

PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Room 104, Shelton City Hall

Shelton, CT

Monday, June 21, 2004

Members Present: Frank Osak, Chairman
Anthony Pogoda
Tom Harbinson
Jim Tate
Fred Musante
Peter DiCarlo
Michael Adanti

Staff Members: Richard Schultz

Agenda Items:

I. Call To Order

Chairman Frank Osak called the meeting to order at 4:32 P.M.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

III. Approval of Minutes

Chairman Osak stated that there were no errors or corrections to the June 2, 2004 minutes. **Anthony Pogoda made a motion to accept the minutes and Tom Harbinson seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken, all were in favor, motion passed.**

IV. Discussion: Scope of Services

Richard Schultz distributed copies of the Shelton Plan of Conservation & Development – Scope/Schedule/Budget that was e-mailed to him today from Planimetrics. It is an 11-page document that details each stage of the plan process with each work item, the purpose and the cost. This has all the adjustments from our last meeting. On page 10 it shows with the adjustments the total is now \$137,500. Last week we went over each line item and made suggestions to Glen Chalder. This reflects everything that was suggested to Planimetrics.

Chairman Osak asked if the capital improvements program was removed or not. Richard Schultz said yes, it was.

Richard Schultz stated that he was directed to call the Mayor's office to schedule a meeting with Frank and Peter. The Mayor is very Tuesday and I am still working to get a slot before Thursday.

Chairman Osak stated that we need to have some answers before Thursday. What we have to do today is to either agree or adjust and accept this Scope of Services and try to split it up in two fiscal years.

Peter DiCarlo asked Rick if he met with Barkan and Ness to discuss a reduction in the fee. Page 10 reflects a reduction in the fee, so did you meet with them, and what was the result?

Richard Schultz stated that calls were made to them and there hasn't been a commitment at this time.

Peter DiCarlo asked, and then the \$137,500 could really be \$147,000? Richard Schultz said yes, but I feel confident that the numbers we are working with will enable you to move ahead. I hate to see you get bogged down. To which, Peter DiCarlo responded, why do you feel confident that Barkin & Ness' fee of \$25,000 is going to go down to \$17,500? It was stated that it was less than that, \$7500. The \$10,000 could go to that if you still wanted to use Barkan & Ness.

Richard Schultz stated that the \$10,000 is earmarked, as noted on page 7 (Infrastructure Issues), which is built into the \$20,000 total. This \$10,000 is for Planimetrics to do it in-house or to pay Barkan & Ness.

It was asked why there are two different proposals to which Richard Schultz responded that you weren't sure if you were going to use Barkan & Ness or a professional traffic engineer, or you can just use Planimetrics. Tony Pogoda and I felt initially that it made a lot of sense to use Barkan & Ness. We have historically used them and they have a wealth of information and as we continue to address all the concerns, we feel they can address them. There is \$10,000 for Planimetrics that they can use themselves or towards Barkan & Ness, and there is another \$7500. That is the \$17,500.

It was stated that if they didn't use Barkan & Ness, the \$7500 would go away.

Fred Musante asked, in regards to the traffic study done by Planimetrics, either they are capable of doing it or not, never mind the price. If they can do it for \$10,000, why would we spend more for the other guy? If we are considering having them do it, they should be able to do it. I don't care about historically. What is it that they have to reinvent here? We know we have to extend

Constitution Blvd, we know most of these things already. What is that is so special that we have to spend \$15,000 more?

Jim Tate replied, the data to make those judgments correct. Richard Schultz added that they have the database.

Peter DiCarlo stated that he admits that they can't do the job that Barkan & Ness can do.

Richard Schultz added that when staff sat down and asked what would it take do a plan update, and we came up with \$20,000-\$25,000. We are now here today saying it is going to be \$17,500.

Jim Tate said, what I am hearing is that we can use \$17,500, not \$25,000 for Barkan & Ness.

The committee members continued discussing the details between the two prices and the two companies and where the pricing came from. The \$17,500 is Chalder's guess on what he thinks Barkan & Ness will do the job for.

Richard Schultz stated that he would have a definite answer on the price tomorrow.

Jim Tate stated he felt we would spend the entire \$25,000, based on the pricing structures. Regardless of who does the job, someone is going to need to relate it to transportation and traffic, or pedestrian or circulation. There is a plan and there is implementation. I like implementation. I feel handcuffed sometimes when the plan doesn't go far enough where you don't have enough in the plan to make implementation decisions.

