the children, staff and families will not be nearly as satisfied. The research has very profound findings as to why smaller schools are better.

I understand that something has to change as the current schools do need renovation but I cannot support one large school for all the elementary age children in the area. As much as I hate to lose Goodwin School, I would be more supportive of two smaller schools if it would be more cost effective than some of the other choices. I know you are all doing your best to find a compromise for a more cost effective choice that will maintain a quality education for our children and we thank you.

Sincerely,

Chandra Lownes, Concerned Parent and resident of Storrs/Mansfield

Significant research findings:

The Significance of Elementary School Size Literature Review

http://www.rda.aps.edu/RDA/Documents/Publications/05_06/ES_School_Size.pdf

Student Attitudes

Student attitudes toward school in general and toward particular subjects are better in small schools compared to large ones.

Student Behavior

Small schools have lower incidences of negative social behavior than do large schools.

Teacher Attitudes

Compared to large schools, smaller schools cultivate better teacher and administrator attitudes toward their work and increase staff collaboration.

A survey of elementary school teachers in Chicago found that communications between teachers and administrators were better in small schools.

New Rules Project Designing rules as if Community Matters: Small Schools vs. Big Schools

<http://www.newrules.org/equity/rules/small-schools-vs-big-schools>

State and local policymakers often prefer large schools, because they are less expensive to operate on an annual per pupil basis. In many states, education funding formulas provide a flat rate per pupil and make no adjustment for the higher costs of running a small school. This favors larger schools and pressures smaller ones to close. Such policies are short-sighted. Small schools may require higher levels of annual per pupil funding, but they are far more cost-effective. Small schools have higher graduation rates and, on a per graduate basis, they cost about the same or less than large schools. Vermont is one of a few states that recognize the effectiveness of small schools and provide additional financial support to maintain them.

Small Schools Why They Matter<http://prorev.com/schoolsmall.htm>

JOE NATHAN PIONEER PRESS, MN - Conventional wisdom holds that small schools are more expensive and that districts automatically save money by closing them. But a new report says bigger isn't necessarily better or cheaper. The report, "Dollars and Sense," summarizes recent research on school construction and concludes small schools - elementaries with 300 or fewer students, middle schools with 500 or fewer and high schools with no more than 600 students - are not prohibitively expensive and that putting tax dollars into those building makes sense. It looks at studies that show when students from similar backgrounds are compared, those in smaller schools are safer, have higher graduation rates and test scores and are more likely to participate in extracurricular activities. They're also likely to have involved parents and more satisfied teachers. The report includes research compiled by Paul Abramson, a columnist for the national magazine *School Planning and Management*, that found costs per student and per square foot were lower for the smaller high schools and smaller middle schools than they were for the larger ones. Smaller elementary construction costs were slightly greater per student than those for larger elementary schools. . . "Dollars and Sense" cites two rural Nebraska districts that thought consolidation would save money. But after adding more than 25,000 miles to the cost of transporting students, buying new band uniforms and athletic equipment, purchasing new textbooks so all students would use the same materials, buying out several teachers whom the new district felt it would not need, increasing pay of remaining teachers and combining the two districts' curricula, the districts spent \$230,000 more than they had been spending. As the report notes, "So much for saving money."

Small Schools and The Issue of Scale: Executive Summary by Pat Wasley
<http://www.newhorizons.org/trans/wasley.htm>

Student attachment, persistence, and performance are stronger in small schools. Students in these schools have better attendance rates, significantly lower dropout rates, and higher grade point averages than do students in larger schools. They also fail fewer courses and demonstrate increased persistence in progress toward graduation. In small elementary schools, fewer students are retained in the same grade than their larger host schools.

Improvement in standardized test scores are apparent. Reading scores have increased in small schools. In the best of the small schools, teachers are targeting reading as an area for their own skill-building. In other small schools, the average standardized test scores are holding steady, which is an improvement given that more students are taking the test.

Violence occurs less frequently in small schools. Small schools provide a remedy for much of the isolation and alienation, often associated with incidents of teen violence, which is found in very large schools. Students in small schools are known by teachers and peers. This increased sense of identity and community has led to fewer incidences of violence. Students feel safer because the values of democratic citizenship are fostered and conflict management is exercised.

The conditions in small schools are more conducive to learning. In small schools, the intimate environment encourages learning. Teachers know their students well and have high expectations for them. Students employ critical thinking in their courses and teachers use a broader range of strategies to engage students.

Parents and community members are more satisfied with small schools. Small schools have greater involvement by parents, community members, and business leaders than larger schools. This increased involvement leads to increased satisfaction among parents and community members and a more productive working relationship with school staff.

The environment for teaching professional is better in small schools. Teachers in small schools are more likely to report a strong professional community and great job satisfaction. Teachers engage in more professional development, build coherent educational programs for students across grades and disciplines, create more focused learning environment for students and moderate their teaching strategies to fit students' needs. Teachers in small schools also are more likely to report that they feel creative, reinvigorated and recommitted to teaching, an important gain in light of the current national teacher shortage.

I oppose the one school plan

From: **Louanne Cooley** (larcooley@sbcglobal.net)

Sent: Sat 7/10/10 1:28 PM

To: TownCouncil@mansfieldct.org; PatersonE@mansfieldct.org; HaddadG@mansfieldct.org;
DeniseKeane2009@gmail.com; PeterKochenburger@yahoo.com; LindseyM@mansfieldct.org;
Morantt@earthlink.net; PaulhusCR@mansfieldct.org; bonbill@charter.net; Carl.Schaefer@uconn.edu

Dear council members,

We strongly oppose the one school plan. Neighborhood schools, where each child is known by the staff and teachers are a crucial key to the high success of Mansfield children. Please vote to keep our schools.

Louanne Cooley

FOI Requests for Calendar Year 2009

Prepared 7/12/10 Person or Entity Requesting	# of Requests	% of Total	Notes
Citizen A	63	44.7%	
Citizen B	34	24.1%	
Citizen C	12	8.5%	
Citizen D	11	7.8%	Citizen D's requests were around a particular item and were made over a 3 week period
Citizen Requests (other)	11	7.8%	
Corporate, Lawyers, & Unions	10	7.1%	
GRAND TOTAL	141	100.0%	

Note: Does not include repeated reviews of the same document by a different requester

Workload Averages for Calendar Year 2009

	# of Requests	Avg. per calendar mo. (12 mos/yr)	Avg. per calendar wk. (52 wks/yr)
Citizen A	63	5.3	1.2
Citizen B	34	2.8	0.7
Citizen C	12	1.0	0.2
Citizen D	11	0.9	0.2
Citizen Requests (other)	11	0.9	0.2
Corporate, Lawyers, & Unions	10	0.8	0.2
GRAND TOTAL	141	11.8	2.7

FOI Requests for Fiscal Year 2009/2010

Person or Entity Requesting	# of Requests	% of Total	Notes
Citizen A	53	43.1%	
Citizen B	26	21.1%	
Citizen C	9	7.3%	
Citizen Requests (other)	19	15.5%	
Corporate, Lawyers, & Unions	16	13.0%	
GRAND TOTAL	123	100.0%	

Note: Does not include repeated reviews of the same document by a different requester

FOI Requests for Fiscal Year 2009/2010

	# of Requests	Avg. per calendar mo. (12 mos/yr)	Avg. per calendar wk. (52 wks/yr)
Citizen A	53	4.4	1.0
Citizen B	26	2.2	0.5
Citizen C	9	0.8	0.2
Citizen Requests (other)	19	1.6	0.4
Corporate, Lawyers, & Unions	16	1.3	0.3
GRAND TOTAL	123	10.3	2.4

Cost of Processing FOI Requests "Normal Weeks"

Hours per week range 5-15 hrs/wk
 Average hourly rate \$31.19
 Benefits Assumption at 30% of pay

	Min	Max
Average hourly rate range/wk	\$155.96	\$467.89
Average hourly rate range/yr	\$8,110.14	\$24,330.43
Pay plus benefits cost per year	\$10,543.19	\$31,629.56

Note: Does not include time preparing/defending against FOI complaints
 Note: Does not include time of Town Attorney

I would also like to comment on the Town managers' report regarding Freedom of Information Act Requests, Cases and updates.

My experience with Freedom of Information requests is well documented. I must say that I have always been presented with the information in a most courteous and professional way by members of the town clerks office.

In most cases I have been given the information requested in a timely manner. There have been several cases though that have not been timely. Last summer I requested email communications between town staff and the Ethics board. Four months later I had still not received the information. I was told by the FOI Commission that I should have filed a complaint within thirty days of my original request. So I made the same request again and was provided some emails within a week. What I received was 4 emails. These covered a four month span of communication between town staff and members of the Ethics board. Simply ridiculous but I let it go.

Although I have attended many Ethics board meetings, the only case I can really talk about is Docket#FIC 2009-627.[p114] This concerned the meeting of September 17th, which I attended. I also testified at the FOI hearing as to the events of that meeting. I told the truth, and nothing but the truth. Some others who testified at that hearing cannot make that same statement. I can attest to the fact that a couple of witnesses did lie under oath.

Suffice to say, members of our ethics board have lied under oath, have lied to the personnel committee, and lied during meetings. If the council so chooses, I will be happy to present the evidence of this in a less public setting.

Also the fact that the secretary brought up the "lawsuit" remark, is a violation of Section 25-7 (b) of the Mansfield Ethics Ordinance which states that members of the public may initiate complaints and the board may as well. The secretary is there only to record the proceedings. Section 25-7 (c) states that complaints must be in writing. Both of these sections were violated. The action taken in this un-noticed executive session was to begin the effective evisceration of the then current chairman.

I am appalled to think this kind of backroom crap can occur in the 21st century let alone occurring in our town. I am calling for the Ethics board, as it now exists, to resign in it's entirety. In lieu of that happening I call on the town council to dissolve the current board, recharge the Ethics board per the current Ethics Ordinance, give the new members sufficient training in ethics, and allow them to revise our current ordinance independent of staff influences. Show our residents that the council truly supports open and transparent government.

Please let's get this behind us and get on with the most important business of Mansfield, how to survive the impending financial typhoon headed to our town.

Ric Hossack
7.12.10

SPECIAL MEETING – MANSFIELD TOWN COUNCIL
July 15, 2010

DRAFT

Mayor Elizabeth Paterson called the special meeting of the Mansfield Town Council to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Audrey P. Beck Building.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Haddad, Keane, Kochenburger, Lindsey, Moran, Paterson, Paulhus, Ryan, Schaefer

II. WORK SESSION

School Building Project

Mayor Paterson welcomed members of the Mansfield Board of Education and staff to the work session. The session was called to discuss the School Building Project and the next steps in the process. Town Manager Matt Hart distributed a worksheet outlining critical questions and options. (Worksheet attached)

Council members discussed their preferred options, the effect of the project on other future and current Town needs, the effect of the project on the tax rate and bond rating, the unpredictability of state revenue and the economy in general, the location of the proposed schools and possible timetables for implementing the project.

By consensus the Council agreed not to add the School Building Project to the November 2010 ballot but instead to continue to work on the options and see how local and state budgetary projections develop.

Council members asked staff to provide the following for the next work session:

- An accounting of repairs needed for the schools in the short term which would make the facilities serviceable for the next 5 years or so.
- An accounting of crucial repair needed for the schools over the next 5 – 10 years.
- A meeting with Lawrence Associates and DRA Architect to review the project and provide information regarding the choices made and priorities identified in the decision process.
- Provide information on a modified Option E which would include the Middle School as described in Option A.
- Additional discussion regarding the Town's fiscal capacity including tax burdens and debt.

Board of Education Chair Mark LaPlaca restated the Board's recommendation of the two school option. Council members requested input from the Board on the merits of considering the elementary schools projects and the middle school project separately.

The Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Town Manager will meet to structure the next meeting. The Sustainability Committee is working on a tool to assist with location choice which will be used by staff as they continue the process of evaluating existing and potential sites.

Communications received by Town Council members and Town Management are included as part of this record. (Statements attached)

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Paulhus moved and Mr. Schaefer seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Motion passed unanimously.

Elizabeth Paterson, Mayor

Mary Stanton, Town Clerk

**Town of Mansfield
Town Council
Proposed School Building Project
Critical Questions and Options**

July 15, 2010

Critical questions

- 1) Do you support the Mansfield Board of Education's recommendation to complete various renovations to MMS and to construct two new elementary schools (Option E)? If yes:
 - a. Do you want to identify a location in the northern part of town or are you comfortable with the Vinton and SE School sites?
 - b. If you would like to identify a location in the northern section of town, are you willing to seek approval from the voters prior to identifying the site for both proposed schools?
- 2) If you do not support the board's recommendation, is there another option that you prefer? (Option D; Option A; other)
- 3) When do you wish to schedule the referendum? (Nov 2010; Jan/Feb 2011; other)
- 4) If you do not wish to proceed with a building project at this time, how should we plan to maintain the existing facilities? (pay-as-you-go; dedicated CIP contribution; other)

Project Chronology

- Sep 2005 – Town Council establishes School Building Committee (SBC) with charge to “review the capacity and condition of the town’s four school buildings, with respect to current needs and future expansion.” SBC is specifically directed to review various key issues, including security concerns, roof replacements and other basic facility needs in addition to enhancing the library/media centers in the elementary schools.
- June 2006 - school consultant Thomas Jokubaitis presents SBC with initial school facility review.
- April 2007 - SBC hires firms of Lawrence Associates and DRA Architects as project architects. Project architects meet with school staff to conduct programming and building evaluations and later facilitate a series of community workshops to identify various construction options.
- March 2008 – SBC selects Newfield Construction to serve as construction manager. SBC learns that cost estimates for preliminary options are much higher than anticipated (estimate for extensive upgrade to three elementary schools and Mansfield Middle School totals over \$90 million).
- Spring/Summer 2008 - SBC identifies concept of new, consolidated elementary school to provide community with upgraded facility and opportunity to leverage state grant reimbursement at much lower cost to Mansfield taxpayers. SBC identifies Southeast School as preferred site to host consolidated school.
- Sep 2008 – SBC conducts public workshop to review four project options (options A-D)
- Feb 2009 – SBC reviews four project options with MBE and Town Council.
- March 2009 - March 2010 - As directed by council and MBOE, SBC further analyzes consolidated school option, including a review of feasibility of land at Southeast Elementary School. SBC also conducts site visits to newer consolidated elementary schools of comparable size (500-700 students) to identify advantages and disadvantages of single district school site.
- March 2010 - SBC presents its proposed “New Community PreK-4 Elementary School and Mansfield Middle School Project” (Option D).

- Late March 2010 – following public hearing on Option D, SBC presents MBOE and Council with information regarding a new option E (extensive renovations to MMS; construction of two new elementary schools of 350 students each).
- March-May 2010 - MBOE reviews proposed project and solicits input from key stakeholders.
- May 24, 2010 - MBOE presents Town Council with its recommendation, endorsing option E.

Options

- 1) Option E – recommended by MBOE. Extensive renovations to MMS; two new elementary schools (350 students each). Cost to Mansfield: \$27M.
 - a. Significant features (as presented in MBOE recommendation)
 - Educational considerations
 - No disruption to preK-4 students during construction
 - Improved social-emotional opportunities for students
 - Improved ability of teachers to collaborate
 - Easier to maintain classroom size in compliance with district guidelines
 - More effective sharing of staff specialists (e.g. counseling, OT, PT)
 - Benefits for special education services
 - Larger, more uniform classroom size
 - More flexibility to accommodate increased enrollment
 - Improves building security (offices located at front entrance)
 - Facility factors
 - New construction promotes sustainability and efficient use of resources – designed to LEED standards with modern energy management systems and lower energy costs – reduces emissions with significant savings to operating budget
 - State-of-the library/media centers
 - Temporary relocatable classrooms at MMS and SE School would be replaced with permanent construction
 - Separate cafeterias and gymnasiums
 - Vehicle access and pedestrian safety improvements
 - New construction leverages more state reimbursement
 - Community considerations
 - Achieves balance between efficiency and community’s desire to maintain smaller schools – required redistricting would negatively impact fewer families than Option D
 - Fewer municipal buildings to repurpose (compared to option D)
 - b. Concerns/Issues
 - Impact on taxpayer – if town revenues continue to decline (e.g. loss in federal supplement to ECS), amount required for debt service could place significant pressure on town/school operating budget and negatively impact other elements of capital improvement program (CIP)
 - Will voters approve if elementary school locations unknown at time of referendum?
 - Costs associated with repurposing existing schools

2) Option D – recommended by School Building Committee (SBC). Extensive renovations to MMS; one new elementary school (700 students). Cost to Mansfield: \$19M.

a. Significant features (as presented in SBC recommendation)

- Accomplishes all objectives related to improvements to school facilities
 - All planned upgrades to MMS
 - Separate cafeteria and gymnasium for elementary school
 - State-of-the library/media centers for elementary school
 - Modern energy management and security systems
 - Larger uniform classroom sizes
- Provides best opportunity to enhance instructional program
 - Opportunities to enhance curriculum and expand district-wide offerings at single location
 - Facilitates district-wide planning for instructional programs and promote maximum use of teachers and support staff
 - Facilitates better coordination for special education teachers
 - Anticipated savings to operating budget provides district with best opportunity to maintain class size guidelines and current instructional program, with potential to invest savings in additional areas and services
- Provides best opportunity to leverage state grant funds, minimizing cost to Mansfield taxpayers
- Promotes sustainability and efficient use of resources
 - New construction promotes sustainability and efficient use of resources – designed to LEED standards with modern energy management systems with reduced emissions and lower energy costs
 - Captures efficiencies in purchasing and reduce need for certain administrative staff – enables district to focus investment on instructional program and curriculum as opposed to administration
 - Most significant savings for district’s operating budget
- Minimizes disruption to learning environment
- Enhances district’s sense of community

b. Concerns/Issues

- Many of the parents and residents who have participated in the public process have expressed preference for smaller schools
- Costs associated with repurposing existing schools

3) Option A – limited improvements to MMS; limited facility improvements to existing elementary schools. Cost to Mansfield: up to \$20M.

a. Significant features (as detailed by SBC)

- Basic improvements to facilities
 - Roof and window replacements
 - Solar panels
 - Fire alarm systems
 - ADA and technology upgrades
 - New heating and ventilation systems
 - New elevator for MMS
 - New gym floors and gym partitions for elementary schools
- Maintains smaller school size (preferred by some)
- No need to repurpose existing buildings

b. Concerns/Issues

- Construction will have some disruption to learning environment
- Will not achieve same energy savings as new schools
- Limited ability to leverage state reimbursement
- Will not achieve desired facility improvements (e.g. does not include library media centers, separate gymnasiums and cafeterias, larger classrooms and security systems)
- Will not achieve desired opportunities to enhance instructional program
- Elementary schools continue to age
- Declining enrollment may lead to closure of one elementary school
- Limited savings to operating budget (some energy savings; no anticipated reduction in administrative personnel)

4) Wait – wait to see what develops with election of new Governor and General Assembly. Will new state government sustain commitment to key educational and municipal grants, as well as school construction program?

a. Benefits

- Time may provide Town with better opportunity to forecast revenues

b. Concerns/Issues

- Opportunity costs – construction costs may escalate. State may reduce scope of school construction program and reduce reimbursement rates.
- Existing facilities continue to age; increased opportunity for building/systems failure (e.g. roof, boiler)
- No immediate savings for operating budget

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Allison Altieri [alliealmighty@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tue 7/13/2010 1:31 PM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: School Building Project
Attachments:

Greetings Mansfield Town Council Members,

I hope to attend the meeting scheduled for July 15 but in case I can not able to, I wanted to make my opinion known to you as I have expressed it members of the BOE and community members alike.

I am **not** in favor of the **one school** option. I feel that building **two green schools** is the better choice if we are going to venture into new construction. I have been to a number of meetings on the issue and have left each feeling that the impassioned voices take essentially two sides. One being passionate about money (cost current and future) and the second about the educational experience of Mansfield children. I feel that the BOE has gone above and beyond in attempting to host and attend meetings and answer questions and concerns of town members, but many questions have gone unanswered to date.

In addition, I am the Vice President of the MMSA (PTA) at MMS and have had scores of parents and school staff expressing their concerns, and anxiety to me throughout the year about the proposed plans.

I became aware of this whole issue 3 1/2 years into the process and realize much debate happened before my time, but have three questions that I believe the Town Council should answer before proceeding.

1. What is the current status of the funding stream (the federal reimbursements for new construction and demolition of the 3 current elementary schools)
2. It is my understanding that if the reimbursement funds are no longer available when we are ready to utilize them, that the entire new school building project will no longer be an option for Mansfield in the foreseeable future.
What happens if we can not acquire all (or most of) the funding sought to cover those proposed federal reimbursement dollars?

Best regards,

Allison Altieri
Invested Community Member

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Sonya Conrad [sonyaconrad@charter.net] **Sent:** Mon 7/12/2010 3:42 PM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: One School
Attachments:

Hello Council Members,

I am a mom of two beautiful boys (I admit I'm a little biased ☺) : 16mnths and 5yrs.

My husband and I moved to Mansfield in 2001 for the purpose of the quality education in smaller schools and the rural feel/small community (as many other people have).

Our family supports the three schools 'as is'. We are in favor of paying more in taxes to maintain the current three elementary schools in town and doing what is necessary to maintain the middle school.

Building a new 'one school' or even 'two schools' does not mean updates/repairs wont need to be done on those buildings in the future. We will have to pay for demolition of the current schools if they aren't leased etc.. Buildings in town such as the library and town hall were schools at one time however we don't need another library or another town hall. I see the vacant schools having potentially many hidden costs.

If my husband and I wanted to pay less in taxes we would move to a neighboring town where taxes are a priority not education (and send them to private school). As a result of some neighboring towns having lower taxes they are paying for it in other ways (the pay me now or pay me later principle – the pay me later has ramifications that no dollar amount could ever truly fix). I would like to not see that in Mansfield.

Thank you for your time.

Cheers,

Sonya Conrad

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Jim Greene [jimgreenejr@hotmail.com] **Sent:** Mon 7/12/2010 6:51 AM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: School options
Attachments:

Good Morning,

I am writing to voice my opinion that Mansfield either adopt the one school policy. As the parent of two elementary school students I believe in the long run that this is the most viable option for the town. Having most of the children attending the same schools throughout their younger years will provide stability and friendships that will last a lifetime. I realize this is a simplistic way of viewing this and there are many other reasons I believe the way I do but I do not feel I will say anything that you have not heard before.

