

Bradley, Laurence

RECEIVED

From: Richard W. Redniss [rick.redniss@rednissmead.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 10, 2008 10:10 PM
To: Weisman@halloran-sage.com; MGalante@fpclark.com
Cc: Bradley, Laurence; hweir@westportny.org; promano@landtechconsult.com; cory@kevcor.com; Bloom, Ira
Subject: Re:

FEB 11 2008

WESTPORT P. & Z. C.

Since Wilbur Smith has had this info for almost 2 months it seems disappointing that this is what we get 1 month before the hearing starts.

Data review.

They could have done this in a few days. In fact they could have commented about dates of data without even reading the report.

Are they proceeding assuming the info is adequate to begin to understand impacts or are they waiting for new info? When can we expect the next letter?

Maybe it will be easy to answer many of these Qs quickly but if they insist upon new counts everywhere before proceeding with the conclusions I can't imagine this all happening in half the time it took them to write their letter.

I thought the changes over time were mostly insignificant. Wasn't that why Mike didn't redo all the counts yet again. The opposition has dragged this on so long the data gets 'old' but that does not mean it is significant. Let's apply some professional common sense.

Question #4 is particularly noteworthy. Theoretically this makes perfect sense. Learn from others. Assuming 'similar facility' means Wilton, New Canaan, or Darien, that info may be easily available or quickly obtainable. But considering the line of questions in their letter it could be the start to an endless nonproductive exercise. What other Y is that close to a parkway exit? New Canaan? - is that close enough? Do they have a summer camp? How big is their pool? Is now a peak time to study or is this a set up for multiple studies/ delay.

Let's narrow the issues, gather the relevant data if it will be truly useful and use it to test the substantive aspects of the study. We need to be careful about getting on a track that in the end is not very useful, causes unnecessary delays and only fuels the opposition tactics.

Q 5 really set the tone that caused me to react so negatively to their letter. Am 7-9 pm 4-5 sat 11-2 are covered- what other hours matter? Do we really have a problem of any significance at 2 pm on Weds? And if there was an off peak issue like school traffic it is easy to manage that through program scheduling. If they had these kinds of basic questions they should have done this at least a month ago.

Traffic is a very important issue and obviously should be examined completely. If they are proceeding with the findings great- if not-unless Mike feels differently they should be directed to proceed with the substance now and revise findings later if necessary.

Remember the town wanted these guys and we gave them extra time. One recent application Wilbur Smith needed so much time we got the town to accept someone else who responded in about a week for less \$!!

Maybe all is on track but if it is not and if Wilbur Smith cannot move more quickly to stay on schedule we may want to scope this out now.

You guys have more experience with Wilbur Smith- maybe I'm over reacting - but as a first response, almost 2 months after getting the study, this was disappointing.

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

From: Weisman, Lawrence P. <Weisman@halloran-sage.com>
To: Michael Galante <mgalante@fpclark.com>
Cc: Bradley, Laurence <LBRADLEY@westportct.gov>; Helene Weir <hweir@westportny.org>; Richard W. Redniss; Peter Romano <promano@landtechconsult.com>; Cory <cory@kevcor.com>; Ira Bloom <IBloom@wsdb.com>
Sent: Fri Feb 08 10:00:41 2008
Subject: FW:

Dear Mike: Here is the first of a projected 4 or 5 memos from Sharat, this one seeking additional data. Because of the intense scrutiny and vigorous opposition to this application, Larry Bradley is being appropriately cautious and, in order to assure transparency, suggests that all communication with Sharat should go through his office and that any meetings between you and Sharat should take place in the Town Hall