

PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Room 104, Shelton City Hall

Shelton, CT

Monday, June 20, 2005

I. Call to Order

Chairman Frank Osak called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30 P.M.

Members Present:

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Frank Osak, Chairman | Peter DiCarlo, Co-Chairman |
| Fred Musante | Mike Adanti |
| Jim Tate | Anthony Pogoda |

Also in attendance:

Rick Schultz, PZC staff
Marianne Chaya, Clerk

II. Pledge of Allegiance

All in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

III. Minutes for Approval

Tony Pogoda MOVED to approve the minutes from the June 6, 2005 meeting. SECONDED by Mike Adanti. All were in favor, MOTION PASSED.

IV. Committee Discussion on Booklets 4 & 5

Peter DiCarlo said he reviewed the highlighted questions from the May 23rd meeting. Rick Schultz made up a set of questions, some of which contained questions posed derived from the May 23rd meeting minutes. Peter took the questions and couched the questions as he felt they should be posed to Planimetrics. The two sets of questions should compliment each other for submittal to Planimetrics. Some of the original questions were completely struck. Peter revised the questions as follows and after discussion of each one from the committee:

1. What is going to be the future impact on municipal services (e.g. education, infrastructure, safety – capital items), and capital investments to handle the change in demographics as noted in the chart on page 9, book 4?
2. What is the recommended best practice and procedure for assessing the impact of 1 above and how to address it proactively?

3. Can you either graphically or by example show the net revenue gain that the city could derive from giving some form of tax abatement to elderly empty nesters as inducement to remain in their homes?
4. The one-year snapshot of the grand list on pages 24-26 is insufficient to show grand list trends as regards the percentages of commercial/industrial and residential revenues. It gives no visibility regarding these percentages from 1990 onward and no projection regarding the future (i.e. 2020). Can such a chart be generated? If so, is this an added scope or part and parcel of what should be done?
5. How do you get the maximum value (optimize the revenue stream) to be obtained from the remaining land?
6. There needs to be more of an explanation of the gray as noted in the legend on the map on page 23. Of the 4800 acres that is talked about, i.e. the developable acres, how do we apply the 4800 acres that is on the map on page 23? Something does not make sense. The area around Trap Falls if available would definitely be a candidate for open space. This is a Class-1 watershed area.
7. Verify and prove the data on page 22 regarding the 290 and 4500 available acres. How was it arrived at based on the mapping?
Side questions: If it states residential, what are you going to hold as the density? If you want to increase the amount of commercial/industrial land to essentially support a future tax base, which land won't stay residential?

Rick Schultz's questions for Planimetrics are as follows:

1. Provide a breakdown of revenue sources for the grand list for the past 10 years for comparative analysis. Compare data with the neighboring towns of Trumbull and Monroe.
2. The Assessor's office primarily uses the income approach for commercial/industrial property assessments. They also use the cost and market approach as well. What type of forecast can we anticipate using this assessment methodology and what impact will it have on the grand list and the City's ability to plan for its capital improvement program?
3. The Assessor's office provides the state with sales ratio forms of all real estate sales. This information is provided to the Office of Policy & Management who determines state aid amounts to each municipality. How does this info, size of the grand list and other factors determine the amount of state aid awarded to each town? Why is Monroe's state aid higher than Shelton?
4. Request for an update from Barkan & Mess.
5. Give a time-line for the remainder of this planning process.

The committee discussed other topics including the presentation from the Board of Ed regarding their future needs. The committee felt they should have Planimetrics spend some time on the education area and get with the Board of Ed if they haven't already. The question to the Board of Ed from Planimetrics

should be, did they, in arriving at their projection for a flat school population include the added growth from the 4500 acres of residential land available? Will Planimetrics determine the Board of Ed's requirements for classrooms/land for the future? Does Planimetrics agree with the Board of Ed's student population?

VI. Schedule Next Meeting

The next meeting is Monday, June 27. The committee needs to plan for a two-hour meeting – 4:30 PM-6: 30 PM.

VII. Adjournment

Fred Musante MOVED to adjourn the meeting. SECONDED by Mike Adanti. All were in favor, MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marianne Chaya
Clerk, Plan Update Advisory Committee
1 tape is on file in the City/Town Clerk's office