I also realize this is a very tough decision that you are facing and there is a lot of pressure being felt on all sides of the issue. I do believe Mansfield had a building committee recommend this to the board of education and also strongly believe the committee had the best interests of both the students and the town when they made that recommendation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kindest Regards,

Jim Greene
52 Beacon Hill Dr.
Storrs, CT 06268

The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars with Hotmail. [Get busy.](#)

Jessica Higham
14 Adeline Place
Mansfield Center, CT 06250
July 10, 2010

Town of Council Members
4 South Eagleville Road
Mansfield, CT 06268

July 14, 2010

Dear Town Council:

I have resided in Mansfield for seven years and I am writing to express my concern about recent discussion at the Town Council public hearing regarding the school building project. I understand that we are in a tough financial time and that any decision to build a new school is a difficult one to make.

However, I do not believe that the one school option is a viable one for the town of Mansfield. Consider: We presently have three elementary schools in town and parents and students are satisfied with the small school setting. Having seven hundred students in one school, the risk for health and personal safety for our youngest residents; is that the direction Mansfield is headed? Furthermore, it is well known that a school size closer to three hundred students is more advantageous for learning, a sense of community and for teacher retention. It is also well known that the two school option was more readily accepted by a majority of parents who attended the informational meetings over the last six months, educating themselves about the options so that they could come to a sound decision in that they felt was best for their children and our community.

It would seem that building one new structure would bring a financial savings while creating a new school for our children. However, smaller school sizes have been researched and found to be a better learning environment for children, and that the teacher retention rate is far higher when school sizes stay small. One school, on the other hand, will increase teacher loss and dissatisfaction and while decreasing student academics and sense of belonging.

Are these tradeoffs that we really want to make? Please consider that the two school option is the best fit for Mansfield.

Sincerely,

Jessica Higham

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Lisa Holle [holledixon@charter.net]
To: Town Council
Cc:
Subject: Public Hearing about School Building Project
Attachments:

Sent: Wed 6/30/2010 1:22 PM

Dear Town Council,

We were unable to attend Monday night's meeting regarding the School Building Project; however, we wanted to express our opinion about the School Building Project. We are in favor of the 2 new elementary school option for several reasons.

- New elementary schools would promote sustainability and efficient use of resources as opposed to the existing schools that are over 50 years old and require repair and are not as energy-efficient
- The size of 2 new schools (as opposed to the 1 large school or the existing 3 schools) is desirable to 1) promote more optimal social-emotional opportunities for students and staff, 2) provide more diversity and options for student activities and groupings; and 3) minimize travel time of specialists so that they could spend more time with the students in the classroom
- Larger room space from the new construction would promote enhanced individual and group activities as well as appropriate storage facilities as opposed to our small and inconsistent class sizes.
- Flexibility in handling reduced enrollment should that occur in the future.

Sincerely,
Lisa Holle and James Dixon
7 Storrs Heights Road
Storrs, CT 06268

Sara-Ann Chainé

From: Celeste N. Griffin
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 10:24 AM
To: Matthew W. Hart; Sara-Ann Chainé
Cc: Fred A. Baruzzi
Subject: FW: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

-----Original Message-----

From: Town of Mansfield [mailto:cgi-noreply@mansfieldct.org]
Sent: Saturday, July 03, 2010 12:43 PM
To: SBCinfo; Webmaster
Subject: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

comment: To whom it may concern,

I have been following the new elementary school issue closely through the town's website, CATV broadcasts of town meetings and the Willimantic Chronicle. At a recent meeting dealing with this issue, a number of town residents expressed their preference for the single, larger elementary school option. The single school option, with its new technologies, would provide the high quality education so important to our children and for which Mansfield is known. At the same time, it would save the town and its residents millions of dollars upfront and, to me, down the road as well. One school would eliminate the duplicative costs of two schools, such as maintenance, including, for example, future roof replacement, etc. In this time of falling elementary school enrollments, not to mention extraordinarily difficult economic times--that could possibly last for several years--I, like the others, believe the single school option is the right one because it makes the best and most beneficial use of our valuable but limited municipal and personal resources. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Robert Jennette, M.D.
610 Browns Road
Storrs, CT 06268

name: Robert Jennette
email: rjennmd@sbcglobal.net

Sara-Ann Chainé

From: Celeste N. Griffin
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 2:17 PM
To: Matthew W. Hart; Sara-Ann Chainé
Cc: Fred A. Baruzzi
Subject: FW: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

-----Original Message-----

From: Town of Mansfield [mailto:cgi-noreply@mansfieldct.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 1:23 PM
To: SBCinfo; Webmaster
Subject: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

comment: While many of us are opposed to the one school option, the two school option is more appealing. Many of us would still prefer the three schools, but this is a better choice. However, the talk of putting both schools on the other side of town is unfair to those of us in the Goodwin community. Our area of Storrs/Mansfield is just as important as those of Vinton and Southeast. Our children deserve to have a school closer to them. It is why many of us moved to this town. We hope that our community isn't put on the backburner and treated as less important as the other school communities. Thank you.

name: John and Karri Prandy
email: kjp1199@sbcglobal.net

Elizabeth Paterson

From: jordan42@charter.net [jordan42@charter.net] **Sent:** Sun 7/11/2010 10:22 PM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: School Building Project: I Support Neighborhood Schools for Mansfield
Attachments:

Dear Town Council Members,

As a Mansfield taxpayer, parent, and Goodwin Elementary School employee, I wish to express to you my strong support for at least two, centrally located neighborhood elementary schools for our town. I am strongly opposed to the one school option because I do not believe it makes sense financially or educationally. This is in agreement with the Board of Education's recommendation.

More specifically, I believe that any supposed state and federal funding for new school construction is not a sufficient reason to build one, or even two new schools at this point and time. The cost to maintain or demolish the current schools has not been factored in. There is also the Storrs Center project that has the potential to change our school enrollment or require redistricting. As a parent and employee who is in the schools on a regular basis, I feel our schools are in fine shape and, with some maintenance, should easily last several more years until the economic and demographic conditions are more appropriate for this decision to be made. There is no real reason to force this new building project through at this time.

Ideally, I support maintaining our three existing elementary schools for the next five to ten years.

Respectfully,

Carey Jordan
42 Moulton Road

Sara-Ann Chainé

From: Celeste N. Griffin
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:09 PM
To: Matthew W. Hart; Sara-Ann Chainé
Cc: Fred A. Baruzzi
Subject: FW: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

-----Original Message-----

From: Town of Mansfield [mailto:cgi-noreply@mansfieldct.org]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 11:17 PM
To: SBCinfo; Webmaster
Subject: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

comment: I am hugely opposed to the ONE school elementary option in Mansfield. Both my husband and I highly support the TWO school option.

name: Esther Soffer Roberts
email: e.soffer.roberts@charter.net

Sara-Ann Chainé

From: Celeste N. Griffin
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 10:23 AM
To: Matthew W. Hart; Sara-Ann Chainé
Subject: FW: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

-----Original Message-----

From: Town of Mansfield [mailto:cgi-noreply@mansfieldct.org]
Sent: Monday, July 05, 2010 3:41 PM
To: SBCinfo; Webmaster
Subject: Form results from
http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

Comment: My husband and I wanted to comment on the June 28th meeting that discussed whether the town should have 1 new elementary school, two new schools, or maintain what we have. We strongly vote for the last recommendation and agreed with both Jeff Smith's point of view as well as Rudy Favretti. These are terrible economic times for towns and the state as well. We must be responsible. Also please do not let this go to a vote in November when Uconn students could also vote. Thank you very much. Karin and John Rickards
From: Karin and John Rickards
Email: j.k.rickards@sbcglobal.net

June 28, 2010

Statement Regarding the School Building Project

When I first began looking into the School Building Project I was a somewhat reluctant supporter of the one-school option. Given the differences in the price tags of the four options being considered at the time, it seemed like the obvious choice. However, as I began to read more about the educational implications of a large elementary school, and as I heard what both parents and educators had to say during the many public meetings held by the Building Committee, it became clear to me that the large-school option is the wrong choice, especially if one's view of educational outcome is not limited to scores on mastery tests, but instead encompasses social and emotional development as well, and especially if the consequences for children at risk are considered.

Having rejected the one-school option, I began to favor simply maintaining the status quo, understanding that even that option would come with a substantial price tag. But as I learned more about the limitations of our current buildings, the implications of projected drops in enrollment, and especially the potential educational benefits of "slightly larger" schools, I became convinced that maintaining the status quo is not the right choice either.

Given all this, I was happy to see the two-school option emerge as the Board of Education's recommendation. The two-school option isn't perfect—it isn't the cheapest option, and it will require some hard choices as we move forward. That being said, I think the two-school plan is by far the best of a set of imperfect choices. It balances fiscal responsibility and educational quality, it gives us the most flexibility to respond to fluctuations in enrollment, and it embraces the 'neighborhood school' concept that our community strongly, and justifiably, values.

In addition to expressing my support for two-school option, I'd like to comment on the suggestion that support for anything but the cheapest option might be limited to parents with small children. I believe this is a mistaken assumption. Mansfield has a long tradition of supporting education. If you adopt a plan that improves the education of our children and comes at a reasonable cost, it will enjoy strong support from a broad cross-section of our community.

Finally, I'd like to say thanks to the members of the Building Committee and the Board of Education for all their efforts in bringing the School Building Project to this point.

Jay Rueckl
128 South Eagleville Road

Sara-Ann Chainé

From: Town of Mansfield [cgi-noreply@mansfieldct.org]
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 3:23 PM
To: SBCinfo; Webmaster
Subject: Form results from http://mansfieldct.org/town/government/committees/school_bldg_com/sbc-comment.php

comment: I am concerned about what a larger school might do to the quality of special ed my son receives. We are in Mansfield largely because of the high quality of his education so far, and the size of the classroom has been ideal for his needs. I think in a larger classroom his needs might be easier to overlook.

name: Melissa Shippee
email: grakowsky@gmail.com

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Spottiswoode, Heather [heather.spottiswoode@uconn.edu] **Sent:** Mon 7/12/2010 11:29 AM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: elementary schools in Mansfield
Attachments:

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My husband, Michael and I are the parents of a daughter who just completed 5 incredible years at Southeast School and a son who is entering 1st grade but has been at Southeast since he was 3. We do not favor one or even two schools and feel that one of the things that sets Mansfield apart from so many other towns is its strong educational opportunities. Friends and family from other districts and states have always marveled over the small class sizes and the closeness of the school communities and it's something that we have always considered our children fortunate to be a part of. We moved to Mansfield largely for this reason when our daughter was 3.

We would very much like to see the 3 schools remain – it's a wonderful, unique system and it certainly isn't broke and doesn't need fixing.

Respectfully,

Heather Spottiswoode

Heather L. Spottiswoode

Program Manager, UCONN Mentor Connection

2131 Hillside Road, Unit 3007

Storrs, CT 06269-3007

860-486-0283

860-486-2900 fax

www.gifted.uconn.edu/mentor

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Whitney Tabor [whitneytabor@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Tue 7/13/2010 11:24 PM
To: Town Council; Elizabeth Paterson; Gregory Haddad; Denise Keane; Peter Kochenburger; Meredith Lindsey; Toni Moran; Christopher R. Paulhus; Bonnie Ryan; Carl Schaefer
Cc:
Subject: Please vote for neighborhood elementary schools, not one large one
Attachments:

Town Council,

As a resident of Mansfield with a child who has gone through the Mansfield elementary and (most of the) middle school, I support the neighborhood school option, not the single large school option. I believe this will be better for students and better for teachers, as suggested by research and also by the testimony of teachers in this district.

Thanks for your consideration.

Best Regards,

Whitney Tabor

294 A Hanks Hill Road
Storrs Mansfield, CT 06268

860 477 0416

 You replied on 7/14/2010 12:48 PM.

Elizabeth Paterson

From: Cynthia Wells [simcyn@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Tue 7/13/2010 10:45 PM

To: Town Council

Cc:

Subject: two school option

Attachments:

Dear Mansfield Town Council,

When I first heard about the one school option that Mansfield was considering I was not against it. I have been keeping informed on the town web site, and appreciate the town for keeping the information up to date and open to the public.

We have two girls attending elementary school, and we, as almost all parents, love their experience. We are glad we have chosen to live in this town, and, of course, education played heavily into the decision.

After the research that I have done, particularly with hearing the views of the school teachers and administrators, I now oppose the one school plan, and would strongly encourage the town to hear the recommendations of the Board of Education and support a two school option as opposed to a one school option.

Respectfully,
Cyndi Wells

**PAGE
BREAK**

LEGAL NOTICE
TOWN OF MANSFIELD
PUBLIC HEARING July 26, 2010

The Mansfield Town Council will hold a public hearing at 7:30 PM at their regular meeting at 4 South Eagleville Road on July 26, 2010 to solicit public comment regarding an Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances.

At this hearing persons may address the Town Council and written communications may be received. Copies of said proposals are on file and available at the Town Clerk's office: 4 South Eagleville Road, Mansfield, CT 06268. A copy of the proposed ordinance is posted on the Town's website (mansfieldct.gov).

Dated at Mansfield Connecticut this 14th day of July 2010

Mary Stanton
Town Clerk

PAGE
BREAK



**Town of Mansfield
Agenda Item Summary**

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *MWH*
CC: Maria Capriola, Assistant to Town Manager; Cherie Trahan, Director of Finance; Dennis O'Brien, Town Attorney
Date: July 26, 2010
Re: Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances

Subject Matter/Background

This item has been included on the agenda in case the Town Council wishes to discuss the comments received at Monday's public hearing, as well as the merits of the proposed ordinance. No specific council action is recommended at this time.

I have invited Town Attorney Dennis O'Brien to make a short presentation at the start of the public hearing and to be available for questions from council members.

Attachments

- 1) Draft Ordinance Regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances
- 2) Excerpts from Town Charter
- 3) Financial Management Goals
- 4) Ordinance for Obtaining Goods and Services



**Town of Mansfield
Code of Ordinances**

*An Ordinance regarding the Procedure for
Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances*

June 14, 2010 Draft

Title

This chapter shall be known and may be cited as “An Ordinance regarding the Procedure for Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances.”

Legislative Authority

This chapter is enacted pursuant to certain provisions of Town Charter section C303A.

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to provide by ordinance the procedure for administration and fiduciary oversight of the Town finances as required by Town Charter section C303A.

Administration and Fiduciary Oversight of Town Finances

Consistent with the responsibility of the Town Manager to the Town Council per section C502 of the Charter of the Town of Mansfield for the supervision, direction and administration of all departments, agencies and offices of the Town, the authority for administration and fiduciary oversight of Town finances shall be the responsibility of the Town Manager to be exercised in compliance with Charter section C506 regarding the Department of Finance, the Ordinance for Obtaining Goods and Services set forth in Chapter 76 of this Code, and the Financial Management Goals of the Town of Mansfield, as amended.

ARTICLE III
The Town Council

§ C301. The Council.

There shall be a Town Council consisting of nine members, herein referred to as the Council. The members shall serve without compensation except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred in the performance of official duties. No member of the Council shall simultaneously hold any other elected municipal office or paid position of the Town.

§ C302. Organization and procedure.

A. At the next regular meeting of the Town Council following the municipal election, the Town Council members shall elect, by a majority vote of all Council members, one of their number to serve as Mayor, who shall preside at Council meetings, and one of their number to serve as Deputy Mayor, who shall serve in the Mayor's temporary absence. If both are absent, the Council may designate from its membership a temporary presiding officer. At this meeting the Council shall fix the time and place of its regular meetings, which shall be at least once each month, and shall provide methods for calling special meetings. If the position of the Mayor is vacated, the Council shall elect a new Mayor in the same manner as prescribed in this section. The Mayor shall be recognized as the official head of the Town for all ceremonial purposes.

B. The Council shall determine its own rules of procedure. Five members shall constitute a quorum. All meetings of the Council for the transaction of business shall be open to the public in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.³ All votes shall be recorded as prescribed by the C.G.S.

C. The Council shall keep for public inspection a journal of all its proceedings, including all roll call votes, which shall be the official record of its proceedings. The journal shall be maintained by the Town Clerk and shall be authenticated for each meeting by the signature of the Mayor or other presiding officer and the Town Clerk.

§ C303. Powers.

A. The Council shall be the governing body of the Town. It shall exercise and perform all the rights, powers, duties and obligations of the Town except as the same may be assigned by the C.G.S. or this Charter to some other officer, board, agency or to the Town Meeting. These powers include, in addition to all other powers, all the powers and duties now or hereafter conferred or imposed by the general statutes, special acts or otherwise upon Town Meetings, boards of finance, and boards of selectmen. The Council shall provide by ordinance the procedure for administration and fiduciary oversight of the Town finances. The Council may provide by ordinance for the exercise by the Manager or some other officer, board or agency of any of the administrative powers not otherwise assigned by this Charter. The legislative power of the Town and final authority concerning the tax rate are vested exclusively in the Council except as otherwise provided in this Charter.

3. Editor's Note: See C.G.S. § 1-7 et seq.

(2) Upon the suspension, removal or resignation of the Town Manager, the Council may appoint a temporary Manager, who shall be a qualified administrative officer of the Town, to serve at the pleasure of the Council for not more than 90 days. The temporary Manager shall have none of the powers of permanent appointment as are conferred upon the Manager in § C503 of this article.

← § C502. Duties of the Town Manager.

A. The Town Manager shall be responsible to the Council for the supervision, direction and administration of all departments, agencies and offices.

B. The Town Manager shall:

(1) Ensure that all laws and ordinances governing the Town are faithfully executed.

(2) Make periodic reports to the Council.

(3) Attend Council meetings with full right of participation in its discussions but without a right to vote.

(4) Submit to the Town Council and make available to the public complete reports on the finances and on the administrative activities of the Town as of the end of each fiscal year.

(5) Make recommendations to the Town Council concerning the affairs of the Town and facilitate the work of the Town Council in developing policy.

(6) Keep the Council fully advised as to the financial condition and anticipated future financial needs of the Town.

(7) Prepare and submit to the Council an annual budget.

(8) At the time of an emergency or disaster, expend the necessary funds to assure the smooth operation of Town business and the health, safety and well-being of the Town and its residents, consistent with this Charter; see § C409.

(9) Assist the Council to develop long-term goals for the Town and strategies to implement such goals.

(10) Encourage and provide staff support for regional and intergovernmental cooperation.

(11) Promote partnerships among Council, staff and citizens in developing public policy and building a sense of community.

(12) Exercise such powers and perform such other duties as may be required by ordinance or resolution of the Council not inconsistent with this Charter.

§ C503. Appointments by the Manager.

The Town Manager shall appoint, and may remove, all department directors and employees of the Town except as otherwise specifically provided by this Charter or the C.G.S. The Town Manager may, subject to the approval of the Council, perform the duties of any such office except those of the Town Treasurer and Town Clerk, provided that, in case the Town Treasurer is absent or unable to act, the Town Manager may countersign checks in accordance with the provisions of § C505 of this Charter. The Town Manager may designate an appointee to serve as acting Manager during the Manager's absence.

§ C504. Administrative departments.

In addition to those administrative departments, agencies and offices established by this Charter, as set forth in § C303B, the Town Council shall establish by ordinance various administrative departments, agencies and offices responsible for public services. Such departments, agencies and offices shall, except as otherwise provided in this Charter, have the powers and duties prescribed by law and by ordinance or resolution of said Council. The department directors shall have the power to appoint and remove such deputies, assistants and employees as shall be deemed necessary, with approval of the Town Manager and pursuant to the personnel provisions of Article VI of this Charter. The directors shall be responsible for the efficient discharge of the responsibilities of their departments, agencies and offices. The directors may delegate a part of the administrative duties of the department, agency or office to any appointee.

§ C505. Office of Town Clerk.

The Town Clerk shall have all powers and duties conferred or imposed by law on Town Clerks, shall serve as Clerk of the Council and shall have such other duties as are prescribed in this Charter or are assigned by the Manager or the Council. All fees collected by the Town Clerk or deputies or assistants shall be paid into the Town Treasury.



§ C506. Department of Finance.

A. The Department of Finance shall be responsible for:

- (1) The keeping of accounts and financial records.
- (2) The assessment and collection of taxes, special assessments and other revenues.
- (3) The custody and disbursement of Town funds and money.
- (4) The oversight of expenditures.
- (5) Except as otherwise provided in § C406, such other powers and duties as may be required by ordinance or resolution of the Town Council.

B. Accounts shall be kept by the Department of Finance showing the financial transactions for all departments and agencies of the Town. Forms for such accounts shall be prescribed by the Director of Finance with the approval of the

Town Manager. Financial reports shall be prepared for each quarter and for each fiscal year and for such other periods as may be required by the Town Manager or Town Council.

(1) Organization.

(a) The Director of Finance shall have direct supervision over the Department of Finance and the administration of the financial affairs of the Town. Subject to the approval of the Manager, the Director of Finance may perform the duties of any office within the Finance Department except that of the Treasurer, and may consolidate one or more such offices under one person, provided that the Town Treasurer shall not also be the Tax Collector or the purchasing agent.

(b) The Tax Collector, Assessor and Treasurer shall have all powers and duties imposed by law on such officers and shall have such other powers and duties as the Director may prescribe.

(c) Purchasing. The Town Council shall establish, by ordinance, procedures regarding the procurement of goods and services.

(d) Nothing herein shall prevent the creation of petty cash funds in individual departments from which small expenditures may be made under rules promulgated by the Director of Finance as to amounts, audits, evidence of expenditure and system for replenishment.

(2) Assessment and collection of taxes. Except as specifically provided in this Charter, the assessment of property for taxation, the billing and collection of taxes shall be performed as provided in the C.G.S.

(3) Expenditures and accounting.

(a) No purchase shall be made by any department, board, commission or officer of the Town other than the Board of Education, except through the purchasing agent.

(b) No vouchers, claim or charge against the Town shall be paid until the same has been audited and approved by the Director of Finance or an agent for correctness and validity. Payment of all approved claims shall be authorized by the Director of Finance which authorization shall be valid when countersigned by the Treasurer, provided that, in the absence or inability to act of either the Director of Finance or Treasurer, the Manager may be authorized to substitute temporarily for either but not both of them.

(c) The Director of Finance shall prescribe the time at which and the manner in which persons receiving money on account of the Town shall pay the same to the Town Treasurer.

(d) The several departments, commissions, officers and boards of the Town shall not involve the Town in any obligation to spend money for any purpose in excess of the amount appropriated therefor unless the matter has been approved by the Council. Each order drawn upon the Treasurer shall state the department, commission, board or officer and the appropriation against which it is to be charged.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in § C406, additional appropriations over and above the total budget may be made from time to time by resolution of the Council, upon recommendation of the Manager and certification from the Director of Finance that there are available unappropriated general fund or other resources in excess of the proposed additional appropriations.