Peter DiCarlo asked if there is sufficient engineering information to implement an action like Constitution Blvd. or the road extension. Jim Tate responded that implementation at this part is not a physical project. What this is for is the definitive direction in your Planning & Zoning regulations that tell you or gives you a certain purpose or certain criteria, and a certain way you are going to look at how you are going to evaluate growth. Peter asked why do I think I am going to get it this time? Jim Tate responded that there is a certain motivation that we have been through it before and we know what worked last time to get the plan together. You will use this plan and proceed with it to satisfy an action and to implement. There seems to be a different mind set to just preparing a plan. Peter DiCarlo noted that there has to be a different statement of work from Barkan & Ness than the previous one.

Chairman Osak stated that if we have a status of all the roads we have now with the traffic counts and statements of deficiencies with satisfactory results, which we have on the 92' plan. If we could update current conditions to where we are,

that has to cost us money. Don't show me the fence, show me how you got over it. If we know where we are, then we start monitoring it, for example, what happens when this happens. All those have questions on schools, on capital spending, traffic, and road improvements, and he has to work in there. We are saying, how much money do we need to have him help us do that.

Michael Adanti stated, that if you describe the value to us, then I think let's spend what it takes to get to that plan. Jim Tate added that he feels that you are at the bottom anyway. Given what I see what you are trying to do with the plan and what you have gone through, you are really at the bottom, money wise.

Chairman Osak stated that we really need to sit down and have an open discussion and get this worked out, maybe with Rick and a few of us. I really want to know where we are right now with the inventory of things that we have. Then, when we know that, we can say, if I do this, I am going to have to fix this, and if I do that, I have to fix that. We need this in our discussion and allocate time to engage us in that conversation. Peter DiCarlo responded that Planimetrics said that they could show the plan for \$10,000. If that is the case, another \$15,000 is going to show you how to get over it. That is Barkan & Ness. So if you want it done stem to stern by the group that is the most knowledgeable in that arena, then Barkin & Mess is going to show you the fence for \$10,000, and for another \$15,000, will show you how to get over it. Now the question is, can they show you how to get over it for \$7500 as opposed to \$15,000. As to Mike's point, that is an annoyance. I think it is worth the exercise for Barkan & Ness. I think we agreed on them but we haven't done it yet.

Richard Schultz said we need one member to meet with them in the next day or so. Tony Pogoda said he could be available.

It was asked if everyone agreed with the fact that they are somewhere between \$10,000 and \$25,000, and that the \$17,500 was the mid-point. It was also discussed when it would be spent during the current fiscal year and the next.

Richard Schultz then went over the 11-page Scope/Schedule/Budget exhibit page by page for the members. The first page discussed the scope of work addressing statutory requirements plus the specific requests from the City. Page 2, Initiation, covers the agreement, organization of the committee, and a listing of what plans and maps will be included in the plan. An informational meeting with the public is planned, which is what will be done this Thursday at the Intermediate School. Page 3, Issues Scoping, noting meetings and workshops and surveys relating to the planning process. A meeting is held with the PUAC to discuss the findings. Page 4, Conditions & Trends, relates to the research and assessment of conditions and trends affecting Shelton both in the past, present, and foreseeable future. The research also obtains the goals from the Board of Aldermen. A meeting is held to discuss the findings with the PUAC. Page 5, Conservation Issues, a workshop to orient the residents to the planning process

and involve them in discussion groups directed towards establishing a conservation vision for Shelton. There is also research and assessment of the natural resource conservation, open space preservation, historic resource preservation and community character and spirit. There will be a preliminary report prepared and discussion with PUAC on the findings. The committee members felt that there has already been a great deal of work in this area by the Conservation Commission and Open Space Committee, which would make some of this research redundant. (The members felt there may be an opportunity to cut the cost on this item from the budget). Page 6, Development Issues, there will be a workshop meeting with the residents to establish a development vision for Shelton. The research is to identify issues/opportunities relating to development topics of community structure, housing/residential development, business/economic development, physical build out and fiscal build out. The preliminary report will be prepared and a meeting with the PUAC will be scheduled to review and discuss the report and refine policy recommendations into a Development Plan for Shelton. Page 7, Infrastructure Issues, there will be a workshop meeting to orient residents to the planning process and involve them in discussion groups directed towards establishing an infrastructure vision for Shelton. The research/assessment is to identify issues and opportunities relating to infrastructure topics such as community facilities, vehicular circulation, transit, other transportation issues, pedestrian/bicycle circulation and sidewalk policies, utilities (piped and wired utilities) and wireless services. A report will be prepared summarizing the issues and opportunities affecting infrastructure issues for discussion at a PUAC meeting. Page 8, Prepare/Review Draft Plan. This identifies the cost of the preparation of the draft plan, 4 meetings with the PUAC, revision, and a community review of the Draft Plan. PUAC Approval. The schedule is for one meeting with the PUAC to discuss modifications to the Draft Plan, if any, based on public comments. Then the plan will be revised and refined as necessary to reflect the review by the PUAC. Another meeting will be scheduled to finalize the Plan with the PUAC. Page 9, PZC Review. This is the meeting where the presentation of the Plan to the Planning & Zoning Commission. There could be up to 4 meetings to review the proposed plan with P&Z. Plan Adoption. There will be a public hearing to present the proposed plan to the community for discussion and feedback prior to adoption. The final plan will be revised and refined as necessary to reflect comments from the Planning & Zoning Commission. Once the plan is adopted by Planning & Zoning it will be printed. Page 10 is the Fee Arrangement. The fees are broken out by each step of the process for a total cost of \$137,500.