(f) Appropriations for construction or for other permanent improvements, from whatever source derived, shall not lapse until the purpose for which the appropriation was made shall have been accomplished or abandoned. Any such project shall be deemed to have been abandoned if three fiscal years shall elapse without any expenditure from or encumbrance of the appropriation. Any portion of an annual appropriation remaining unexpended and unencumbered at the close of the budget year shall lapse.

(g) Every payment made in violation of the provisions of this Charter shall be deemed illegal and every official authorizing or making such payment or taking part therein and every person receiving such payment or any part thereof shall be jointly and severally liable to the Town for the full amount so paid or received. If any officer or employee of the Town shall knowingly incur any obligation or shall authorize or make any expenditure in violation of the provisions of this Charter or take any part therein, such action shall be cause for removal.

§ C507. Official bonds.

A. The Town Manager, Town Clerk, Director of Finance, Treasurer, Tax Collector, Director of Public Works, Building Official and such other officers and employees as may be required to do so by the Council shall, before entering on their respective official duties, execute to the Town, in the form prescribed by the Council and approved by the Town Attorney, and file with the Town Clerk, a surety company bond in a penal sum to be fixed by the Council, conditioned upon honesty and/or the faithful performance of such official duties.

B. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Council, if it deems it to be in the best interests of the Town, from prescribing a name schedule bond, schedule position bond or blanket bond, or from prescribing which departments, offices, agencies, boards or commissions shall be covered by a specific type of the aforementioned bonds. Premiums for such bonds shall be paid by the Town.

§ C508. Salaries.

Salaries of the Town Clerk, all directors and all employees in the classified service of the Town shall be determined by the Council, in conformity with a systematic pay plan for the positions involved, upon recommendation of the Manager, provided that nothing herein shall be construed to limit the power of the Board of Education to fix the compensation of the employees of the school system.

ARTICLE VI The Merit System

Sec§ C601. Merit principle.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT GOALS

PREFACE

The Fiscal Performance Goals adopted by the Town Council on March 9, 1987, as amended November 25, 1996, represent an effort to establish written policies for guiding the Town's financial management practices. These goals are not intended in any way to limit the authority of the Council to act, but rather to form a framework within which to make financial decisions and to monitor financial activity in a consistent manner. The adoption of these goals will not restrict the Town Council's ability and responsibility to respond to emergency or service delivery needs above or beyond the suggested limitations herein established.

FINANCIAL REPORTING PERFORMANCE GOALS

- A policy of full and open disclosure of all financial activity will be adhered to.
- Records will be maintained on a basis consistent with accepted government accounting standards.
- The Director of Finance will prepare monthly, quarterly and annual financial reports, presenting a summary of financial activity by major types of funds and programs.
- The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report will be prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America and governmental financial reporting practices.
- An independent public accounting firm will be employed to perform an annual audit of all funds, authorities, agencies and grant programs, and the annual audited report will be made available to the general public, bond and financial consultants, and other interested citizens and organizations. The audit will be completed and submitted to the Town Council within one hundred fifty (150) days of the close of the Town's fiscal year.

RESERVE PERFORMANCE GOALS

- A contingency account will be established annually in the operating budget to:
 - a. provide for settlement of pending labor contract negotiations;
 - b. provide for temporary funding of unforeseen needs of an emergency or nonrecurring nature;
 - c. permit orderly budgetary adjustments when revenues are lost through the action of other governmental bodies;
 - d. provide the local match for public or private grants; and
 - e. meet unexpected small increases in service delivery costs.
- The contingency account will be budgeted at a level sufficient to provide for settlement of pending labor contract negotiations plus an amount not to exceed one percent of the proposed Town budget. The Town's budget will be amended at the time such contingency funds are committed. The contingency account will be separate from the carryover fund balance.

FUND BALANCE GOALS

- A year-to-year carryover fund balance will be maintained in an amount necessary to maintain adequate cash flow and to prevent the demand for short-term borrowing. The undesignated fund balance should be at least five percent (5%) of the general fund operating budget and shall be separate from the contingency account. Fund balance in excess of the three percent goal should be used for balancing the proposed operating tax budget in the succeeding fiscal year.
- It is Council policy that the practice of using fund balance as a source of financing future years operating budgets has an inherently destabilizing impact upon the operating budget. Therefore, any fund balance in excess of the five percent goal will be transferred to the CNR Fund and used for one-time expenditures.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PERFORMANCE GOALS

- Capital improvements will be based on long-range projected needs rather than on immediate needs, in order to minimize future maintenance, replacement and capital costs.
- All capital improvements should be made in accordance with the Town's five-year capital improvements program. The capital improvements program shall be revised annually.
- The development of the capital improvements program will be coordinated with the operating budget in order to maintain a reasonably stable total tax levy.
- Before submission to the Town Council, the Town Manager will identify the estimated cost and potential funding sources for each capital project proposed. Future operating costs associated with a proposed capital improvement will be estimated before a decision is made to implement a project.
- Federal, State and other intergovernmental and private funding sources will be sought out and used as available to assist in financing capital improvements.

INVESTMENT PERFORMANCE GOALS

- A cash flow analysis of all funds will be developed on a regular basis. Collections, deposits and disbursements of all funds will be scheduled in a way as to ensure maximum cash availability.
- Where permitted by law, cash from separate funds and sources will be pooled to maximize investment yields. Interest will be credited to the General Fund except where prohibited by law or where the source of the cash is from an individual or corporation to ensure performance. Interest will be credited to the Capital and Nonrecurring Expenditure Fund (CNR) on cash held in the CNR Fund and the Capital Fund. The interest income will be used for future capital projects or debt service.
- Investment policy will be consistent with State law and will provide for security of principal, as well as needed liquidity.

DEBT PERFORMANCE GOALS

- Long-term debt will be limited to those capital improvements that should not be financed from current revenues.
- The maturity date for any debt will not exceed the reasonably expected useful life of the project so financed.
- The total direct general obligation debt will not exceed three percent (3%) of the full assessment value of taxable property.
- As a means of further minimizing the impact of debt obligations of the taxpayers:
 - a. long-term net debt will not exceed \$500 per capita; and
 - b. these limitations will not apply to any debt incurred for emergency purposes.
- The issuance of bond, tax and revenue anticipation notes will be avoided.
- Special assessments, revenue bonds and/or any other available self-liquidating debt measures will be used instead of general obligation bonds where and when possible and applicable.
- An official statement will be prepared to be used in connection with all sales of bonds and notes.
- Good relations will be maintained with financial and bond rating agencies, and a policy of full and open disclosure on every financial report and bond prospectus will be followed.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES PERFORMANCE GOALS

- The Town Manager will propose and the Town Council will adopt and maintain a balanced budget in which expenditures will not be allowed to exceed reasonable estimated resources and revenues.
- All current operation and maintenance expenses will be paid from the current revenue sources.
- The operating budget will provide for the adequate maintenance of capital assets and equipment.
- The budget will provide for adequate funding of all employee benefit programs and retirement systems.
- A budgetary control system will be maintained to enable adherence to the adopted budget. This will include a record keeping system to be adhered to by all programs and activities receiving annual Town Council appropriations.
- A system of regular monthly fiscal reports comparing actual revenues and expenditures to budgeted amounts will be prepared and maintained.
- An effective risk management program to minimize loss and reduce costs will be developed and implemented. The Town Manager will ensure that adequate insurance programs are in place, including unemployment and workers' compensation insurance.
- Delivery of services by other public and private organizations will be encouraged whenever and wherever greater efficiency and effectiveness can be expected. Technology and productivity advancements that will help reduce or avoid increasing personnel costs as a proportion of the total budget, that use available resources more productively and creatively, and that avoid duplication of effort and resources will be utilized.
- A Reserve Fund for Capital and Nonrecurring Expenditures will be maintained and will be adequately funded each year by a transfer from the General Fund Budget and by unanticipated one time revenues.

Revenue Performance Goals

- A diversified and stable revenue system will be maintained as protection from short-run fluctuations.
- Annual revenues will be estimated on an objective and reasonable basis. The Town Manager will develop a method to project revenues on a multi-year basis.
- One time or special purpose revenues will be used only for capital expenditures or for expenditures required by the revenues and not to subsidize recurring personnel, operation or maintenance costs.
- All user charges and fees will be annually re-evaluated at a level related to the cost of providing the services.
- Appropriate expansion and diversification of the tax base will be encouraged and additional Federal and State revenues will be sought in order to reduce the reliance on the property tax as it affects individual homeowners.

Town of Mansfield
Code of Ordinances
"An Ordinance for Obtaining Goods and Services
By the Town of Mansfield"

Approved June 22, 2009

Section 1. Title.

This chapter shall be known and may be cited as "the Ordinance for Obtaining Goods and Services.

Section 2. Legislative Authority.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the provisions of Town Charter section C506 B(1)(c).

Section 3. Purpose and Application.

- A. The purpose of this ordinance is to provide a set of procedures designed to obtain the best possible value for the necessary goods and services purchased by the Town of Mansfield, in accordance with Article V Section 506 of the Town Charter. The Town Council has determined that competitive bidding in some instances may be against the best interest of the Town. The Council, therefore, invokes its powers under Article V Section 506B(1)(c) to establish this ordinance designed to better ensure receipt by the Town of the best possible value for necessary goods and services by taking advantage of all prudent purchasing methods and opportunities available in the marketplace including the open competitive bidding process and delegates authority to implement these procedures to the Purchasing Agent. These procedures are further designed to provide for the fair and equitable treatment of all persons involved in public purchasing by the Town of Mansfield.
- B. This Ordinance shall apply to the purchase of all supplies, materials, equipment and other commodities and contractual services and construction (hereafter referred to as "products and services") required by any department, agency, board or commission of the Town, irrespective of the source of funds, except the purchase of specialized goods and contractual services for the purpose of instruction by the Board of Education. The Mansfield Board of Education and the Region 19 Board of Education shall be encouraged to adopt purchasing regulations similar to the provisions of this Ordinance. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the Director of Finance from serving, to the extent requested, as the Purchasing Agent for all requirements of the Board(s) of Education.

C. In order to increase the development and awareness of environmentally sound products and services, the Town of Mansfield will ensure that all possible and feasible specifications are reviewed for consideration of environmental impacts. Consideration will be given to those products that from a life cycle perspective, adversely affect the environment in the least possible way. This means that the Town of Mansfield will make a reasonable and responsible effort to choose product and services that:

- 1) are produced in an environmentally responsible manner
- 2) are distributed in an environmentally responsible manner
- 3) cause the least possible damage to the environment
- 4) can be removed in an environmentally responsible manner

Section 4. Solicitation and award procedures.

A. As provided in the Town Charter the Director of Finance shall serve as the Purchasing Agent for the Town, and shall be responsible for the procurement of all products and services for the Town. Subject to the limitations set forth in the Charter and in section 1B of this Ordinance, the Purchasing Agent shall have the authority to approve all contract specifications, prescribe the method of source selection to be utilized in the procurement of all products or services, award all contracts for products and services based on a determination of the bidder who offers the best value to the Town, and shall have the authority necessary to enforce the purchasing provisions of the Charter and these Rules. In addition, the Purchasing Agent shall have the following specific duties:

- 1) Inspect all supplies, material and equipment ordered by and delivered to the town to ensure compliance with specifications and conditions affecting the purchase thereof, or delegate the inspection thereof to such Town employees as are authorized to purchase said supplies, materials or equipment in accord with subsection B of this section;
- 2) Procure and award contracts for, or supervise the procurement of, all products and services needed by the Town, and maintain custody and care of all contracts for goods and contractual services to which the Town is a party;
- 3) Transfer between offices or sell, trade, or otherwise dispose of surplus supplies, materials, or equipment belonging to the Town;
- 4) Prepare, issue, revise, and maintain all bid specifications and establish and maintain programs for specification development, and the inspection, testing, and acceptance of products and services;

- 5) Prepare and adopt operational procedures governing the procurement functions of the Town;
- 6) Have the discretion and authority for cause to disqualify vendors and to declare them to be irresponsible bidders and to remove them from receiving any business from the Town;
- 7) To cancel, in whole or in part, an invitation to bid, a request for proposals, or any other solicitation, or to reject, in whole or in part, any and all bids or proposals when to do so is in the best interests of the Town;
- 8) To require, when necessary, bid deposits, performance bonds, insurance certificates, and labor and material bonds or other similar instruments or security which protect the interests of the Town;
- 9) Procure for the Town all federal and state tax exemptions to which they are entitled;
- 10) Ensure that the Town is exempt from state fair trade laws as provided by the Connecticut General Statutes;
- 11) To join with other units of government and with private sector organizations in cooperative purchasing plans when the best interests of the Town would be served;

B. Delegations to Other Town Officials. With the written approval of the Town Manager, the Purchasing Agent may delegate any portion of the authority to purchase certain products and services to other Town employees, if such delegation is deemed necessary and appropriate for the effective and efficient operation of Town government and for the procurement of those items. The Purchasing Agent, with the written approval of the Town Manager, may revoke such delegation at any time. The person to whom such authority is delegated shall be responsible for complying with the requirements of the Charter, this ordinance and any rules or regulations which may exist relating to the execution of the procurement process.

C. Methods of Source Selection. In accordance with Article V of the Town Charter, unless otherwise prescribed by law, the Purchasing Agent shall take advantage of all prudent purchasing methods and opportunities available in the marketplace. This includes, but is not limited to, such methods as competitive sealed bids, competitive sealed proposals, competitive negotiation, sole source procurement, small purchase procedures, credit card procedures, bulk ordering, emergency purchases, multi-step bidding, internet purchasing, use of cooperative purchasing plans and public auctions.

In deciding which method to utilize, the Purchasing Agent may take into consideration the following factors:

- 1) how to obtain the best value for the commodity;
- 2) whether or not to utilize a fixed-price or fixed-service contract under the circumstances;
- 3) whether quality, availability, or capability is overriding in relation to price;
- 4) whether the initial installation needs to be evaluated together with subsequent maintenance and service capabilities and what priority should be given to these requirements;
- 5) what benefits are derived from product or service compatibility and standardization and what priority should be given these requirements;
- 6) whether the marketplace will respond better to a solicitation permitting not only a range of alternative proposals, but evaluation, discussion, and negotiation of them before making the award;
- 7) what is practicable and advantageous to the Town;
- 8) the availability of vendors;
- 9) the efficiency of the process;
- 10) the fair and equitable treatment of potential participants;
- 11) the degree to which specifications can be made clear and complete;
- 12) the timeliness of the process to the needs of the Town;

D. **Award of Contract.** Contracts shall be awarded, by the Purchasing Agent, to the vendor who offers the best value to the Town. The Finance Committee shall be advised in the next quarterly financial report, or sooner when appropriate, when the Purchasing Agent awards a contract for goods or services (but not professional services as defined in Section I) other than by competitive sealed bid in accordance with Article V, Section 506B (1) (c) of the Town Charter. Best value shall be determined by consideration of some or all of the following factors as deemed appropriate by the Purchasing Agent:

- 1) The quality, availability, adaptability, and efficiency of use of the products and service to the particular use required;

- 2) The degree to which the provided products and services meet the specified needs of the Town, including consideration, when appropriate, of the compatibility with and ease of integration with existing products, services or systems;
- 3) The number, scope, and significance of conditions or exceptions attached or contained in the bid and the terms of warranties, guarantees, return policies, and insurance provisions;
- 4) Whether the vendor can supply the product or service promptly, or within the specified time, without delay or additional conditions;
- 5) The competitiveness and reasonableness of the total cost or price, including consideration of the total life-cycle cost and any operational costs that are incurred if accepted;
- 6) A cost analysis or a price analysis including the specific elements of costs, the appropriate verification of cost or pricing data, the necessity of certain costs, the reasonableness of amounts estimated for the necessary costs, the reasonableness of allowances for contingencies, the basis used for allocation of indirect costs, and the appropriateness of allocations of particular indirect costs to the proposed contract;
- 7) A price analysis involving an evaluation of prices for the same or similar products or services. Price analysis criteria include, but are not limited to: price submissions of prospective vendors in the current procurement, prior price quotations and contract prices charged by the vendor, prices published in catalogues or price lists, prices available on the open market, and in-house estimates of cost;
- 8) Whether or not the vendor can supply the product or perform the service at the price offered;
- 9) The ability, capacity, experience, skill, and judgment of the vendor to perform the contract;
- 10) The reputation, character and integrity of the vendor;
- 11) The quality of performance on previous contracts or services to the Town or others;
- 12) The previous and existing compliance by the vendor with laws and ordinances or previous performance relating to the contract or service, or on other contracts with the Town or other entities;

13) The sufficiency, stability, and future solvency of the financial resources of the vendor;

14) The ability of the vendor to provide future maintenance and service for the use of the products or services subject to the contract.

E. Common Specifications and Standards.

- 1) In accordance with this ordinance, all of the Town's departments, agencies, boards and commissions shall work together with the Purchasing Agent to identify common needs and establish standard specifications for the purchase of goods and contractual services which are commonly used by more than one department, agency, board, or commission.
- 2) The Purchasing Agent shall be responsible for identifying goods and contractual services common to the needs of the Town, School Department and their boards and commissions and for preparing and utilizing standard written specifications submitted for such goods and contractual services. After adoption, each standard specification shall, until revised or rescinded, apply in terms and effect to every purchase and contract for said goods or contractual service. The Town Manager may exempt any using agency of the Town from the use of the goods or contractual services in such standard specification if, in his/her judgment, it is to the best interest of the Town to so do.

F. Sole Source Procurement and Brand Name Specification.

- 1) It is the policy of the Town to encourage fair and practicable competition consistent with obtaining the best possible value for the necessary products and services required by the Town. Since the use of sole source procurement or a brand name specification is restrictive, it may be used only when the Purchasing Agent makes a written determination that there is only one practical source for the required product or service or that only the identified brand name item or items will satisfy the Town's needs and the Town Manager concurs with such finding. A requirement for a particular brand name does not justify sole source procurement if there is more than one potential vendor for that product or service.
- 2) Any request by a Using Agency that procurement be restricted to one potential contractor or be limited to a specific brand name shall be accompanied by an explanation as to why no other will be suitable or acceptable to meet the need.

3) A record of all sole source procurements and brand name specifications shall be maintained. Sole source records shall list each contractor's name; the amount and type of each contract; a listing of the products or services procured under each contract; and the effective dates of the contract. Brand name records shall list the brand name specification used, the number of suppliers solicited, the identity of these suppliers, the supplier awarded the contract, and the contract price. The Town Council Finance Committee shall be advised, in the next quarterly financial report, or sooner when appropriate, when the Purchasing Agent and the Town Manager have made a determination of brand name or sole source selection.

G. All purchases made and contracts executed by the Purchasing Agent shall be pursuant to a written or electronic purchase order from the head of the office, department or agency whose appropriation will be charged, and no contract or order shall be issued to any vendor unless and until the Director of Finance certifies that there is to the credit of such office, department or agency a sufficient unencumbered appropriation balance to pay for the supplies, materials, equipment or contractual services for which the contract or order is to be issued. This requirement may be deferred in the event that an emergency situation requires prompt action by the Purchasing Agent. This section will not prevent the use of open purchase orders or the use of a purchasing card program designed to consolidate many small transactions onto a single monthly invoice.

H. The responsible head of each department, office, institution, board, commission, agency or instrumentality of the Town shall certify, in writing, to the Purchasing Agent the names of such officers or employees who shall be exclusively authorized to sign purchase orders for such respective department, office, institution, board, commission, agency or instrumentality, and all requests for purchases shall be void unless executed by such certified officers or employees and approved by the Purchasing Agent.

I. **Professional Services.** As the procurement of professional services is generally exempt from the requirements of competitive sealed bidding, all contracts for professional services including legal services shall be obtained in accordance with the following guidelines; with the exception of the Town Attorney who shall be chosen in accordance with Article III Section 305 of the Town Charter. The Town Manager shall execute an agreement for professional services with the appointed Town Attorney.

1) A Request for Proposal (RFP) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) shall be written for all requests for professional services (except as described in subsection 3 below) in excess of \$10,000. The RFP or RFQ shall be written in such a manner as to describe the requirement to be met, without having the effect of exclusively requiring a

proprietary product or service, or procurement from a sole source, unless approved in accordance with the requirements of this Article.

- 2) When the scope of work is less precise, the preferred method of obtaining professional services shall be through the use of competitive negotiation. The process used for the solicitation of proposals shall assure that a reasonable and representative number of vendors are given an opportunity to compete. The Town Manager may limit the number of qualified vendors considered and may approve solicitation by invitation or public notice.
- 3) In accordance with Article III Section 305 (C) of the Town Charter, the Town Manager with the approval of the Town Council may obtain special legal services other than the Town Attorney. In obtaining those services the Town Manager may consider in addition to hourly rate, the reputation, character and integrity of the firm, the quality of performance on previous contracts and services to the Town, the ability of the firm to provide these services over an extended period, and the ability, capacity, experience, skill and judgment of the attorneys performing the service.
- 4) The award of a professional services contract shall be done in a manner designed to obtain the best possible value to the Town and with consideration of the factors listed in Subsection D of this Ordinance titled "Award of Contract".
- 5) Professional services are defined as:
 - a) work requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of study and which frequently require special credentialing, certification or licensure. Such areas include but are not limited to engineers, architects, appraisers, medical service providers, consultants, actuaries, banking services, legal, or;
 - b) work that is original and creative in character in a recognized field or artistic endeavor or requires special abilities and depends primarily on a person's invention, imagination, or creative talent. Such fields or artistic endeavor include but are not limited to the following: health & fitness, cultural arts, crafts, ice skating, specialty area instructors; and
 - c) work that requires consistent exercise of independent discretion and judgment to perform according to their own methods and without being subject to the control of the Town except as to the result of the work.

d) professional service providers shall not be dependent on the Town as their sole client, and must be clearly considered an independent contractor as opposed to an employee as defined by State and Federal laws, regulations, and court decisions.

6) On behalf of the Town, the Town Manager shall have the authority and responsibility to execute professional service contracts in excess of \$10,000.

J) **Invoice Schedule.** All contracts for goods, contractual services and professional services to which the Town is a party shall include a provision requiring the vendor or contractor to invoice the Town in a timely manner, pursuant to a schedule established by the Purchasing Agent.

K) **Custody of Contracts.** All contracts for goods, contractual services and professional services to which the Town is a party shall be kept in the office of the Purchasing Agent and shall be under the care and custody of the Purchasing Agent unless the Purchasing Agent has delegated the authority to take custody of such a contract to another Town official in accord with subsection B of this section. All other contracts to which the Town is a party or to which any officer or board, bureau or commission of the town, acting in behalf of the Town, is a party shall be kept on file in the Town Clerk's office and shall be under the care and custody of the Town Clerk. When any officer, board, bureau or commission of said Town shall require any original contract in which the Town is interested, as aforesaid, the contract shall not be taken from the Town Clerk's or Purchasing Agent's office until such officer, board, bureau or commission has given a receipt therefore, and a copy of such contract shall be filed with the Town Clerk or Purchasing Agent, as soon as the same can be made. The above provisions shall not apply when any such contract is needed for temporary use in the town building and is returned on the same day that it is taken.



**Town of Mansfield
Agenda Item Summary**

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *M.H.*
CC: Maria Capriola, Assistant to the Town Manager
Date: July 26, 2010
Re: Community/Campus Relations

Subject Matter/Background

I wish to report on a few items of interest to the Town Council:

- 1) At its meeting on July 19, 2010, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) approved the proposed zoning regulation revisions regarding the definitions of family and boarding house (see attached);
- 2) Mayor Paterson, Councilor Moran and I recently met with UConn President Phil Austin and Chief of Staff Ron Schurin to discuss various issues regarding town-university relations. The meeting was very positive and we will be able to debrief with you at Monday's council meeting.
- 3) On August 12, 2010, town, state and university staff will meet with representatives of the three large student apartment owners to discuss preparations for the fall semester. We generally meet with the landlord representatives at the start of each semester, to discuss items of mutual concern and to plan for the upcoming term.

Attachments

- 1) Draft Motion and proposed zoning regulation revisions regarding the definitions of family and boarding house

DRAFT MOTION: PZC Proposed Regulation revisions regarding definitions of Family and Boarding House

_____ MOVED, _____ seconded, to approve, effective August 15, 2010, revisions to Article IV Sections B.7 and B.25. of the Zoning Regulations regarding the definitions of Boarding House and Family. The revisions to the definition of Family, which had not been amended since 1972, are comprehensive and include criteria for five distinct groups that would qualify as a family for zoning occupancy purposes. These revisions update and refine provisions regarding blood relations, incorporate new provisions that authorize "functional families", incorporate new provisions that authorize living arrangements that qualify as "reasonable accommodation" and reduce the number of unrelated individuals who automatically qualify as a family from four (4) to three (3). The revision to the definition of Boarding House is needed to be consistent with the new definition of Family. The subject Zoning Regulation revisions, which are attached, were presented as 4/8/10 drafts at May 3, 2010 and June 7, 2010 Public Hearings. As a minor correction in category 5 of the definition of family, "pursuant" has been changed to "pursuit".

In approving these Zoning Regulation revisions, the Planning and Zoning Commission has reviewed and considered all Public Hearing testimony and communications including reports from the WINCOG Regional Planning Commission, Mansfield's Director of Planning and the Mansfield Town Attorney and communications from numerous citizens. The regulation amendments referenced above are adopted pursuant to the provisions and authority contained in Chapter 124 of the Connecticut General Statutes, including Section 8-2, which grants the Commission the following:

- the authority to regulate the location and use of buildings, structures and land for trade, industry, residence or other purposes;
- the mandate to consider the Plan of Conservation and Development prepared under Section 8-23;
- the mandate to promote health and the general welfare and to facilitate the adequate provision for water, sewerage and other public requirements;
- the mandate to give reasonable consideration as to the character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses and with a view to conserving the value of buildings and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout such municipality;

The subject regulation revisions have been adopted because they promote these statutory goals. Furthermore, the Commission has adopted the subject regulation revisions for the following reasons:

1. The subject regulation revisions promote goals, objectives and recommendations contained in Mansfield's 2006 Plan of Conservation and Development. In particular, the revisions will promote policy goal 4: "To strengthen and encourage a sense of neighborhood and community throughout Mansfield". The revisions also implement a specific action item contained in Mansfield's 2008 "A Unified Vision Strategic Plan" and the revisions are consistent with state and regional land use plans. The proposed reduction in the number of unrelated individuals that would automatically qualify as a family was recommended by Mansfield's Community Quality of Life Committee.
2. The subject regulation revisions promote goals and objectives contained in Article I of the Zoning Regulations and are designed to promote the public's health, welfare and safety. The revisions are consistent with the approval considerations contained in Article XIII Section D of the Zoning Regulations.
3. The subject regulation revisions have been found to be appropriately worded and legally acceptable to the Town Attorney (see 5/3/10 report from Attorney O'Brien).

4. The subject regulation revisions recognize and provide for significant changes that have occurred in family composition since 1972 and are intended to help address significant neighborhood impacts that have occurred in recent years in many of Mansfield's single family residential neighborhoods. The new regulations are designed to:
 - A. promote cohesiveness and reduce negative neighborhood impacts,
 - B. preserve the character of Mansfield's single family neighborhoods and protect property values,
 - C. enhance housing opportunities for families meeting the new definition and
 - D. reduce the increasing number of single family homes that are purchased for the primary purpose of renting to transient persons, primarily college students.

April 8, 2010 DRAFT
Proposed Revision to the Zoning Regulations:
Definitions of Family and Boarding House

(New provisions are underlined or otherwise indicated)

(Deletions are bracketed or otherwise indicated)

(Explanatory Notes are provided to assist with an understanding of the proposed revisions. These notes are not part of the proposed zoning revision)

1. Delete in its entirety existing Article IV, Section B.25 Definition of Family.

25. [Family. One or more persons who live together and maintain a common household, related by blood, marriage, or adoption. A family may also include domestic help and gratuitous guests. In addition, a family may include not more than three persons who are not related by blood, marriage or adoption.]

2. Add a new Article IV, Section B.25 Definition of Family to read as follows:
 25. Family: A person living alone, or any of the following groups living together as a single non-profit housekeeping unit and sharing common living, sleeping, cooking and eating facilities:
 1. Any number of people related by blood, marriage, civil union, adoption, foster care, guardianship or other duly authorized custodial relationship, gratuitous guests, domestic help and not more than one (1) additional unrelated person. (Related by blood shall include only persons having one of the following relationships with another individual(s) residing within the same dwelling unit: parents, grandparents, children, sisters, brothers, grandchildren, stepchildren, first cousins, aunts, uncles, nieces and nephews);
 2. Two (2) unrelated persons and any children related to either of them;
 3. A cumulative total of up to three (3) adult persons. More than three (3) adult persons may qualify as a family pursuant to other categories of this definition;
 4. Persons living together as a functional family as determined by the criteria listed below. For the purpose of enforcing these regulations, it shall be assumed (presumptive evidence) that more than three (3) persons living together, who do not qualify as a family based on categories one or two of this definition, do not constitute a functional family. To qualify as a functional family, the following criteria shall be met:
 - A. The occupants must share the entire dwelling unit and live and cook together as a single housekeeping unit. A unit in which the various occupants act as separate roomers may not be deemed to be occupied by a functional family;
 - B. The group shares expenses for food, rent or ownership costs, utilities and other household expenses;
 - C. The group is permanent and stable. Evidence of such permanency and stability may include:
 1. The presence of minor dependent children regularly residing in the household who are enrolled in local schools;
 2. Members of the household have the same address for purposes of voter's registration, driver's license, motor vehicle registration and filing of taxes;
 3. Members of the household are employed in the area;
 4. The household has been living together as a unit for a year or more whether in the current dwelling unit or other dwelling units;
 5. There is common ownership of furniture and appliances among the members of the household; and
 6. The group is not transient or temporary in nature;

April 8, 2010 DRAFT

Proposed Revision to the Zoning Regulations:
Definitions of Family and Boarding House

- D. Any other factor reasonably related to whether or not the group is the functional equivalent of a family.
 - E. Occupancy in a dormitory, fraternity, sorority, club, tourist home, emergency shelter, rooming or boarding house, group home or similar group occupancy shall not be construed to be a family. Many of these land uses are defined in Article IV, Section B.
5. Any group protected by the “reasonable accommodation” criteria of the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act or Fair Housing Act in that group members are the functional equivalent of a family sharing and in continued pursuant of their common commitment to rehabilitation or recovery from chronic drug or alcohol addiction or abuse, evidenced by substantial compliance with the following criteria, listed in order of importance:
- A. The residence facility is certified by the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services as congregate sober housing.
 - B. Collectively, the residents lease the entire residence rather than any particular room.
 - C. Residents may remain indefinitely, but are required to leave the residence if they use drugs or alcohol.
 - D. Residents share equally most household expenses, including rent, a single household budget, most household chores, including cleaning, shopping and cooking, and the work of maintaining the premises.
 - E. Weekly meetings are used to discuss household, financial, logistical or interpersonal issues, and household safety, including fire safety.
 - F. Residents prepare food and eat together on a frequent basis and there is shared food in the refrigerator.
26. Revise Article IV, Section B.7 Definition of Boarding House to read as follows:
- a. **Board House.** A dwelling unit in which more than [four 4] three (3) persons, not a family reside.

Explanatory Note: The proposed revisions to Mansfield’s definition of family update and refine existing provisions, particularly with respect to blood relations; incorporate new provisions that authorize “functional families”; incorporate new provisions that authorize legally recognized living arrangements that qualify as “reasonable accommodation”; and reduce the number of unrelated individuals who automatically qualify as a family from four (4) to three (3). The proposed revisions, which recognize and provide for significant changes that have occurred over the past fifty years in family composition, are designed to preserve the character of Mansfield’s single family residential neighborhoods, protect property values, reduce the increasing number of single family homes that are purchased for the primary purpose of renting to transient persons (primarily college students), enhancing housing opportunities for families meeting the new definition and in general to promote the public health, welfare and safety. All existing single family uses that comply with the existing definition of family, but would not comply with the proposed definition of family, would become non-conforming uses if the new definition is adopted. Legally established non-conforming uses can be continued, regardless of ownership changes, unless there has been a voluntary change in use or a clear intent to abandon rights to the pre-existing non-conforming use. The proposed revisions to Mansfield’s definition of Board House are necessary to be consistent with the proposed definition of family.

PAGE
BREAK



**Town of Mansfield
Agenda Item Summary**

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *MWH*
CC: Maria Capriola, Assistant to Town Manager
Date: July 26, 2010
Re: Community Water and Wastewater Issues

Subject Matter/Background

I have attached for your information excerpts from the Willimantic River Study, commissioned by the University of Connecticut. Staff members Rob Miller, Director of Health, and Greg Padick, Director of Planning, served on the technical advisory group (TAG) established to coordinate the project and to assist the consultant team. While the report sets out several recommendations, it is helpful to note that the recommendations "are aimed at reducing demand through the use of conservation measures rather than setting specific production cutbacks."

The complete report is available at:

http://www.facilities.uconn.edu/Willimantic_River_Study_Final_Report.pdf

Attached

- 1) Excerpts from Willimantic River Study

**REPORT OF THE
WILLIMANTIC RIVER STUDY**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT WATER SUPPLY WELLS
ON THE FISHERIES HABITAT OF THE WILLIMANTIC RIVER**

WILLIMANTIC RIVER WELLFIELD
MANSFIELD DEPOT, CONNECTICUT

June 17, 2010

MMI #1958-09



Prepared for:



University of Connecticut
Office of Environmental Policy
31 LeDoyt Road, U-3055
Storrs, CT 06269

Prepared by:

MILONE & MACBROOM, INC.
99 Realty Drive
Cheshire, Connecticut 06410
(203) 271-1773
www.miloneandmacbroom.com

In association with:

Environmental Research & Consulting, Inc.
126 Bancroft Road
Kennett Square, PA 19348
(610) 444-2875

Complete Report available at

https://www.facilities.uconn.edu/willimantic_River_Study_Final_Report.pdf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	viii
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Background	1-1
1.2 Study Objectives	1-2
1.3 Willimantic River Wellfield	1-3
2.0 HYDROLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY.....	2-1
2.1 Drainage Basins	2-1
2.2 Surface Water Hydrology	2-3
2.3 Surficial Geology	2-5
2.4 Bedrock Geology	2-9
2.5 Locations of Water Diversions	2-11
2.6 Climate, Precipitation, Evapotranspiration, and Recharge	2-12
3.0 DESCRIPTIONS OF PREVIOUS STUDIES	3-1
3.1 Mansfield Training School Wells	3-1
3.2 1960s Subsurface Investigations	3-2
3.3 Construction and Testing of Production Well UConn #1	3-3
3.4 Construction of Production Well UConn #2.....	3-4
3.5 Level A Mapping of the Willimantic River Wellfield.....	3-5
3.6 1999 Safe Yield Test of Production Well UConn #4 and Aquifer Pumping Test.....	3-7

4.0	INSTREAM FLOW STUDY	4-1
4.1	Background	4-1
4.2	Materials and Methods	4-3
4.2.1	Project Scoping	4-3
4.2.2	Selection of Target Species and Habitat Suitability Curves	4-5
4.2.3	Transect Selection	4-6
4.2.4	Hydraulic Data Collection	4-6
4.2.5	Hydrologic Data Collection	4-7
4.2.6	Hydraulic Simulation	4-9
4.2.7	Habitat Index Simulation	4-10
4.2.8	Habitat Time Series/UCUT Analysis	4-11
4.3	Results	4-13
4.3.1	Habitat Mapping and Transect Selection/Weighting	4-13
4.3.2	Hydraulic Data Collection and Simulation	4-15
4.3.3	Habitat Index Simulation	4-17
4.3.4	Habitat Time Series/UCUT Analysis	4-20
4.3.5	Hydrologic Dataset Analysis	4-26
4.4	Recommendations	4-29
5.0	SUPPLEMENTAL HYDROGEOLOGIC STUDY	5-1
5.1	Background	5-1
5.2	Monitoring Network	5-1
5.2.1	Selection of Observation Wells	5-3
5.2.2	Riverbed Piezometers	5-4
5.2.3	River Discharge Gaging Stations	5-6
5.3	Monitoring Events	5-6
5.3.1	Monitoring Event #1	5-6
5.3.2	Monitoring Event #2	5-13
5.3.3	Monitoring Event #3	5-20
5.4	Findings and Conclusions	5-23

6.0	UPDATE OF LEVEL A NUMERICAL MODEL	6-1
6.1	Numerical Methods.....	6-1
6.2	Previous Modeling Effort (2007 Level A Model)	6-2
6.3	Revised Model Characteristics	6-5
	6.3.1 Dimensions and Discretization	6-5
	6.3.2 Layers and Elevations.....	6-7
	6.3.3 Boundary Conditions.....	6-8
	6.3.4 Hydrologic Stresses, Sources, and Sinks.....	6-15
	6.3.5 Selection of Aquifer Parameters	6-16
6.4	Updated Model Construction and 1999 Pumping Test Calibration.....	6-20
6.5	Model Verification.....	6-29
	6.5.1 2008 Hydrogeologic Monitoring	6-29
	6.5.2 2009 Hydrogeologic Monitoring	6-32
7.0	PREDICTIVE SIMULATIONS	7-1
7.1	Timing of Pumping Impacts	7-1
7.2	Pumping Management Scenarios.....	7-5
8.0	FINDINGS	8-1
9.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	9-1
9.1	Recommendations for Demand-Based Water Conservation	9-1
9.2	Recommendations for Supply Management.....	9-4
10.0	REFERENCES	10-1

TABLES

Table 1-1	Summary of Well Specifications	1-5
Table 2-1	Statistical Flows of the Willimantic River.....	2-5
Table 2-2	Registered and Permitted Diversions Upstream of Willimantic River Wellfield	2-11
Table 2-3	Precipitation Summary, Connecticut Water Company Gage in Rockville, Connecticut	2-13
Table 2-4	Monthly Evapotranspiration Rates for Shetucket River Basin.....	2-14
Table 2-5	Recharge Rates	2-15
Table 4-1	Fishes Collected in the Willimantic River by the DEP, July 1994.....	4-3
Table 4-2	Definitions of Aquatic Mesohabitat Types.....	4-4
Table 4-3	Target Species and HSC Curves.....	4-5
Table 4-4	Bovee Substrate Codes Used in the Willimantic River Instream Flow Study.....	4-7
Table 4-5	Summary of Mesohabitats Within the Study Area	4-13
Table 4-6	Habitat Typing and Weighting of Transects.....	4-14
Table 4-7	Dates of Hydraulic Data Collection and Measured River Flows.....	4-15
Table 4-8	Flow Duration Statistics for Mean Daily Flow Data in Natural Dataset at Willimantic River Wellfield	4-16
Table 4-9	Weighted Usable Area (ft ² /1,000 ft) for Target Species.....	4-17
Table 4-10	Weighted Usable area (ft ² /1,000 ft) Over a Restricted Range of Flows (5-30 cfs).....	4-19
Table 4-11	Percent of Maximum WUA, Discharge, and Persistent Duration of Common, Critical, Rare, and Extreme Habitat Thresholds.....	4-25
Table 4-12	Recommended Willimantic River Drought Trigger Levels and Corresponding Drought Management Response	4-32
Table 4-13	Comparison of 2007 Drought Period Production Data With 2006 Production Data	4-33
Table 5-1	Observation Wells Utilized for Supplemental Hydrogeologic Monitoring.....	5-4
Table 5-2	Piezometers Installed for Supplemental Hydrogeologic Monitoring	5-5
Table 5-3	Data Collection During 2008 Monitoring.....	5-7
Table 5-4	8/21/2008 Temperature Monitoring.....	5-10
Table 5-5	2008 Discharge Measurements Performed by MMI.....	5-12
Table 5-6	Data Collection During September 2009 Monitoring.....	5-14
Table 5-7	9/23/2009 Temperature Monitoring.....	5-16
Table 5-8	Data Collection on November 12, 2009	5-20
Table 5-9	11/12/2009 Temperature Monitoring.....	5-22

TABLES (Continued)

Table 6-1	River Cell Conductance (ft ² /d)	6-14
Table 6-2	1999 Model Stress Period Setup	6-23
Table 6-3	Residuals Associated with Model of 1999 Pumping Test	6-28
Table 6-4	2008 Model Setup	6-31
Table 6-5	Residuals Associated with Model of 2008 Pumping Test	6-32
Table 6-6	2009 Model Setup	6-34
Table 6-7	Residuals Associated with Model of 2009 Pumping Tests.....	6-35
Table 7-1	Simulated Time to Reduction in Flow in the Willimantic River Due to Pumping	7-3
Table 7-2	Pumping Management Scenario Setup	7-5
Table 7-3	Summary of Cumulative Streamflow Loss for Pumping Management Scenarios	7-8

FIGURES

Cover Photo	Willimantic River Looking Upstream at USGS Gage at Wellfield	
Figure 1-1	Site Location Map: Willimantic River Wellfield	1-4
Figure 2-1	Location Map	2-2
Figure 2-2	Surficial Geology	2-7
Figure 2-3	Geologic Cross Section Through UConn Well #3	2-8
Figure 2-4	Bedrock Geology	2-10
Figure 4-1	Proportional Distribution of Mesohabitats Within the Study Area	4-14
Figure 4-2	Weighted Usable Area Curves for Target Species	4-18
Figure 4-3	Weighed Usable Area Over a Restricted Range of Flows (5-30 cfs)	4-20
Figure 5-1	Monitoring Network	5-2
Figure 5-2	9/23/2009 Temperature Profile Along Willimantic River Thalweg	5-19
Figure 6-1	Model Domain	6-6
Figure 6-2	Boundary Conditions	6-9
Figure 6-3	Hydraulic Conductivity	6-19
Figure 6-4	Simulated Heads in Layer 2, 8/19/1999	6-25
Figure 6-5	Simulated Heads in Layer 2, 8/23/1999	6-26
Figure 6-6	Simulated Heads in Layer 2, 8/28/1999	6-27
Figure 7-1	Existing and Potential Well Locations Used in Predictive Simulations	7-2
Figure 7-2	Cumulative Streamflow Loss Under Simulated Pumping Management Scenarios	7-7

APPENDED FIGURES

Appended Figure 1 Reach Location Map

APPENDICES

Appendix A	PHABSIM Input and UCUT Curves
Appendix B	Supporting Documentation for Conversion of Mean Daily Flows at Coventry to Mean Daily Flows Above Wellfield
Appendix C	UConn Draft Drought Response Plan (August 2008)
Appendix D	2008 and 2009 Monitoring Data
Appendix E	Model Drawdown Curves
Appendix F	CD of Numerical Model Files
Appendix G	Discussion of Impoundments in Willimantic River Headwaters

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report could not have been completed without the significant efforts and contributions of many people and organizations. The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) provided valuable input and guided this project. Members of the TAG included the following:

- Dr. Amvrossios Bagtzoglou, University of Connecticut, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
- Mr. Thomas Callahan, University of Connecticut, former Vice President
- Mr. Jason Coite, University of Connecticut Office of Environmental Policy
- Ms. Virginia de Lima, United States Geological Survey
- Ms. Corrine Fitting, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, Aquifer Protection Program
- Ms. Lori Mathieu, Connecticut Department of Public Health, Drinking Water Section
- Mr. Daniel Meade, retired from Department of Environmental Protection
- Mr. Richard Miller, University of Connecticut Office of Environmental Policy
- Mr. Robert Miller, Eastern Highlands Health District
- Mr. Brian Murphy, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Fisheries Division
- Mr. Michael Pacholski, University of Connecticut, Facilities Department
- Mr. Gregory Padick, Town of Mansfield Planning Department
- Mr. Peter Pezanko, The Connecticut Water Company
- Ms. Meg Reich, Willimantic River Alliance
- Mr. Timothy Tussing, University of Connecticut, Facilities Department
- Dr. Glenn Warner, University of Connecticut, Institute of Water Resources
- Mr. Bruce Wittchen, Connecticut Office of Policy and Management

Special thanks are directed to Dr. Bagtzoglou and Dr. Warner for the use of an extra datalogger for monitoring in 2008 and Mr. Pezanko for his assistance in coordinating the three pumping tests conducted for this study.