Chairman Osak stated that they will be keeping the Planning & Zoning updated as they go along. They all agreed. Chairman Osak asked for a motion to accept the Scope of Services with a change on page 5. They want to reduce the cost by half and to clarify the costs for the development issues.

Tom Harbinson made a motion to accept the Scope/Schedule/Budget as presented from Planimetrics subject to clarification on Page 6,

Development Issues, where it notes one meeting with PUAC for discussion purposes, and on Page 5, Conservation Issues. We feel there has already been a lot of work that has been done by the Conservation Commission regarding open space inventory and would like to see the cost reduced to \$7000. Regarding the traffic study done by Planimetrics and Barkan & Ness, that there be a sub-committee consisting of Anthony Pogoda, Richard Schultz and Glen Chalder. Anthony Pogoda seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion passed.

Chairman Osak asked Richard Schultz what happened when the 92' plan was adopted. Richard said that when the plan was created there was a committee such as this, who did diligence to prepare it. It sat for a long time before P&Z adopted it because they had to go through the whole document and extrapolate the strategies that they felt comfortable with. What we are hearing now is we will work with the Commission to get these strategies that we can live with. The plan is only as good as it is accepted by the community.

Anthony Pogoda said he would speak with the members of the Commission to urge them to stay aware of the entire process of the Plan.

Chairman Osak said that as it stands now Planning & Zoning, they act, 90% of the time as a regulator. They should be leaning more on the principals and concepts. We need to establish what the principals and concepts are and they haven't chance to develop them. As a result, everything filters through as a formal application. You have to know how to say no. Fred Musante asked if they can set their own pace, to which Richard Schultz responded that they have statutory obligations to respond within a certain timeframe. Chairman Osak said for instance, regarding PDD in a residential area. If P&Z says all PDD's are not to be done in a residential area at all. Then XYZ developer comes in and tells Rick that is what they want to do, and then Rick can say, "look, I want to tell you, P&Z told me not to give you any encouragement. If you spend \$50,000 on engineering, it is at your own risk". If you go to Stamford or Norwalk, this is what you get. If you go north of the Merritt Parkway in Stamford, you don't talk an application, you just get policy. Here, we keep it up to the individual elected member to make that decision after you have been compromised with the acceptance of an application by staff. They can't turn anyone away. Think about the P&Z Commission members. How much time do they have to talk about concept and principal? That is what we are supposed to do for them. We have to make that happen.

Anthony Pogoda said that he would definitely welcome that and so would some of the other members he spoke with. I can't speak for all the members though.

V. Discussion: 6/24 Public Informational Meeting

Richard Schultz stated that they are expecting between 100-150 people to attend. This will be in the cafeteria at the new Intermediate School. Chairman Osak said they would be sitting on the side observing and then he would introduce the members to the public and they would have nametags. The meeting will be taped but no minutes. Fred Musante said he would do a spread in Shelton Life that would be in the September issue. He will take photographs for the publication. Jim Ryan will also attend this meeting.

VI. Future Meeting Times and Schedules

They will still like to keep the meetings to every other Monday at 4:30 P.M. The next meeting will be Monday, June 28, 2004 at 4:30 P.M. in room 104.

VII. Comments by Committee Chair

There is a bill from Planimetrics that needs approval to be paid. This is for professional time and a meeting in the amount of \$3126.20. **Anthony Pogoda made a motion to approve payment of the invoice to Planimetrics in the amount of \$3126.20. Fred Musante seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken, all were in favor, motion passed.**

VIII. Adjournment

Tom Harbinson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Anthony Pogoda. Meeting adjourned at 5:43 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Marianne Chaya
Secretary, Plan Update Advisory Committee

A tape is on file in the City/Town Clerk's office