The consultant team consisted of Milone & MacBroom, Inc. (MMI) with Environmental Research and Consulting (ERC) as a subconsultant. David Murphy, P.E. (MMI), Harold M. Brundage III (ERC), and Scott J. Bighinatti (MMI) conducted the bulk of data collection, analysis, modeling, and report drafting. James G. MacBroom, P.E. and Jeanine Armstrong Gouin, P.E. of MMI provided technical and managerial oversight. Shawn Goulet, Garrett Cavaiuolo, Edward Belinsky, and James Murac of MMI assisted with field data collection and survey.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Connecticut (the University) owns and operates two public water supply wellfields known as the Willimantic River Wellfield and the Fenton River Wellfield for provision of public water in the Storrs area of Mansfield, Connecticut. Ongoing concerns over the relationship between wellfield operations and instream flow diminution have led the University to study the two rivers associated with the wellfields. The subject study originated in the November 6, 2006 *Memorandum of Agreement* with the Connecticut Water Planning Council in which the University agreed to conduct a study to determine whether and, if so, how water withdrawals from the Willimantic River Wellfield affect the aquatic habitat of the Willimantic River in the vicinity of the wellfield.

The Willimantic River Wellfield is located upstream (north) of Route 44 and downstream of Merrow Road. The four Willimantic River Wellfield wells are registered with the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection for a maximum combined withdrawal of 2.3077 millions of gallons per day (3.57 cubic feet per second).

The specific objectives of this study were to:

- Develop relationships between instream flow and habitat in the Willimantic River for selected fish species
- Derive the relation between the magnitude and timing of ground water withdrawals on the stage and flow of water in the Willimantic River from Merrow Road to Mansfield Depot using existing data, new data collection, and mathematical simulation modeling
- Numerically model selected water-management scenarios to optimize water withdrawals while minimizing adverse impacts on river flow and instream habitat

The Willimantic River drainage basin encompasses approximately 225 square miles in Connecticut and a small part of Massachusetts. Discharge in the Willimantic River is affected upstream of the Willimantic River Wellfield by several registered and permitted diversions for public water supply and industry in addition to impoundments utilized for recreation and fire protection. The geology of the watershed in the vicinity of the wellfield was studied in depth by the University and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) in the late 1960s, and further research was performed at the wellfield during the Level A Aquifer Mapping fieldwork performed in the 1990s.

The Instream Flow Incremental Method (IFIM) was used to evaluate the potential effects of reductions in river flow associated with withdrawal of water at the Willimantic River Wellfield on the habitats of representative fish species in the Willimantic River. Target fish species included brook trout, brown trout, fallfish, and common shiner.

Simulation of river hydraulics and aquatic habitat was performed using computer models collectively known as Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM). The hydraulic simulation

models of PHABSIM are used to predict changes in depth, velocity, and wetted area at various river flows. The aquatic habitat simulation models generate a composite suitability function collectively referred to as Habitat Suitability Criteria (HSC) derived from curves representing the depth, velocity, and substrate preferences of selected target species/life stages. The aquatic habitat simulation models integrate the output of the hydraulic simulation models with the HSC to yield an estimate of habitat usability called weighted usable area (WUA).

Field data collection for the IFIM spanned 2008 and 2009. Aquatic habitat was mapped to determine the percentage of all significant mesohabitat types in the study area. Nine representative reaches of the significant mesohabitats were selected based on the aquatic habitat mapping, with representative transects selected within those reaches. Velocity, depth, substrate, cover, bed elevations, and water surface elevations were surveyed at each transect during five calibration discharges.

The USGS has operated a long-term real-time gaging station on the Willimantic River in Coventry since 1931. Flow statistics from this site have been published by the USGS. The 99% duration discharge of the Willimantic River (approximately equivalent to the 7Q10 discharge) is estimated to be 11 cubic feet per second at the subject wellfield. The published mean daily discharge values were modified to represent discharge at the Willimantic River Wellfield by correcting for water supply withdrawals, wastewater discharges, and drainage basin area. The lowest recorded mean daily discharge at the wellfield since 1958 is believed to be approximately 6.0 cubic feet per second during the prolonged drought of August 1999.

The PHABSIM output provided relationships between WUA and discharge for each target fish species. The mean daily streamflow dataset calculated for the wellfield and the WUA to discharge relationships for each target species were then used to perform habitat time-series and Uniform Continuous Under-Threshold (UCUT) analyses. These analyses evaluated the magnitude, frequency, and duration of various discharge-related habitat events for the target species. The results of the UCUT analysis are summarized in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1
Percent of Maximum WUA, Discharge, and Persistent
Duration of Common, Critical, Rare, and Extreme Habitat
Thresholds for Target Fish Community

Habitat Stressor Threshold	Parameter	Result
Common (Upper Subregion)	Habitat (% Max WUA)	44%
	Discharge (cfs)	27
	Persistent Duration (days)	19
Common (Lower Subregion)	Habitat (% Max WUA)	34% to 49%
	Discharge (cfs)	19
	Persistent Duration (days)	19
Critical	Habitat (% Max WUA)	28%
	Discharge (cfs)	15
	Persistent Duration (days)	13
Rare	Habitat (% Max WUA)	24%
	Discharge (cfs)	12
	Persistent Duration (days)	12
Extreme	Habitat (% Max WUA)	19%
	Discharge (cfs)	7.8
	Persistent Duration (days)	7

Note: cfs = cubic feet per second

The recommendations of this study are aimed at reducing demand through the use of conservation measures rather than setting specific production cutbacks. The results of the UCUT analyses were tied to the draft drought response plan of the University of Connecticut Water Supply Emergency Contingency Plan as shown in Table ES-2. The time lapse between each trigger level was found historically to be approximately four to six days. Future efforts will formally link these trigger thresholds to appropriate response and recovery guidelines.

Table ES-2
Recommended Willimantic River Drought Trigger Levels and
Corresponding Drought Management Response

Drought Response Stage	Willimantic River at Wellfield Trigger Discharge	Examples of Conservation Measures
Prepare for implementation of Stage IA	Discharge \leq 27 cfs	None / Preparation for Stage IA
Stage IA (Two potential triggers)	Discharge < 27 cfs for 19 or more days	Voluntary: Shorter showers, condensed washing loads, elimination of nonessential consumption, raise thermostats on centrally chilled buildings
	Discharge < 19 cfs	
Stage IB	Discharge < 15 cfs	
Stage II (Two potential triggers)	Discharge < 15 cfs for 13 or more days	Voluntary items above become mandatory and include (but are not limited to) the following mandatory items: No flushing of hydrants, pipes, or sewer lines; no vehicle fleet washing; no use of water for street sweeping; reduce irrigation by 50%; reduce operation of research equipment cooled with domestic water; import water needed for construction dust control; no pool filling; raise thermostats of centrally chilled buildings
	Discharge < 12 cfs	
Stage III (Two potential triggers)	Discharge < 12 cfs for 12 or more days	
	Discharge < 7.8 cfs	
Stage IV	Discharge < 7.8 cfs for 7 or more days	

A hydrogeologic study was performed to evaluate the effects of sustained pumping on the aquifer under various river discharges. The objective was to collect data during three different combinations of river flow regime (low to moderate, low to moderate, and low) and wellfield operation (low, moderate, and high). Each monitoring event consisted of a 72-hour constant-rate pumping test.

Data collection included water levels measured at existing monitoring wells and at 12 piezometers installed for the study and temperature monitoring at each piezometer and along the thalweg of the river. In addition, river flow was measured consistent with USGS methods at locations upstream of, downstream of, and at the USGS gaging station at the wellfield in order to determine if direct impacts to river discharge could be detected. Automatic dataloggers were

used to assist with data collection and were installed in one monitoring well and in four of the piezometers.

The drawdown of ground water due to the Willimantic River wells can cause the ground water table in the vicinity of the Willimantic River to fall below the river water surface and, in some locations, the riverbed. In these cases, water will infiltrate from the riverbed into the ground water system (i.e., induced infiltration). The piezometer and temperature data provided an estimate of the area of influence of the wellfield, which is believed to extend from slightly south of the wellfield and along the stratified drift aquifer to the northwest into Coventry.

The Willimantic River in the vicinity of the Willimantic River Wellfield is a complex system that naturally has gaining and losing reaches due to the surrounding geology. A numerical model was originally constructed using the USGS program MODFLOW-2000 for the vicinity of the Willimantic River Wellfield during the Level A Aquifer Protection Area Study. The Level A model was updated in this study to more precisely model the Willimantic River and its interactions with the underlying aquifer. A pumping test conducted in 1999 and the three monitoring events performed during the hydrogeologic study herein were used to calibrate and verify the updated model.

The updated numerical model was used to simulate the timing and magnitude of pumping on the stage and discharge in the Willimantic River under various management scenarios. First, the four existing production wells and eight theoretical production well locations within the model area were simulated to determine the timing of pumping impacts. The model output suggests that the Willimantic River will have a slightly delayed response to pumping with reductions of discharge in the Willimantic River occurring as soon as nine hours after pumping begins for wells close to the river.

The existing wells and several of the theoretical wells were then simulated under 11 pumping management scenarios to determine if withdrawals can be managed to minimize adverse habitat impacts while meeting water supply demands. The model output for the management scenarios suggests that while there are combinations of wellfield withdrawals that will provide lower impact overall to instream flow through the model area the difference in river flow reduction between the existing wellfield operation and the best modeled condition is a reduction of only 0.31 cubic feet per second. It is believed that water conservation measures are more cost effective than constructing and permitting new water supply wells.

The formal recommendations of this study are divided into Demand-Based Water Conservation recommendations and Supply Management recommendations. Recommendations for Demand-Based Water Conservation include:

1. Incorporate the trigger discharges into the Drought Response Plan. Discharges measured by the USGS at the Merrow Road gaging station will be used to determine when triggers are met. The precise methodology that the University will use to activate and deactivate conservation measures will be determined outside of this study, such as in the proposed

Willimantic River Wellfield – Fenton River Wellfield Management Plan. These triggers should be revisited as appropriate when changes in supply occur.

2. Incorporate mandatory conservation measures for both on- and off-campus users, including residential, municipal, and commercial customers; and Connecticut Department of Corrections facilities.

Recommendations for Supply Management include:

1. Develop a combined Willimantic River Wellfield – Fenton River Wellfield Management Plan to manage the University's water supplies. This document should include a discussion of how the University will correlate upstream discharges to the discharge triggers for protection of fisheries habitat, a formal update to the Drought Response Plan, authorization for limited but occasional use of the Fenton River Wellfield when it would otherwise be shut down, and available supply versus system demand calculations on a monthly basis throughout the calendar year.
2. Complete the design and construction of the Reclaimed Water Facility.
3. After the Reclaimed Water Facility is operational, the University should ensure that the increment of water freed from nonpotable usage (central utility plant and athletic fields) will be partially allocated to instream needs as well as new potable demands that may arise in the future in an equitable manner.
4. Consider future ground water supplies downstream of the Willimantic River Wellfield in a location where instream flows would be higher than they are at the existing wellfield, and/or fish habitats would be less sensitive to flow reductions. If a new supply were to be developed, the most logical use relative to protection of instream flows in the Willimantic River would be to utilize the new source(s) to reduce stress on the Willimantic River habitat near the Willimantic River Wellfield.
5. Pursue interconnections with the Connecticut Water Company's Northern Region/Western System and Windham Water Works, which the University could utilize for supply during drought periods.
6. Consider provision of short-term or pulsed releases from the Staffordville Reservoir, Crystal Lake, and/or State Line Pond. This will require cooperation with the dam owners and the parties that control the impoundments and the dam outlet works.

1. Key
Part of next
H2O
supply plan
updates

PAGE
BREAK



**Town of Mansfield
Agenda Item Summary**

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *M.H.*
CC: Maria Capriola, Assistant to Town Manager; Fred Baruzzi, Superintendent of Schools; Gregory Padick, Director of Planning; William Hammon, Director of Facilities Management
Date: July 26, 2010
Re: School Building Project

Subject Matter/Background

I have added this item to the agenda to provide council and staff with an opportunity to debrief your recent work session regarding the school building project, and to plan for your next work session on this topic.

As noted in the minutes of the July 15th meeting, by consensus the Town Council has agreed not to add the School Building Project to the November 2010 ballot but to instead continue to review the options and see how local and state budgetary projections develop. However, I think that it would be important for all involved for the council to set a timeframe for its decision-making process, including a decision to wait on initiating a project. We should also identify the major subjects and issues that you would like to review to enable you to make a decision on the project. Subjects that I believe are relevant for the council's review include: a session with the architects regarding the methodology, choices and priorities in preparing schematics for options D and E; a review of the town's financial capacity, revenue and expenditure forecasts, debt service projections and anticipated capital improvement program needs; and additional discussion regarding the siting of any new schools and the potential re-use of existing facilities if new schools are constructed.

I noted the following action items from the July 15th workshop:

- 1) Provide list of critical repairs and maintenance that we anticipate will be necessary over the next 1-5 yrs;
- 2) Provide list of critical repairs and maintenance that we anticipate will be necessary over the next 6-10 yrs;
- 3) Project architects to conduct a presentation to council to review methodology, choices and priorities in preparing schematics for options E and D;
- 4) Provide revised version of Option E, to reduce MMS work to work outlined in Option A; PreK-4 scope to remain as originally outlined for Option E;

- 5) Conduct an additional discussion regarding Town's fiscal capacity, including revenue and expenditure forecasts, debt service projections and anticipated capital improvement program needs;
- 6) The MBOE to discuss whether it would make sense to split the middle school and elementary components of the project;
- 7) Proceed with siting analysis; and
- 8) Schedule next council workshop, to include opportunity for public comment.

Please let me know if you concur with the suggestion to set a target for your decision-making process as well as the subjects that you would need to review in more detail to make a decision on the proposed project. Also, please inform me if you have other suggested action items for the next council workshop regarding this subject.



**Town of Mansfield
Agenda Item Summary**

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *MWH*
CC: Maria Capriola, Assistant to Town Manager; James Kodzis, Resident State Trooper Sergeant
Date: July 26, 2010
Re: Proclamation in Recognition of Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office

Subject Matter/Background

This past year in the Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office has been marked by many notable accomplishments. I propose the attached proclamation be issued by the Town Council in recognition of the fine work accomplished by our state troopers and police officers.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Council authorize Mayor Paterson to issue the attached proclamation.

If the Town Council concurs with this recommendation, the following motion is in order:

Move, effective July 26, 2010 to authorize the Mayor to issue the attached Proclamation in Recognition of Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office.

Attached

- 1) Proclamation in Honor of Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office



Town of Mansfield

Proclamation in Recognition of Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office

Whereas, the state troopers and police officers of the Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office are responsible for the preservation of public order, dedicated to the impartial enforcement of town ordinances and state statues, and tasked with the protection of life and property as well as addressing quality of life issues in town; and

Whereas, the Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office is to be commended for its assistance in the promotion of positive community-campus relations, including its participation in the activities of the Mansfield Community Campus Partnership and its attention to unsanctioned off-campus functions and other problematic off-campus behavior; and

Whereas, over the past year the Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office has successfully executed an aggressive campaign targeting narcotics related offenses in Mansfield; and

Whereas, in partnership with other local and state agencies the Mansfield Resident State Trooper's Office has continued its proactive enforcement of town and state liquor laws to promote public health and safety, particularly for our youth; and

Whereas, over the past year several of the state troopers assigned to Mansfield have received commendations, awards and promotions for meritorious service to our community and the State of Connecticut:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Mansfield Town Council, on behalf of the community, does hereby express its appreciation and gratitude to the state troopers and police officers of the Mansfield Resident State Trooper Office for their outstanding service to the community.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand and caused the seal of the Town of Mansfield to be affixed on this 26th day of July in the year 2010.

Elizabeth C. Paterson
Mayor, Town of Mansfield



**Town of Mansfield
Agenda Item Summary**

To: Town Council
From: Matt Hart, Town Manager *MWH*
CC: Maria Capriola, Assistant to Town Manager; Dennis O'Brien, Town Attorney;
 Claire Twerdy, Judge of Probate
Date: July 26, 2010
Re: Memorandum of Agreement, Tolland-Mansfield Probate District

Subject Matter/Background

As you will recall, pursuant to Public Act 09-114 the State of Connecticut has adopted a plan to consolidate the number of probate court districts from 117 to 54. The plan is effective on January 5, 2011 and creates a new consolidated probate court district number 25 that is comprised of the towns of Coventry, Mansfield, Tolland and Willington.

Earlier this year, the chief executive officers of the district towns and the two sitting probate judges reviewed the process and the various issues involved in establishing the new district, including the location of the new court. The Mansfield and Tolland municipal buildings were the only viable locations and, after a thorough review, we collectively determined that the Tolland location was best suited for the needs of the district court.

I suggested to my colleagues that we memorialize the primary terms of the consolidation and the operations of the district court in the form of a memorandum of agreement (MOA). I asked Town Attorney Dennis O'Brien to prepare an initial draft of the agreement, which was deemed acceptable by the CEO's with some minor revisions. The two sitting probate judges were also provided an opportunity to review and comment on the draft, and their comments were incorporated into the final version.

I am now seeking your authorization to execute the proposed MOA, which shall run for an initial term of four years and may be extended for subsequent four-year terms. Importantly, however, paragraph 6 of the agreement does require the parties to review court operations every four years and to determine whether any amendments to the MOA would be in order. The towns of Coventry and Willington have endorsed the MOA, and the Tolland Town Council is expected to act on the proposal at its meeting on July 27, 2010.

Financial Impact

The operating costs for the district court shall be allocated to the member towns *pro rata*, on the basis of their respective grand list. This methodology is set out under state

statute (C.G.S. §45a-8) and has served as the basis for allocating costs for the Mansfield-Coventry Probate Court. It is important to note that municipalities are not responsible for personnel expenditures associated with the probate court. The CEO's are projecting an additional one-time expenditure of \$1,200-\$1,500 per town to fund the renovation of the facility in Tolland. Mansfield has budgeted \$5,230 for probate court expenses for FY 2010/11, which is premised upon six months in the existing facility and six months in the new court as well as the one-time renovation costs. For the next few years, we estimate that Mansfield's contribution to the district will average approximately \$5,000 per year.

Legal Review

The MOA has been prepared and reviewed by the Town Attorney.

Recommendation

I recommend that the Town Council authorize me to execute the proposed MOA governing the operations of the new probate district. If the Town Council concurs with this recommendation, the following motion is in order:

Move, effective July 26, 2010, to authorize the Town Manager to execute the Memorandum of Agreement regarding the Tolland-Mansfield Probate District, for an initial term to commence on January 5, 2011 and to expire on January 5, 2015, which term may be extended for another period of four years at each such fourth anniversary, in accordance with paragraph 6 of the agreement.

Attachments

- 1) Proposed memorandum of agreement

**MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
TOLLAND-MANSFIELD PROBATE DISTRICT**

Whereas, the State of Connecticut has enacted legislation, codified as Public Act 09-114 (hereinafter "Act"), reducing the number of Probate Court Districts in the State of Connecticut from 117 to 54, effective on January 5, 2011; **and**

Whereas, as of its effective date, said Act creates a new, consolidated Probate Court District ("the new District"), State of Connecticut Probate District Number 25, that encompasses and will provide services to the Towns of Coventry, Mansfield, Tolland and Willington ("the Towns"); **and**

Whereas, said Towns are required to report their recommendations regarding the name and site of the consolidated court to the Office of the Probate Court Administrator; **and**

Whereas, Mansfield and Tolland are the largest towns in the new District with the weightiest probate court workloads, and each town is currently the site of a local district probate court, including Coventry in the present District of Mansfield, and Willington in the existing District of Tolland; **and**

Whereas, the current Judges of Probate and Chief Executive Officers of the four towns situated in the new District have participated in meetings convened by them to address, *inter alia*, the issues of naming the District and identifying the location of the Court;

Whereas, after a thorough review and investigation of sites by said public officials and consultation with the Probate Court Administrator of the State of Connecticut, neither of the existing court locations is adequate to host the new District Number 25 Probate Court; **and**

Whereas, the Town of Tolland has identified another location within its municipal building that is available and sufficient with minor renovation to host the new District Court.

WHEREFORE, subject to approval of the Office of the Probate Court Administrator, the undersigned municipal Chief Executive Officers as authorized by their legislative bodies agree to the following:

1. The name of the District shall be the Tolland-Mansfield Probate District; **and**
2. The District Court will be located in the Tolland Town Hall and be opened and staffed as required by the Probate Court system.
3. The costs of operating the court shall be allocated among the Towns, **pro rata**, on the basis of their respective grand lists. On an annual basis, as it is estimated that the Towns will need to collectively contribute \$16,259.00 to the consolidated costs of the Court. The pro rata cost shall be updated annually and agreed to by the parties. Based on the respective grand lists, the current allocation rate is Tolland – 34.6%; Mansfield – 26.43%; Coventry – 26.10% and

Willington – 12.87%. Consequently, the estimated payment in Fiscal Year 2011/2012 is \$5,625 for Tolland, \$4,297 for Mansfield, \$4,243 for Coventry and \$2,092 for Willington.

4. The host town shall include the probate court as a program in the host town's annual municipal operating budget, with revenues derived from the pro rata contributions from the member towns. The host town shall bill the other member towns on annual basis and pay the budgeted expenses on behalf of the probate court from the court's program budget.
5. It is estimated that there will be a one time cost of \$1,250-\$1,500 per town to fund the renovation of the facility in Tolland.
6. The initial term of this Agreement shall commence on January 5, 2011 and shall terminate on the fourth anniversary of such date. The term of this Agreement shall be automatically extended for another period of four years at each such fourth anniversary, except that no later than 180 days prior to the end of the term, all parties hereto and the presiding judge shall undertake a thorough and expeditious review of court operations and this Agreement, a process which may conclude in the renegotiation of this Agreement and amendment, change or alteration of any of its provisions in the best interests of the towns and their residents. Any such amendment, change or alteration shall be implemented at the beginning of the next four year term. To be effective, any such amendment, change or alteration must gain the official support of three of the four parties to this Agreement, and be accomplished in conformity with paragraph 7 of this Agreement, below.
7. This Agreement shall not be altered, changed or amended except for formal written amendment approved by the legislative bodies and duly executed by the parties hereto. The performance by the parties of their respective obligations under this Agreement shall not operate in any way as a waiver of non-compliance or breach by the other parties.

So Agreed:

Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager
Town of Mansfield
Date: _____

Steven R. Werbner
Town Manager
Town of Tolland
Date: _____

John Elsesser
Town Manager
Town of Coventry
Date: _____

Christina B. Mailhos
First Selectman
Town of Willington
Date: _____

TOWN OF MANSFIELD
Energy Education Team
Minutes of the Meeting
May 25, 2010

Present: Britton (chair), Williams, Nash, Millius, Walton (staff), Hoyle, Spurlock

The meeting began at 7:06 p.m.

The minutes from the April 20, 2010 meeting were reviewed and accepted.

Walton reported that at the April 29, 2010 sustainability committee meeting, Mark Paquette, from the Windham Region Council of Government (WINCOG), briefed the committee on their effort to create a 22 town district that encompasses most of the Quinebaug-Shetucket corridor towns (the "last green valley"). By designating a district, federal funds will be readily available for regional planning projects. A UConn student intern will be working for the Town this summer to add 2008-2009 data to the small town carbon calculator. At the next sustainability committee meeting, Wednesday, May 26, 2010, Dr. Richard Parnas will brief the committee on UConn's biodiesel production.

Hoyle reported that Governor Rell vetoed the renewable energy bill.

Walton sent a letter to the participants of the energy challenge reminding them to send in their May and June 2009 and 2010 electricity bills, and asking them to sign up for clean energy.

Walton reported that the Town has earned three (almost four) kilowatts of solar panels. She is working with Connecticut Innovations to see if the additional panels can be added to the existing 3 kilowatt system on EO Smith's rooftop. EO Smith staff has expressed an interest in having another ribbon-cutting once the installation is complete. 7.4% of (416) Mansfield ratepayers are signed up for CleanEnergyOptions. The Town has earned 482 points.

It was decided that the team will focus on getting 18 more CleanEnergyOptions sign ups to reach 500 points, which will award another 1 kilowatt system to the Town. Staff will advertise in the local papers, ask the EO Smith Cool-It Team to promote 18 more sign-ups within the school community and look into having a table display at the June library book sale and the farmer's market. The display will be updated. The other immediate focus is to increase the number of home energy audits by using the strategies that the Woodbridge Energy Task Force has used through an agreement with Competitive Resources, Inc. Walton will work on this arrangement.

Nash reported that the Mansfield Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation is still interested in solar electric systems, even though incentive money is no longer available. Britton suggested that the nursing center consider solar thermal, as there is money for commercial systems. Nash will direct the Mansfield Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation to Ed Austin, chair of the Juniper Hill Village board of directors. Through a stimulus grant, Juniper Hill Village will be putting a solar

system on their roof. Nash will also refer Mansfield Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation administrators to Dan Britton for more information.

The next meeting is schedule for June 15, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Virginia Walton
Recycling/Refuse Coordinator

Cc: Lon R. Hultgren, Director of Public Works, Members, file, Town Manager, Town Clerk



COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

June 23, 2010 @ 7:00 p.m.

Special Meeting
Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Toni Moran called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Present: Meredith Lindsey, Toni Moran, Bill Ryan

2. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS

No comments

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Lindsey moved and Mr. Ryan to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2010 meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

4. DISCUSSION OF MANSFIELD AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE CHARGE

Chair of the Agriculture Committee Al Cyr and Staff member Jennifer Kaufman discussed the proposed changes to the Committee's charge noting that the proposed charge now reflects the current activities of the Committee. Mr. Cyr described some of the activities the Committee has been involved with including monitoring the farm plans for Town owned properties, identifying farm land in the Town and advising the PZC on potential zoning changes. The goal of the Committee is to advocate for farm preservation and viability.

Mr. Cyr agreed to present to the Agricultural Committee the addition of the oversight of use agreements for Town owned properties to the charge. He will email the revised charge to the members of the Committee on Committees.

Mr. Ryan moved and Ms. Lindsey seconded to accept the proposed changes, as amended and discussed, to the charge for the Agricultural Committee and to recommend its approval to the Town Council. Motion passed unanimously.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL SERVICE COMMITTEES

Members discussed the concept of establishing an oversight committee comprised of members representing the various constituents served by the Human Services Department. Committee members will reflect on the draft charge and make it an item of business at the next meeting.

6. REVIEW OF COMMITTEE FOLLOW UPS

Ms. Lindsey reported that she has contacted the Communication Department at UConn and has, to date, been unable to find any staff person willing to serve. Ms. Lindsey has spoken to John Reisen who is interested in serving on the Community Quality of Life Committee. Ms. Moran, who has recently been appointed as chair of that Committee will call Mr. Reisen. Ms. Moran will call Anne Smith to see if there are any League of Women Voter members who might be interested in serving on a committee. Mr. Ryan reported he has made numerous calls to Joshua Trust members regarding the Open Space Preservation Committee, but has had no luck. He will keep trying. The Town Clerk will ask Jennifer Kaufman if there is a member of the Parks Advisory Committee willing to serve on the Open Space Preservation Committee and will ask Mike Nintean to contact member of the Building Board of Appeals to ascertain their interest in continuing to serve. Ms.

Lindsey will ask John Hankins and Ms. Moran will contact Vicki Wetherall and Meg Reich to see if they have any suggestions for the Open Space Preservation Committee.

7. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Committee members agreed to present the following nominations to the Council:
Katherine Paulhus will be recommended for reappoint as a member of the Mansfield Advocates of Children.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Members of the Conservation Commission and Director of Planning Greg Padick will be invited to the July 19th meeting to discuss the Town Council's policy on communicating with outside agencies.
The Human Service Advisory Committee will be discussed at the next meeting

9. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Ryan moved and Ms. Lindsey seconded to adjourn the meeting.
Motion passed unanimously.

Mary Stanton, Town Clerk

MANSFIELD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS –REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
JUNE 9, 2010

Chairman Pellegrine called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building.

Present: Members – Fraenkel, Pellegrine, Singer-Bansal, Wright

Alternate – Accorsi, Clauson, Gotch

Absent: Members – Katz

RAY DUPLISSIE – 7:00 PM

To hear comments on the application of Ray Duplissie for a Special Exception of Art IX, Sec C.2.b to construct a 17'4" x 30' deck onto a non-conforming residence, at 527 Middle Tpk.

Mr. Duplissie represented the homeowner, William M. Paulson. Mr. Duplissie has redesigned the deck, showing the removal of 32" from the front so that it does not extend past the porch. Railings and an enclosure underneath the deck will be added. Access will be by french doors off the porch.

A Neighborhood Opinion Sheet was received showing no objections from abutters.

BUSINESS MEETING

Fraenkel made a motion to approve the application of Ray Duplissie for a Special Exception of Art IX, Sec C.2.b to construct a 17'4" x 30' deck onto a non-conforming residence, at 527 Middle Tpk, as shown on submitted plan, seconded by Accorsi.

Alternate Clauson acted as a voting member of the Zoning Board of Appeals for this hearing.

In favor of approving application: Clauson, Fraenkel, Singer-Bansal, Wright

Reasons for approving application:

- does not adversely affect neighborhood
- deck enhances property

Opposed to approving application: Pellegrine

Reasons for opposing application:

- deck was built without proper approval from town

Application was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 14, 2010 AND MAY 12, 2010

Wright moved to approve the minutes of April 14, 2010 as presented, seconded by Accorsi. All in favor.

Accorsi moved to approve the minutes of May 12, 2010 as presented, seconded by Singer-Bansal. All in favor.

STEPHEN BAKER – 7:30 PM

To hear comments on the application of Stephen Baker for a Special Exception of Art IX, Sec D.3.a to construct a 425 sq ft porch with staircase access onto an existing residence within a Flood Hazard Zone, at 109 Thornbush Rd.

Mr. Baker submitted proposed plan to raise the house up above flood level, adding on a porch with staircase. He has been working with FEMA and Deputy Fire Marshall, John Jackman to draw up a plan and obtain a grant in order to resolve his flooding problems.

A Neighborhood Opinion Sheet, showing no objections and certified receipts were received.

BUSINESS MEETING

Fraenkel moved to approve the application of Stephen Baker for a Special Exception of Art IX, Sec D.3.a to construct a 425 sq ft porch with staircase access onto an existing residence within a Flood Hazard Zone, at 109 Thornbush Rd, as shown on submitted plan.

Alternates Accorsi & Gotch acted as voting members of the Zoning Board of Appeals for this hearing.

In favor of approving application: Accorsi, Fraenkel, Gotch, Pellegrine, Wright

Reasons for approval:

- renovations will enhance safety

- no negative impact on neighborhood
- town services won't be needed as often to deal with flooding problems

Application was unanimously approved.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Accorsi, Secretary

**Town of Mansfield
Public Safety Committee
April 14, 2010
Bergin Correctional Institution**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Barberet, R. Blicher, G. Cole, D. Keane, C. Lary, C. Paulhus, R. Pellegrine, Warden M. Rinaldi, Lt. W. Solenski, W. Stauder (Chair), S. Thomas
Staff Present: Maria Capriola (Town), Deputy Warden Michael Davis (DOC), Dorothy Durst (DOC), Don Cyr (DOC), Cptn. Chris Corey (DOC)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:00pm

II. Minutes of 1/13/10

The minutes of 1/13/10 were approved unanimously as presented.

III. Warden's Report and Discussion

Warden Rinaldi provided an update on the population. Currently there are 1,027 inmates and some of the overflow unit has reopened. Recreational hours have been extended as daylight hours have increased.

Bergin staff and the Town of Mansfield Department of Public Works have been coordinating roadside litter pick-up crews. Bergin staff attended the Friends of the Mansfield Library book sale and was able to obtain books for the inmates.

Ms. Durst provided an update on school enrollment and programming. Bergin continues to lead the state in GEDs awarded to inmates. Numerous programs and classes are being offered such as vocational training (horticulture, culinary arts, business education), re-entry programs, domestic violence training (mandated if an inmate has had a domestic violence offense within the past five years), parenting, English as a second language, etc.

IV. Chairperson's Report

None.

V. Communications

Letter to Mansfield residents re: Community Notification System. Ms. Capriola and Warden Rinaldi provided information on the phone notification list/system. Committee members suggested that it might be helpful to consider the use of notification technology that can provide information to cell and land lines. The current technology only provides notification through land lines.

VI. Public Comment

None.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:35pm. Following adjournment, members took a tour of dormitory facilities, the job center, programming space, and other areas of Bergin.

Respectfully Submitted,
Maria Capriola, M.P.A.
Assistant to Town Manager

ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting of Tuesday, 01 June 2010
Mansfield Community Center (MCC) Conference Room

MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:05p by Jay Ames. AAC members present: Jay Ames, Kim Bova, Tom Bruhn, Scott Lehmann, Blanche Serban. AAC members absent: none. Others present: René Raucci, Jay O'Keefe (staff).

2. René Raucci showed a portfolio of large watercolors, largely of geometric designs, which she would like to exhibit. The AAC agreed that the work was suitable for exhibit at the MCC. Ms. Raucci will need to submit an application {which she did before leaving the MCC} and to make a selection of her work, as there is not enough space to display it all.

{The hallway and lower sitting room exhibit areas will not be free until 4/15/11, and the AAC agreed later in the meeting to reserve the 4/15/11–5/31/11 period for another school art exhibit. Ms. Raucci could have the upper sitting room display area for two quarters, starting 9/1/10, or the hallways and sitting room areas from 6/1/11 to 8/15/11. Jay A. will contact her.}

3. The minutes of the 04 May 2010 meeting (and, belatedly, of the 02 February 2010 meeting) were approved as written.

4. Blanche submitted for review photos of four additional works for her upcoming exhibit at the Mansfield Library. The AAC had no concerns about their suitability for that venue.

5. Correspondence.

- a. Jay O'K distributed notices regarding (i) a sculpture park in Des Moines (IA), which the AAC might want to suggest emulating on a smaller scale in the new Storrs Center development, and (ii) an art contest for children sponsored by the Connecticut Recreation and Parks Association, for which Mansfield Parks and Rec will handle submissions by Mansfield children "express[ing] their idea of play."
- b. Marcel Defresne, a photojournalist at UConn, has applied to exhibit 18x20 (and larger) photographic prints of Kenyan subjects. After some discussion the AAC agreed that the proposed show appeared to be designed primarily to highlight the work of Friends of Kenya, a group including Mansfield residents, and that the Mansfield Community Center administration, rather than the Arts Advisory Committee, should – as in the case of the upcoming DCF Heart exhibit – decide whether to sponsor it.
- c. Jay A. reported that Michael Allison will exhibit his colored wooden bowl-sculpture in the display cases in the Fall quarter.

6. MCC exhibit schedule.

Exhibit Period	Entry cases		Sitting room		Hallway	
	Double-sided	Shelves	Upper (5)	Lower (3)	Long (5)	Short (2)
01 Jun – 14 Aug	<i>Ballard Institute</i> (puppets)		<i>Nancy Bergeron</i> (paintings)			
15 Aug – 14 Oct	<i>Festival on the Green</i> (advertising, art show winners)		<i>MCC cleaning & painting 8/22-8/28</i>			
15 Oct – 14 Jan	<i>Michael Allison</i> (colored wooden bowls)		<i>Rene Raucci</i> 9/1-4/15? (watercolors)	<i>DCF Heart Exhibit 10/1 – 12/31</i> (photos of children needing adoption)		
15 Jan – 14 Apr				<i>Martin Calverly</i> (New England photos)		
15 Apr – 31 May	<i>Mansfield School Art?</i>					
01 Jun – 15 Aug			<i>Rene Raucci?</i> (watercolors)			

6. Adjourned at 8:05p. Next meeting: 7:00p, Tuesday, 06 July 2010.

Scott Lehmann, Secretary, 02 June 2010; approved 06 July 2010.

Animal Control Activity Report

REPORT PERIOD 2009 / 2010

PERFORMANCE DATA	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	This FY to date	Last FY to date
Complaints investigated:														
phone calls	225	192	175	186	123	149	127	104	107	172	174	247	1981	2038
road calls	35	17	27	13	14	15	14	15	21	19	20	19	229	241
dog calls	123	80	68	87	47	53	50	56	53	79	89	140	925	903
cat calls	62	80	64	73	55	60	50	26	35	60	44	58	667	762
wildlife calls	17	9	14	3	6	8	4	5	3	4	10	17	100	102
Notices to license issued	10	7	10	19	17	15	5	7	18	17	11	5	141	92
Warnings to license issued	59	84	58	0	0	80	8	57	0	0	0	0	346	522
General warnings issued	18	2	4	9	3	5	5	3	5	4	1	4	61	48
Infractions issued	2	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	5	2	1	0	16	10
Notices to neuter issued	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	9	19
Dog bite quarantines	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	15
Dog strict confinement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cat bite quarantines	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Cat strict confinement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dogs on hand at start of month	5	5	6	4	5	2	2	1	1	1	4	2	38	44
Cats on hand at start of month	17	15	12	16	21	12	15	11	9	12	9	14	163	169
Impoundments	31	25	17	24	13	26	17	10	20	19	22	23	247	288
Dispositions:														
Owner redeemed	14	3	3	4	6	6	6	2	6	5	9	5	69	80
Sold as pets-dogs	8	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	2	26	28
Sold as pets-cats	9	16	6	10	12	14	12	5	7	9	5	8	113	146
Sold as pets-other	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	9	0
Total destroyed	1	6	3	3	6	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	30	28
Road kills taken for incineration	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	10	13
Euthanized as sick/unplaceable	1	6	2	2	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	20	15
Total dispositions	33	27	15	18	25	23	22	12	17	19	19	17	247	281
Dogs on hand at end of month	5	6	4	5	2	2	1	1	1	4	2	4	37	44
Cats on hand at end of month	15	12	16	21	12	15	11	9	12	9	14	18	164	175
Total fees collected	\$861	\$948	\$ 515	\$ 460	\$ 726	\$ 691	\$ 463	\$ 383	\$ 365	\$ 365	\$ 370	\$ 625	\$6,772	\$ 9,896

Scotland dogs FY 09/10 to date

7

NO. 0001

-116-

Jul. 6. 2010 11:48AM

Item #8



TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

July 22, 2010

Mr. Michael J. Pacholski
287 River Road
Willington, Connecticut 06279

Dear Mr. Pacholski:

On behalf of the Town of Mansfield, I would like to thank you for your service to the Four Corners Water and Sewer Advisory Committee. Your knowledge of the university's water and wastewater system was extremely valuable to the advisory committee and helped to move our project forward in a constructive manner.

We greatly appreciate your commitment to the greater Mansfield community and wish you all the best in a well-deserved retirement!

Sincerely,

Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

CC: Town Council
Four Corners Water and Sewer Advisory Committee
Barry Feldman, Chief Operating Officer, University of Connecticut

PAGE
BREAK

TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

Item #9



Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

July 19, 2010

Ms. Joan Buck
6 Sumner Drive
Mansfield, Connecticut 06268

Re: Appointment to Mansfield Conservation Commission

Joan
Dear ~~Ms. Buck~~:

I am pleased to appoint you to the Mansfield Conservation Commission as an alternate for an initial term to expire on August 31, 2013.

I trust that you will find the work of the Commission to be rewarding, and I greatly appreciate your willingness to serve our community.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions regarding your appointment.

Sincerely,

Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

Cc: ✓ Town Council
Mansfield Conservation Commission
Mary Stanton, Town Clerk

TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER



Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

July 13, 2010

Mr. Neil Facchinetti
6 Storrs Heights Road
Mansfield, CT 06268

Re: Appointment to Mansfield Conservation Commission

Dear Mr. Facchinetti:

I am pleased to appoint you to the Mansfield Conservation Commission as an alternate for an initial term to expire on August 31, 2013.

I trust that you will find the work of the Commission to be rewarding, and I greatly appreciate your willingness to serve our community.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions regarding your appointment.

Sincerely,

Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

Cc: Town Council
Mansfield Conservation Commission
Mary Stanton, Town Clerk

WARNING
DISTRICT MEETING - PUBLIC HEARING
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER 19
TOWNS OF ASHFORD, MANSFIELD AND WILLINGTON
AUGUST 3, 2010

The electors and citizens qualified to vote in town meetings of the Towns of Ashford, Mansfield and Willington are hereby warned that a public meeting of Regional School District Number 19 will be held at E.O. Smith High School, Library Media Center, in Mansfield, Connecticut on Tuesday, August 3, 2010 at 7:00 P.M. for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on the following recommendations of the Board of Education:

1. That \$2,167,000 be appropriated for costs of renovations and improvements to various athletic facilities of the District at E.O. Smith High School, contemplated to include renovation of the onsite athletic track, inner game field and exterior tennis/basketball courts, installation of a synthetic athletic field and installation of light fixture stanchions and related conduits and wiring, and which may include, to the extent of available funds, bleacher installation; for costs of related materials, equipment and improvements; and for costs of the financing of the project. The Regional School District 19 Building Committee is authorized to determine the scope and particulars of the project. The Regional School District 19 Building Committee is further authorized to reduce or modify the project scope, including without limitation the elimination of project components as necessary or desirable to complete the project within the appropriated amount, and the entire appropriation may be expended on the project as so reduced or modified. The appropriation may be spent for design, construction and installation costs, related improvements, repairs, equipment and materials, engineering and consultant fees, administrative costs, printing, legal fees, net interest on borrowings and other financing costs, and other expenses related to the project.

2. That \$2,167,000 bonds and temporary notes of the District be authorized to finance the appropriation.

3. That the Chairman of the District Board of Education and the District Treasurer, or such officer or body delegated by the Board, be authorized to require the District and its member towns to comply with applicable federal income tax requirements for tax-exempt bonds.

4. That the Chairman of the District Board of Education and the District Treasurer, or such officer or body delegated by the Board, be authorized to make representations and enter into written agreements for the benefit of holders of the bonds or notes to provide secondary market disclosure information.

5. That the Building Committee established by the District Board of Education for the project be authorized to contract with architects, engineers, contractors and others in the name and on behalf of the District with respect to the projects, following approval from the District Board of Education; to approve design and construction

expenditures for the projects; and to exercise such other powers as are necessary or appropriate to complete the projects. Committee members shall not receive any compensation for their services. Necessary expenses of the Committee shall be included in the cost of the projects. The records of the Committee shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Board of Education and shall be open to public inspection during normal business hours. Upon completion of the projects, the Committee shall make a complete report and accounting to the District Board of Education.

6. That the aforesaid bond and temporary note authorization be submitted to referendum vote by the electors and citizens qualified to vote in the towns of the District.

Dated at Mansfield, Connecticut this 26th day of July, 2010.

Francis Archambault, Chairman
Board of Education
Regional School District Number 19

DRAFT MOTION: PZC Proposed Regulation revisions regarding Political Signs

_____ MOVED, _____ seconded, to approve, effective August 15, 2010, revisions to Article X Section C.4.h.4. of the Zoning Regulations regarding political signs. The revisions will replace current standards for political signs with new provisions. The subject Zoning Regulation revisions, which are attached, were presented as 3/10/10 drafts at May 3, 2010 and June 7, 2010 Public Hearings.

In approving these Zoning Regulation revisions, the Planning and Zoning Commission has reviewed and considered all Public Hearing testimony and communications including reports from the WINCOG Regional Planning Commission, Mansfield's Director of Planning, Mansfield's Town Manager and the Mansfield Town Attorney. The regulation amendments referenced above are adopted pursuant to the provisions and authority contained in Chapter 124 of the Connecticut General Statutes, including Section 8-2, which grants the Commission the following:

- the authority to regulate the location and use of buildings, structures and land for trade, industry, residence or other purposes;
- the mandate to promote health and the general welfare and to give reasonable consideration as to the character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses and with a view to conserving the value of buildings and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout such municipality;

The subject regulation revisions have been adopted because they promote these statutory goals. Furthermore, the Commission has adopted the subject regulation revisions for the following reasons:

1. The subject regulation revisions are consistent with recommendations contained in local, state and regional land use plans.
2. The subject regulation revisions promote goals and objectives contained in Article I of the Zoning Regulations and are consistent with the approval considerations contained in Article XIII Section D of the Zoning Regulations.
3. The proposed revisions have been found to be appropriately worded and legally acceptable to the Town Attorney
4. The revisions address concerns raised by the American Civil Liberties Union of Connecticut regarding the regulation of political signs on private property.

March 10, 2010 DRAFT

**Proposed Revisions to Article X, Section C.4.h.4 of Mansfield's Zoning Regulations
Regarding Political Signs**

Proposed Zoning Regulation Revisions

Revise Article X, Section C.4.h.4 as follows:

1. Delete existing provisions.
2. Add the following new provisions:
 4. Political Signs

Subject to obtaining property owner approval, political signs on private property are authorized. Political signs also are authorized along street rights-of-way abutting private property subject to obtaining the abutting property owners approval. All political signs must be in compliance with the traffic safety criteria of Section C.7. of this Article.

Political signs shall not be located on public property or street rights-of-way abutting public property. To help reduce neighborhood impact and to help preserve Mansfield's scenic character, it is recommended that political signs be limited in size and number, be non-illuminated and be displayed for a limited period of time.

Explanatory Note:

The proposed Zoning Regulation amendment would eliminate current standards for political signs on private property which include restrictions on the number, size and period of time for display and limit the nature of a political sign. The proposed amendment retains an existing provision that prohibits political signs on public property but does authorize political signs along street rights-of-way provided abutting private property owners have granted permission. The proposed provision includes generic recommendations for political signs which are advisory and not mandatory. These recommendations are included to help reduce neighborhood impact and potential litter problems and to help preserve Mansfield's scenic character.

Town of Mansfield
Special Town Meeting
July 12, 2010
Mansfield Middle School Auditorium

Town Clerk Mary Stanton called the Special Town Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Auditorium of the Mansfield Middle School and read the notice of the meeting as published and posted. She then called for the election of a Moderator. Mayor Paterson moved to nominate Bruce Clouette as Moderator. The nomination was seconded and the motion to approve the nomination passed unanimously. A motion was made and seconded to adopt Roberts Rules of Order for the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Clouette outlined the rules of debate for the meeting asking the public to limit their initial comments to five minutes.

Mr. Clouette dismissed the point of order raised by Ms. Tanaka as it was not consistent with Roberts Rules of Order.

Mr. Clouette recognized Town Planner Gregory Padick to present an overview of the ordinance.

Mr. Padick highlighted the basic structure of the ordinance. Specifically, emphasizing the applicability section of the ordinance; the parking space site plan requirements and modifications to the site plan requirements.

David Morse moved to sustain the action of the Council regarding the ordinance, the motion was seconded.

David Morse, Birchwood Heights, spoke in favor of the ordinance. He feels although, the ordinance is not perfect it does succeed in making good neighbors and strong neighborhoods.

Cynara Stites, Hanks Hill Road, plans on voting to sustain the ordinance but would like to see the Council amend the ordinance by defining landlord and by dropping the requirement that restricts vehicles from backing out of driveways onto adjacent streets.

David Haseltine, 209 Birch Road, feels this ordinance is an unnecessary government intrusion on the rights of private property owners and questions the timing for the town meeting, seeing that UConn students are away and not able to exercise their right to vote. He would like to see this ordinance nullified.

Betty Wassmundt, Old Turnpike Road, asked for clarification on the definition of a rental. Mr. Padick's understanding is that the ordinance is silent on this issue, but there is a provision for an owner/occupancy exemption. In order to be exempt the owner must live in the dwelling for 6 months in a calendar year. She feels the ordinance is not clear and should not be sustained.

Frauke Steahr, 18 Farmstead Road, thinks that vehicles backing onto roads are more of a safety issue. He feels the ordinance is well crafted and thereby, very comfortable endorsing it.

Therese John, 835 Stafford Road, questioned whether children of rental owners qualified as having an owner/occupancy exemption. Mr. Padick explained the exemption would only apply to record owners having a minimum 50% fee simple interest. She would like to see offenders addressed.

Christopher Masterjohn, 65 Northwood Road, is glad to hear that parking issues are being addressed. He expressed his concern that landlords are being targeted as operating businesses. He feels two dangerous precedents within the ordinance are being set; 1) violating the basic concept of property and 2) enforcing an ordinance on various specific groups of people without applying it to everyone.

Paul Stearn, a resident of the Town of Ashford, owning rental property on Storrs Road, is concerned that this ordinance is not fair to everyone.

Dori Smith, Atwoodville Road, feels the ordinance is fair.

Matvey Soklvsy, Storrs Road expressed his concerns on the fewer number of people that are leaving the town resulting in more traffic congestion.

Joan Hall, Birchwood Heights, does not think this is an issue about private property, but more about regulating commerce.

Peter Kochenburger, Storrs Heights Road, feels this ordinance is more about economic regulation, requiring those in business of renting property to provide parking for their tenants.

Nancy Cox, called the question. The motion was seconded and passed by a show of hands by more than a 2/3rds vote.

The motion was sustained by a show of hands. With 326 persons voting, the motion passed with 218 in favor and 108 opposed.

A motion to adjourn the Town Meeting was made, seconded and passed by all at 7:00 p.m.

Christine Hawthorne, Asst. Town Clerk



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. Census Bureau
Norwich Office
2 Cliff Street
Norwich, CT 06360

Item #13

July 15, 2010

REC'D JUL 20

Elizabeth Paterson, Mayor
Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
4 South Eagleville Rd
Mansfield, CT 06268

Dear Mayor Paterson:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and your organization for the generous donation of your time and facilities to the 2010 U.S. Census.

As we wind down our operations here in eastern Connecticut, you should know that our tremendous success is due in large part to your support and the support of the rest of our community.

More than 1,000 temporary Census employees from 66 cities and towns contributed to our mission of counting everyone. This accomplishment ensures that the people and communities in eastern Connecticut will receive the appropriate congressional representation, government funding and other support to which they are entitled.

Should you have any questions or if we can assist you in any way, please feel free to call me at our office in Norwich at (860) 367-8340. We expect the office will remain open through the end of August.

We could not have done this without your assistance. Again, please accept my thanks and best wishes.

Respectfully,

F. Ellen Whaley
Manager
Norwich, Conn., Local Census Office
(860) 367-8340

PAGE
BREAK

Parking restrictions reasonable, defendable

By DAVID MORSE

7/7

Mansfield residents who do not feel the direct impact of the University of Connecticut's expansion into residential neighborhoods might learn by observing what's happening in Hartford. There, Trinity College is evicting long-time residents on Crescent Street in order to house more students. The pressure is intense.

The situations are different: Trinity owns the houses; in Mansfield, the homes being turned over to undergraduates are privately owned. The takeover is not by eminent domain, and the taker is not UConn; rather it is private investors seeking to profit from a ready supply of renters and lack of controls.

Those Mansfield residents not impacted directly — who may live in enclaves of \$600,000 homes, or who have little sense of "neighborhood," or who feel insulated by their distance from UConn — don't have to look to Hartford. They could, and should, observe what's happening in their own town.

Once vibrant residential neighborhoods are being drained of life. Owner-occupied homes, which often included basement or garage apartments rented to students and were the backbone of communities that prized their proximity to UConn, are being gobbled up by absentee investors who pack them with undergraduates who quite reasonably want to escape the high cost of campus housing.

The results are obvious to anyone with eyes to see. Where children once played and teachers walked to work, front yards are now littered with plastic-wrapped Reminders and other trash, lawns are covered with cars. Many houses are given over to partying on weekends and abandoned for the summer. This is happening all over Mansfield, most severely in neighborhoods surrounding UConn. A college town is becoming a ghost town.

UConn has shown little leadership in addressing the problem. And the most vulnerable neighborhoods are among those least equipped to make their voices heard. The

Community voices

owners are elderly. They do not live in expensive homes. They are husbanding their energies and in many cases they're afraid. They're afraid sometimes of physical violence. They're afraid of losing their nest egg and their quality of life. They fear being forced to sell to investors and contributing to the decay.

The Town of Mansfield, urged by its Committee on the Quality of Life, is finally taking positive steps. Among the new tools for mitigating this out-of-control sprawl is an ordinance requiring owners to provide designated parking places for their tenants.

The parking ordinance puts teeth into Mansfield's existing blight ordinance. It specifically prohibits unsafe and unsightly parking, and provides for a \$90 fine for violations.

The ordinance is being attacked by landlords under the convenient rhetoric of "free enterprise" and in opposition to "Big Brother" intrusion by local government. The other objection one hears, and I think the more principled one, advanced by Jake Friedman, is that whatever rules are laid down for landlords should apply to everybody equally, regardless of ownership, and that tenants should not be discriminated against.

To that argument I say this: landlords are running a business. Businesses are expected to observe such strictures as provision of parking, size of advertising signs and public safety. Landlords should be held accountable as a business and to standards suitable for residential neighborhoods.

Take the case of parking on lawns. Homeowners are free to park on their lawns. Why not tenants? The answer is that a tenant is in a different position, and so is a landlord, when the lawn is offered as the only parking option, or where an unsafe exit is the only exit. The tenant is in a contractual relationship, and the landlord — especially an absentee landlord

— may not care.

No ordinance is perfect. This one may duplicate some of what is already on the books, and it may require variances for those homeowners whose site-configuration requires cars to back into a road. But, it's an important first step toward addressing the out-of-control usurpation of residential neighborhoods.

The same landlords who are profiting from the existing chaos will make their presence known loudly at the July 12 town meeting, at which the ordinance will be either voted down or affirmed.

I urge Mansfield residents who care about their town and the fate of their neighbors, even if they themselves are not yet affected, to attend and listen to all sides. I especially call on those who signed the petition calling for the town meeting to attend, so they can hear from those struggling to save their homes and perhaps rethink their position. And I urge those whose neighborhoods are under attack, and who have been silent to date, to attend the town meeting and make their voices heard.

The "Town Meeting on the Ordinance Regarding Off Street Parking on Residential Rental Property" is scheduled for 6 p.m. on July 12, at the Mansfield Middle School auditorium.

I also invite homeowners and renters who are fighting for the quality of their neighborhoods to attend a special gathering under a new banner: HOME (Help Organize Mansfield Energies).

The HOME gathering will be held this Thursday at 7:30 p.m. in the council chambers in the Mansfield Town Hall.

The point is to inform ourselves and map strategy in advance of the July 12 town meeting.

Help preserve the vitality of Mansfield neighborhoods.

The writer is a resident of Mansfield, president of the Birchwood Heights Association and Citizens for Responsible Growth.

PAGE
BREAK

Editor:

7/9

As one of the Mansfield residents (some landlords) who successfully circulated a petition in May to nullify the off-street parking ordinance, passed by the town council, I would like to explain why so many residents find it objectionable and extreme.

I have been a landlord in Mansfield for 12 years. Parking has never been an issue on our rental property.

The ordinance requires each landlord to submit a "parking place site plan," a rather involved procedure of drawing up a site plan, to scale, with designated parking spaces to accommodate the "allowed" number of cars.

We will have to re-surface the parking area with an acceptable dust-free material (what is acceptable is unclear) and erect "permanent barriers to separate the parking area."

We will be charged a \$35 fee per dwelling unit to go through all of this trouble and expense. Paying that fee means that we are consenting to let the enforcers of this ordinance come onto our rental property at any time and issue \$90 parking tickets, presumably to the vehicle's owner.

This is intrusive and discriminatory. It infringes on our rights as property owners. It does not apply to "apartment complexes," but rather, one- to four-unit homes, even if they are owner-occupied (by less than 50 percent).

Those who attended numerous meetings on this ordinance (not all were landlords) were given the opportunity to express their feelings on this issue and were in disbelief when the council unanimously passed it, since those who spoke opposing the ordinance outnumbered those in favor by about four to one.

I believe this ordinance negatively impacts smaller landlords and enforcement of it will be costly to the town of Mansfield. Please attend the town meeting on Monday at 6 p.m. at the Mansfield Middle School and vote this ordinance down.

Kerry John
Storrs

Editor:

The forthcoming meeting on Monday at 6 p.m. at Mansfield Middle School is an important one for all who care about the quality of life in Mansfield.

While it is normal and to be expected that landlords seek to maximize returns on invest-

ment, they should do so by legal means within the rules of the game.

At the present time some landlords are filling up their properties with student numbers well in excess of the rule limiting the number of unrelated persons per household to four.

While the authorities have difficulty enforcing this rule, the proposed ordinance would help keep practice in line with the intent of current regulations and slow the deterioration now in process in our older neighborhoods.

Please come and support this proposed ordinance.

David Edens
Storrs

Editor:

Residents of Mansfield should understand the purpose of the parking ordinance currently under discussion in town. If you do not live in a neighborhood close to the University of Connecticut campus you may not know that these neighborhoods are under siege by absentee landlords who buy up houses in these locations and rent them to students.

Only four unrelated persons are legally permitted to live in one dwelling, but the town finds this impossible to regulate because of privacy issues. Many landlords fill their rentals with as many tenants as they can possibly hold and authorities are not able to gain access to determine this.

By regulating the number of cars permitted at each unit, a brake might be applied to overpopulated dwellings and their attendant degradation of our neighborhoods.

Please attend the hearing on this issue on Monday at 6 p.m. at the Mansfield Middle School auditorium and voice opposition to the landlords, who vociferously oppose this

regulation.

Sandra Edens
Storrs

Editor:

On Monday, there will be an important town meeting in Mansfield to consider the new parking ordinance adopted by the town council. The town meeting can nullify the ordinance, approve it or send it to referendum.

This ordinance grew out of several years of work by the quality of life committee, appointed by the town council in response to many resident complaints about the impact of increasing student rental housing in town.

Among the issues of concern are declining property values in those neighborhoods where residences which were once single-family homes are now rental properties, usually rented by groups of students. In particular was a concern about the deterioration of the exterior and grounds of a significant number of these homes, particularly because of random parking and multiple cars without adequate parking places.

Many, if not most, landlords in town already provide adequate and appropriate parking areas around their properties. But not all do, particularly non-resident landlords.

Cars parked in front of houses, on what were once lawns are unsightly and damaging. Prior to the adoption of this ordinance, there was no recourse for homeowners who watched their neighborhoods deteriorate as the result of increasingly ugly and unsafe parking.

The ordinance is limited in approach. Only non-resident landlords are required to submit plans for appropriate parking, and only in the neighborhoods already regulated by the town. The ordinance provides for accommodation for those properties which already comply or where strict compliance would be unfeasible. Fines are not levied until after a warning is issued. Town staff understand that occasional events will require residents to park in places normally not designated as parking spaces.

Non-resident landlords are operating a business, and should be held to appropriate standards.

**Toni Moran
Storrs**

Editor:

I would like to share three insights I had while weeding my garden, pulling up exhausted snow pea vines, getting everything in shape before the scorching heat wave.

The first insight is that gardening nourishes me far beyond the ripe tomato or the zucchini. It helps define home and neighborhood.

The second is that all this disappears when a neighborhood is taken over by absentee landlords renting to undergraduates. A neighborhood gets hollowed out. It dies during the summer.

Third: As investors stuff one or two students into every available bedroom, the population of some neighborhoods will double or triple. Traffic, yes. But what about the water table? This transfer of population could spell trouble in a drought, even in adjacent neighborhoods depending on fractured bedrock wells for water.

Mansfield's new town council-approved parking ordinance offers at least some curb on exploitive absentee landlords, by limiting cars to designated parking spaces. These same landlords will pack the town meeting scheduled for Monday with the intention of strangling the new ordinance in its crib.

They will complain that the ordinance is "unprecedented" and "intrusive" and somehow discriminates against renters or students. This is a smokescreen for their wish to maximize profits without being subject to rules like any other business.

I urge Mansfield voters concerned about preserving neighborhoods to turn out to vote at the town meeting at 6 p.m. Monday at Mansfield Middle School. Protect your home from absentee greed.

**Joan Hall
Storrs**

Chronicle

7/10

Lucy B. Crosbie
President

Kevin Crosbie
Publisher

Charles C. Ryan
Editor

Letters to the editor

Editor:

As the voters of the Town of Mansfield gather on Monday to consider an "ordinance regarding off street parking on residential rental property" I am recalling that about 40 years ago that the president of a national university once quipped that the president of a university had three major tasks for success: football for the alumni, sex for the students and parking for the faculty.

UConn continues to struggle with those tasks, and the struggle for parking is reflected in the need for the ordinance.

We neighbors of the university commend its attempts to be a pedestrian friendly campus with parking garages, shuttle buses and fees for parking permits. However, in our affluent nation there are few students who do not own a car and one incentive to rent off-campus is to have that car easily available.

The result is that homes built during UConn's expansion of staff in the 1950s and 1960s for families with one- or two-car or garages or no garages are being bought by investors and flooded with the cars of student renters.

In my neighborhood, at 6 a.m., as many as seven cars have been parked diagonally across the front muddy lawn of a three bedroom, no-garage house.

The tenants are young adults, doing what is appropriate for their stage of human development, and one area they need to learn for their future success is how to care for their living space, and maintain quality and, hence, property value in their neighborhood.

I wish to call on the landlords to help with that task by assigning parking spots. Increasing in the profit from their investment, the landlords could add a rental fee for each parking spot, perhaps matching UConn parking permit costs, and specify in their lease terms of subletting those valuable spots.

Susanna Thomas
Storr

Editor:

I am disappointed in the Mansfield Town Council for passing a new ordinance regulating parking at rental properties. This ordinance is an obvious backlash from Spring Weekend and a futile attempt by the council to appear as if it is actually addressing the issue. The law punishes 300 landlords when only a handful are responsible for parking issues. In 2008, there were only 10 complaints for the entire year. This ordinance will do nothing to change Spring Weekend or curb any other disruptive student behavior.

My family has been in Mansfield for 200 years and has rented one house for 60 years. I mow the lawn, plow the driveway and maintain it as nicely as my own home. We carefully screen our tenants every year to ensure that they are good neighbors. We will be required to resurface the driveway and paint lines. \$5,000 to \$10,000 and be much less environmentally friendly than the good gravel lot we have. One paid town official actually said this was a good start to make being a landlord in Mansfield not profitable. What an ignorant statement from someone who is partly responsible for the economic growth of our town.

You could be next on the list. Maybe they won't like it if your child moves home and has a couple of vehicles, or if you have company that sleeps over, a highly paid town inspector might be in your yard measuring your lot to see if you comply. If you want to arrest people for illegal parking, noise or blight, we already have plenty of ordinances in place. Enforce them.

Maybe it's time Mansfield gets a third party like Willimantic. Stop this ordinance. We can find a better way to get along.

Bruce John

Editor:

As a UConn graduate student and renter who recently registered to vote in Storrs over the recent parking issue, I read with interest David Morse's July 7 commentary urging the community to attend Monday's town meeting on the ordinance regarding off street parking on residential rental property.

While I, too, want to live in a peaceful, safe neighborhood free of unsightly litter, I believe Morse's description of "chaos" and "decay" in this "ghost town" is greatly exaggerated. To my knowledge, no elderly have been threatened by college students with physical violence. The yards along the roads that lead to the university are clean and free of litter.

Morse suggests that investors who purchase homes in this town are engaging in a "takeover" analogous to eminent domain and states that elderly "fear being forced to sell to investors."

On the contrary, the same system of free enterprise operates in Storrs that operates in the rest of America. Homes are only exchanged on the market when both the seller and the buyer view the exchange as mutually beneficial.

In reading Morse's article, I was struck by how little the article focused on parking.

If it is truly the "takeover" of the area by investors renting to students that Morse opposes, he ought to bring the question of whether students have the right to rent rooms in houses to referendum and let the courts decide the constitutionality of the result.

Parking issues, by contrast, can be dealt with by enforcing current laws when the overflow intrudes onto public roads. When the situation is limited to private property, they should be dealt with privately between landlords and tenants.

I, for one, will be voting against the parking ordinance on Monday.

**Chris Masterjohn
Storrs**

Editor:

To anyone who loves the Town of Mansfield and feels heartsick over the deterioration of many of our neighborhoods, with more of the same likely coming to a neighborhood near you, please get out and vote at the town meeting at 6 p.m. today in the Mansfield Middle School.

We'll be voting on the ordinance regarding parking for rental properties that are not owner occupied.

You know, we're talking about those rental properties with tons of cars parked on the front lawn that are cause for decreasing property values of entire neighborhoods.

Look around. The problem is just part of an ever-growing cancer on our town as more and more family homes are being sold and converted into student housing, with all of the ensuing issues thereof, slowly but surely changing the character of Mansfield.

Let's not let this continue to happen.

This ordinance will help put controls on what is now an uncontrollable problem. Landlords, good and not so good, will be out voting against the ordinance.

There's a clue. While not a cure-all, your affirmative vote will be at least one step in the right direction.

**Nancy Tomastik
Storrs**

Showdown pits landlords against parking ordinance

By MIKE SAVINO 7/10
Chronicle Staff Writer

MANSFIELD — A controversial ordinance proposal intended to control parking at apartment complexes will go to a town meeting Monday.

The meeting will begin at 6 p.m. at Mansfield Middle School, located on Spring Hill Road.

The town council approved the "Ordinance Regarding Off Street Parking on Residential Rental Property" on May 10, but agreed June 14 to send the issue to a town meeting after receiving a petition from residents.

According to Town Clerk Mary Stanton, 228 signatures were filed and certified May 24, but residents told the council more signatures were collected than what was reported to the town clerk's office.

Residents attending Monday's meeting can vote to accept or reject the ordinance, or they can send the ordinance to a referendum within 60 days of the town meeting.

The meeting will be the third time residents have the chance to debate the ordinance after the town held two public hearings.

The ordinance targets one-, two- and three-unit apartment complexes — many rented by University of Connecticut students — with the intent of creating and enforcing a parking plan.

The ordinance would require landlords to provide a minimum of two parking spots per unit and

would limit the number of available spaces to six.

Mayor Elizabeth "Betsy" Paterson said the town has had an "increasing problem in the last few years" with people buying single-family homes and renting them to UConn students.

She also said those who rent out properties should be seen as business owners and not as residents, but many in town objected.

Opponents say the ordinance interferes with the rights of property owners and some said the ordinance could also create problems for residents who live in their homes and have numerous vehicles.

The town council will also hold a public hearing a 7:30 p.m. at the town hall to discuss proposed revisions to an ordinance establishing a fee schedule for fire prevention services.

The schedule specifies fees for people looking to obtain permits for any building, with the exception of one- and two-family homes, which are exempt.

Mansfield Fire Marshal John Jackman said the current schedule only addresses new construction and the revision would also apply to permits needed for existing buildings.

"What we're trying to do is make the services somewhat pay for themselves," Paterson said.

Copies of both proposals are available at the town hall or on the town's web site, www.mansfieldct.gov.

PAGE
BREAK

Storrs center plan to get \$4.9M boost

By MIKE SAVINO
Chronicle Staff Writer

MANSFIELD — The proposed Storrs Center development project will get a major boost Monday when U.S. Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District, will announce a \$4.9-million grant to improve public transportation.

The grant, which will be announced at 2:30 p.m. Monday outside the Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building in Storrs, comes from the U.S. Federal Transit Authority.

It is expected to help fund proposed efforts to increase access to the development. "It just opens up all sorts of possibilities" for transportation options, Mansfield Mayor Elizabeth "Betsy" Paterson said about the grant.

The grant will provide funding for an "inter-modal hub," a central location for buses from the University of Connecticut and the Windham Region Transit District, as well as parking for cars and bicycles.

Paterson said the grant will supplement

other funding also slated to improve public transportation — which she said is "almost nonexistent" in the area — and access to Storrs Center.

The roughly \$220-million proposed Storrs Center project is a mix of residential developments, retail shops and commercial buildings to be built along Storrs Road from Dog Lane to South Eagleville Road.

The project is to be funded by a mix of federal, state, local and private funding.

Paterson and Mansfield Downtown Partnership Director Cynthia van Zelm said the funding would help to make improvements to Storrs Road and other roads to improve access to the center.

"We were very pleased, obviously, to receive the grant," van Zelm said Friday, adding the funding is "part of the whole puzzle."

UConn spokesman Michael Kirk agreed, saying the improvements will make it "faster" and "easier" for UConn buses and students "to

get in and out" of the center.

Paterson, meanwhile, said Courtney "fought very hard to get this money," as did U.S. Sens. Christopher Dodd, D-Conn., and Joe Lieberman, I-Conn.

She said Courtney — who said the project will increase local business, create new jobs and improve public transportation — understands the value of the proposed Storrs Center.

The grant announcement comes roughly a week after the project received a letter of intent to open from a 10th business. Insomnia Cookies — a Pennsylvania-based company with 19 other locations — would provide late-night delivery of fresh-baked cookies.

Pomfret-based Vanilla Bean Café, Moe's Southwest Grill, Storrs Automotive, Wings Over Storrs, Travelplanners, Campus Cuts, Body Language, Tailoring by Tima and Cosino's Italian Restaurant have also all submitted letters of intent since May 2009.

PAGE
BREAK

Editor:

7/12

In the debate surrounding parking at residential properties in Mansfield, I find it odd that the proponents of the parking ordinance rarely actually talk about parking.

Indeed, when preparing to vote on the ordinance, the town council discussed drug education and the age at which someone "matures." You can hear it for yourself in the audio files of the May 10 council meeting.

This ordinance is about parking. More specifically, this ordinance is about ticketing of cars parked on private property, both rented and owner-occupied.

Please take the time to read the actual ordinance carefully and not take my (or anyone else) word for what it says. There is something fundamentally wrong with allowing our and our neighbors' private driveways to be subject to parking tickets.

This is not done in commercial parking lots and I cannot find another town where it is done to nearly this extreme on residential property. David Morse had it right when he said that this ordinance is redundant. Existing parking rules should be enforced on both rental and non-rental properties.

Perhaps the reason why parking is rarely brought up as an issue is because what really bothers people in some neighborhoods in town is not related to parking. In the effort to improve our community, let's solve the real issues that bother people, such as noise and let people park on their hard-earned properties without fear of \$90 parking tickets.

If this ordinance is allowed to pass, it won't be because it's popular. It will be because voters are too complacent to come out and vote or can't make the time. Please show

up at the town meeting tonight and vote for property rights and against parking tickets in driveways.

**Jake Friedman
Storrs**

Editor:

Is rental property a business use?

I am an owner of commercial rental property in Mansfield. I am required to provide and maintain adequate parking for occupants and customers at all times. I must have proper landscaping and safe access to and from the site. I am even required by law to report my exact rental income every year — and my taxes are based on these figures.

Less than a half mile away, landlords can rent residences to "four students" for considerable rents. None of these regulations apply to them because they're not commercial.

I disagree. Unless a landlord physically resides within the rental house, that rental is a business. That's the whole point of buying up these houses.

Yes, Mansfield should have a firm parking regulation, and I think they should go a step further and deal with rental properties as commercial entities. That's what they are. You can choose to exempt owner-occupied homes if need be.

Discussion and voting takes place in Mansfield at the middle school tonight.

**Mary Campbell Hirsch
Mansfield**

PAGE
BREAK

Opinion

Chronicle

Lucy B. Crosbie
President

Kevin Crosbie
Publisher

Charles C. Ryan
Editor

Editorial 7/13

Emergency response is town responsibility

No matter how tough the times are, the proposal recently floated in Mansfield to charge for emergency services provided by the fire department is a step in the wrong direction.

Charging an innocent accident victim to be extricated from the wreckage of an auto accident makes as much sense as charging a parents a per pupil fee for their children to attend school.

Some municipal services, like public education and public safety, deserve to be tax supported by the whole population.

What's next? A fee for police to investigate a robbery or assault?

We have no problem with the Mansfield's policy of charging fees for non-critical nuisance calls, such as when a police officer has to respond to noise complaints at the same address more than once in a day. We also agree that the towns should charge for excessive false alarms from automatic security systems.

But charging for emergency rescue services seems wrong.

Yes, Mansfield charges for ambulance calls, as do a number of other area towns. Many auto or health policies will make at least partial payments on such billings and perhaps Mansfield officials anticipate insurers would do likewise for other emergency services.

Unfortunately, the ambulance fees have set an unfortunate precedent and create a slippery slope that will result in more and more municipal services being fee-based.

Government exists to provide services that no one else can, should, or can do as efficiently.

All but the most die-hard libertarians would agree that public safety is one of those services best provided by government. And that means spreading around the cost of providing that service through general taxation.

It can't be denied that towns end up providing services to non-taxpayers and even non-residents. It might be service to a visitor who suffers a mishap while in town, or it might be while assisting state police on a state or Interstate highway accident.

Unfortunately, that's an expense that comes with the territory.

Mansfield citizens travel beyond the borders of town, many on a daily basis. Surely, some of them will need attention from an emergency responder some place at some time. They have the right to a reasonable expectation that the government in charge of whatever piece of geography where they meet bad luck will have responders ready and willing to help them — because that's a public responsibility.

PAGE
BREAK

Three local towns to benefit from energy funding

Gov. M. Jodi Rell recently announced a partnership led by the Connecticut Clean Energy Fund that will receive \$4.17 million in competitive federal stimulus funds for energy efficiency, conservation and renewable energy programs in Connecticut.

Three local towns — Lebanon, Mansfield and Windham — are impacted by the announcement.

The Clean Energy Fund is a ratepayer fund to promote, develop and invest in clean energy sources.

It was one of only 20 awarded nationwide in this competitive na-

7/13
tional solicitation for towns with populations under 35,000.

Rell said the partnership estimates the project will create and retain nearly 400 jobs; save nearly \$150 million in energy costs, while leveraging \$4.70 for every federal dollar invested.

“Connecticut has a well-established blueprint for supporting and growing alternative energy industries and CCEF has been a strong partner in that development,” Rell said. “These funds will further enhance the strides we have made and that have made Connecticut a leader in the field of renewable energy and energy efficiency. It is an industry with unlimited potential, especially since the well-trained workforce it requires is already in place in Connecticut.”

In addition to CCEF, the partner-

ship is composed of eight public, private, academic and nonprofit organizations and funds: AFC First Financial, Clean Water Fund, Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund, Earth Markets, Efficiency 2.0; MIT Field Intelligence Lab/Empower Devices, SmartPower and the Student Conservation Association.

The partnership will undertake a collaborative project to help residents save energy and boost clean energy usage through a comprehensive portfolio of actions modeled after CCEF’s award-winning Connecticut Clean Energy Communities Program.

The actions will be implemented by a consortium of 14 rural, suburban and low-income communities throughout Connecticut, including Bethany, Cheshire, East Haddam, East Hampton, Glas-

tonbury, Lebanon, Mansfield, Portland, Ridgefield, Weston, Westport, Wethersfield, Wilton and Windham.

These towns are already Connecticut Clean Energy Communities and, under this project, will be strengthening their commitment to clean energy, energy efficiency and conservation.

The project aims to have at least 10 percent of households set specific, measurable goals of 20 percent energy savings and clean energy usage and provides support to help residents achieve these goals.

The partnership estimates the project could reduce the production of nearly 250,000 metric tons of harmful carbon dioxide emissions.

Project initiatives include an innovative online platform involving energy advisers and leader boards for communities, an on-the-ground clean energy community corps, financing to assist homeowners with energy efficiency measures and clean energy installations, performance-based incentives to reward communities for meeting targets and a monitoring program to support both continuous program improvement and investment impact analysis.

“The collaborative efforts of all involved — including the initial partners, the participating communities and support from our Congressional delegation — helped contribute to a successful outcome for Connecticut,” said Lise Dondy, CCEF president. “We look forward to working with the entire project team to expand our community-based energy efficiency and clean energy efforts, help our residents benefit from significant energy cost savings, create green jobs and become a national model for increased adoption of clean energy.”

The energy grant was awarded by U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) through a competitive solicitation under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

The DOE dedicated \$60 million nationwide in Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant funding to help local governments, nonprofit groups and quasi-public agencies promote energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

For more information on stimulus programs in Connecticut, visit the state’s official stimulus web site at www.ct.gov and click on the CT Recovery link. For more information on CCEF, go to www.ccleanenergy.com.

PAGE
BREAK

Officials: Storrs center project will happen

By MIKE SAVINO
Chronicle Staff Writer

7/13

STORRS — After receiving a \$4.9-million federal grant for a transportation hub, local, state and federal officials said Monday the Storrs Center project is well on its way.

The funding will go toward an intermodal hub that will integrate bus, pedestrian and bicycle traffic into the proposed development, as well as improve roadways.

Mansfield Mayor Elizabeth "Betsy" Paterson said the grant, from the Federal Transit Administration, was a large sum of money for a small town like Mansfield to receive.

"I want to tell you that we are well on our way to making Storrs Center happen," Paterson said at a press conference announcing the funding Monday.

The roughly \$220-million proposed Storrs Center project is a mix of residential developments, retail shops and commercial buildings to be built along Storrs Road from Dog Lane to South Eagleville Road.

The FTA received 250 requests nationwide asking for a combined \$2 billion, but the Storrs Center grant was one of about 50 grants worth a combined \$160 million, said Vicki Shotland, executive director of the Greater

Hartford Transit District.

The district is working with Mansfield Downtown Partnership Inc., on the intermodal hub and will be the recipient and administrator for the grant.

State and federal officials repeatedly said they view the project as a model for future development, helping the town receive the entire amount of funding requested.

"This was an application that had to rise or fall on its merit," said U.S. Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District, adding the funding was the result of a "very competitive" grant process.

FTA Administrator Peter Rogoff said the project was created by a "vision of this community," noting town officials, businesses, residents and the University of Connecticut have all collaborated on the project.

He said specifically the transportation hub will unify communities on transportation needs while also creating jobs and boosting economic development.

Paterson said the hub will be a "comprehensive network" to accommodate buses, pedestrians and bikes and will help connect adjacent communities to Storrs Center and to each other.

The hub will provide more of a connection

between the Windham Region Transit District and UConn's bus service.

Paterson and Mansfield Downtown Partnership Director Cynthia van Zelm said the project could also feature Zip Cars, a service that allows people to rent cars by the hour.

The current timeline calls for construction to begin in 2011, with completion by 2019, and while some have questioned why the project has taken so long, UConn Chief Operating Office Bruce Feldman said it is a major undertaking.

Feldman, who helped plan Blue Back Square in West Hartford, said many towns have "restored" or "renovated" downtowns in recent years, but estimated it has been at least 90 years since anyone in the state has built an entirely new downtown area.

Partnership board of directors President Philip Lodewick said the project now has \$23 million in state and federal grants to accompany roughly \$200 million in private investments.

He also said the state Department of Transportation is currently evaluating road improvements to improve traffic to and inside the proposed development.

PAGE
BREAK

Voters give parking plan the green light

By MIKE SAVINO 7/13
Chronicle Staff Writer

MANSFIELD — Residents at a town meeting Monday overwhelmingly agreed to sustain an ordinance addressing parking on rental properties that was approved by the town council in May.

Attendees at the town meeting, the result of a 228-signature petition certified in May, sustained the ordinance with a 218-108 vote after about an hour of discussion.

The parking rules take effect immediately, but enforcement for existing rental properties will be phased in when occupancy certificates are re-issued. For new properties, it takes effect immediately.

The ordinance requires parking plans and limits parking at one-, two-, and three-unit homes in an attempt to limit the number of cars parked on those properties.

Mansfield Director of Planning Gregory Padick said 290 properties currently fall under the ordinance, which requires adequate parking for tenants and guests.

He said the ordinance requires a minimum of two spaces per unit and limits the total number of spaces for such properties to six.

Owners need to submit parking plans to the town and face fines if they do not comply, while tenants

PARKING	
YES	NO
218	108

can face fines of \$90 if they violate an approved parking plan.

Supporters said the ordinance addresses a public safety issue because it will limit parking and prohibit plans that require tenants to back out of driveways.

David Morse, a landlord, said he supports the ordinance because it "fosters good practice and stable neighborhoods," and landlords opposed to it are "motivated ... by greed."

But Therese John, a real estate agent, said some of the "worst offenders" in town are students living in houses owned by their parents and not one by a landlord.

She asked whether that would be considered a rental property.

Padick said an owner with at least a 50-percent interest in the house must live in the house for at least half the year, so the student would need to own the house.

Others opposed the ordinance because they saw parking as more of a blight issue and the town already has ordinances in place to

(Voters, Page 4)

Voters give parking plan the green light

At the town council's meeting after the town meeting, Councilman Antonia Moran said one question that was never clarified during the town meeting was the issue of elderly residents who put their homes into a trust or hand-ownership to a relative.

She said a town attorney said, the elderly resident does not pay rent, so those properties would not fall under the ordinance.

animsously supported the ordinance because in part because it saw rental properties as a business.

(Continued from Page 1)
address blighted properties.

Paul Stearn, an Ashford resident who owns a rental property near UConn, said he supports what the ordinance seeks to accomplish, but the regulation will create "two groups of people who do not have the same rights."

But supporters said the new parking ordinance will give the town firmer regulations to deal with parking, noting a blight ordinance can be subjective.

Some opponents, meanwhile, said the bill unfairly attacked certain groups of people, mostly landlords and University of Con-

"This is not a question of eminent domain, it's not an issue of private property, per se, it's a question of regulating business," he said, adding other commercial properties also need to submit parking plans.

PAGE
BREAK

Editor: 7/16

The recent discussion regarding a new school(s) in Mansfield centered on how much money would be saved by building one large

school. The savings are substantial. In 40 years as a teacher, administrator and school board member, in schools ranging in size from 150 to 650 children, I've seen numerous positive benefits from having one large school. The most obvious is reduced operating costs and duplication of services. In a large school, you can have full-time support staff and provide greater opportunities in a variety of specialized areas.

A large school allows you to more easily balance class sizes and composition. More teachers at the same grade level provide greater opportunities for them to share ideas and work together. Curriculum issues and in-service training can be more easily implemented.

The duties of the principal and assistant principal can be divided and shared. A large school needs more structure to provide a safer environment than you might often find in a small neighborhood school. A large building can easily be built to provide a small school climate by having separate wings or pods around central core facilities. This provides children with the nurturing environment found in some small schools.

Research does not support one size school over other. Upon entering any size school, the most important person in the child's school life is the classroom teacher. By keeping class sizes reasonable, by providing our staff with training, we will be helping to give our children a lifetime gift of a good education. A large building with reduced non-educational operating costs, freeing up monies to give us the most bang for our buck in the classroom.

John Fratiello
Storrs

PAGE
BREAK

Tour de Mansfield Saturday

By MIKE SAVINO 7/16
Chronicle Staff Writer

MANSFIELD — While it may not feature the French Alps or the Champs-Elysees, local cyclists will push themselves to the limit in the fifth annual Tour de Mansfield.

Festivities will begin at 11 a.m. Saturday at the Mansfield Community Center, with registration taking place beforehand.

Participants can take part in a 5-mile Family Fun Ride, a 20-mile "challenge ride" or a 40-mile "expert ride."

Tour de Mansfield is organized by the town of Mansfield, the Mansfield Downtown Partnership, Mansfield Community Center, local businesses and volunteers.

Organizers said the event will provide an activity for area residents that encourages exercise and also introduce cyclists to the various scenic areas of Mansfield.

The tour will take riders through the various villages in Mansfield, include Merrow, Mansfield Depot, Mansfield Four Corners, Storrs, Gurleyville, Hanks Hill, Wormwood Hill, Mount Hope, Chaffeeville, Eagleville, Spring Hill, Atwoodville, Chestnut Hill, Mansfield City, Mansfield Center, Mansfield Hollow, Perkins Corner, Ridges and Conantville.

The races will all start and end at the Mansfield Community Center, and a barbecue will be held after the events.

The fee for participants who

register at the event will pay an additional \$5 fee.

Registration on the day of the race will begin at 7 a.m. at the community center, and anyone under 18 is free, while those under 12 must be accompanied by an adult.

The registration fee will help provide support and includes a snack and lunch, while the first 100 registrants will also receive a free shirt.

All riders must wear a helmet and be familiar with the basic safety rules of the road.

Anyone interested can register online at www.mansfieldct.gov, while anyone seeking more information can contact the town manager's office at (860) 429-

**PAGE
BREAK**

Ethics board is criticized ^{7/19} in Mansfield

By MIKE SAVINO
Chronicle Staff Writer

MANSFIELD — After fielding repeated criticism toward the board of ethics — including calls to disband the board altogether — the town council will discuss a possible vote of confidence at its next meeting.

Council Vice Chairman Gregory Haddad requested the item be included on the council's July 26 agenda after a few residents raised concerns about the ethics board during public forum portions of the July 12 meeting.

The board meets at 7:30 p.m. July 26 at the Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building.

Haddad said there "comes a time when the council needs to respond" to the criticism and either show its support for the board or move toward making changes.

He added he personally believes the ethics board has done its job since being reconvened in 2008. None of the other councilmen commented July 12.

But three residents criticized the ethics board, with resident Ric Hossack even saying the council should disband the board if the current members, who are appointed, do not agree to resign.

While Monday's discussion centered around responses to some recent Freedom of Information Commission hearings on complaints against the board, resident Betty Wassmundt said concerns have existed for a while.

"I personally would have no confidence in this board," Wassmundt said, adding she has also asked the council in the past to rescind appointments.

She said the ethics board was put in place to revise the code of ethics into a "good, strong" code and it has not done that.

Haddad agreed the board was reconvened to help revise the code, but said he believes the board has done a "thorough" job fulfilling its responsibilities.

He said the board reviewed the code "from top to bottom," as has the council, and it is now up to the council to "put pen to paper" to enact any revisions.

But Wassmundt, and current board member Michael Sikoski, said they were also concerned

(Ethics board, Page 4)

Ethics board criticized in Mansfield

(Continued from Page 1)
Maria Capriola, assistant to the town manager, was appointed as the board's secretary.

Wassmundt said the move has allowed the town to maintain an influence over the board.

"Had we been left alone to operate, as we should be, none of this would have happened," said Sikoski, adding the board should be independent from the town.

Town Manager Matt Hart agreed the ethics board needs to be free from town influence and said

he believes Capriola's role is to simply provide support from the town.

"Their decisions carry a great deal of importance," Hart said about the board, adding Capriola's predecessors — including Hart himself, have also provided support to the ethics board.

Sikoski also raised concerns about FOI violations and referred to hearings that resulted from complaints he had filed last year.

Wassmundt, who also filed complaints, agreed the board's actions are reason for concern.

The ethics board added an agenda item to a special meeting Oct. 15, 2009 — a violation of state law — when other members voted to remove Sikoski as chairman.

The FOIC said the board violated state law, but also found Sikoski at fault for not setting a regular meeting schedule, forcing the board to hold special meetings.

The FOIC also ruled the ethics board did not give proper notice for an executive session held in September 2009, a complaint

filed by Wassmundt.

But the FOIC did not find the ethics board at fault in other complaints filed by Wassmundt and Sikoski, and did not issue any penalties against the board or the town for the violations it found.

Haddad said the complaints are coming from a group of residents who are unhappy with the board.

But Wassmundt called herself, Sikoski and Hossack three individuals with a similar concern and said others in town also have the same concerns.

PAGE
BREAK

7119



Seeing Mansfield by bike

TOP LEFT: Janet Knopf of Berlin gets ready to head out on her 40-mile bicycle ride as she participates in the 'Tour de Mansfield: Village to Village' bike ride event that started at the Mansfield Community Center Saturday morning. Sponsored by the town, the Mansfield Community Center and the Mansfield Downtown Partnership, the event is designed at providing a fun, family-friendly recreational opportunity that benefits both body and mind — not to mention being a showcase for local villages. BOTTOM LEFT: Riders take off from the community center. This colorful group is called the NERAC Bicycle Club in Tolland.



Al Malpa photos

PAGE
BREAK

Mansfield OKs new political sign rules

By MIKE SAVINO 7/20
Chronicle Staff Writer

MANSFIELD — Residents no longer face time limits for political signs following the planning and zoning commission's approval Monday of new political sign regulations.

The new regulation, approved unanimously, takes effect Aug. 15 and will replace previous restrictions on political signs, which will be deleted entirely from the zoning regulations.

The new regulation also contains no definition for a political sign, meaning signs are not limited to a specific election — as they were under the old regulation — and can also include general political or social statements.

"That was one of the primary issues raised by the American Civil Liberties Union, said planning director Gregory Padick said.

Padick said the town began revising the regulation after receiving a letter from the Connecticut ACLU Chapter in December.

He said the town actually received an initial letter a few years ago and decided to not enforce the previous regulation, as opposed to changing the wording.

But the second ACLU letter contained "stronger language" and called the regulation unconstitutional, prompting the town and the town's attorney to work on a new regulation.

The new regulation, which PZC Chairman Rudy Favretti called a "big change," no longer includes a time (Mansfield, Page 4)

Mansfield OKs new political sign rules

(Continued from Page 1)

limit for political signs.

Previously, town regulations stated a sign could only be posted within 30 days of a local, state or federal election and had to be taken down no more than five days after the election.

Favretti said the elimination of a set time limit was a "main feature" in the change but he also noted the new regulation does recommend political signs be displayed for a "limited period of time."

The new regulation also recommends residents limit both the number and size of political signs and opt for displays that are not illuminated.

The regulation does still require that residents get approval from owners of abutting properties when placing signs along street rights-of-way, which are technically public property.

Padick also said signs placed within a street right-of-way must meet any traffic safety requirements and cannot obstruct the

view of any motorists, especially those in driveways or at intersections.

Signs would still be banned from any public property and the PZC noted its recommendations were an effort to "help preserve Mansfield's scenic character."

He said violators would be subject to the town's citation ordinance — which allows the zoning enforcement officer to issue a fine of \$150.

The "main objective," though, of any enforcement would be to

correct any violations, Padick said.

Padick also said the PZC could continue to alter the regulation if problems arise from the newer version. Any changes would first need to go to a public hearing.

He added the issue of political signs acknowledges the First Amendment issue, something the PZC would need to consider before making further changes.

"It's not an easy issue when you're talking about freedom of speech," Padick said.

**PAGE
BREAK**