



## **RECORD OF MEETING**

Regional Planning Commission (RPC)  
of the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (NVCOG)  
NVCOG Offices, 49 Leavenworth St. Waterbury, CT  
Third floor  
6:30 p.m. Tuesday, October 4, 2016

**Attendance:** Marie Chasse, Bristol; Nancy G. Clark, Southbury (by phone); Robert Clarke, Woodbury (by phone); Leslie Creane, Derby; Sue Goggin, Naugatuck; Gil Graveline, Prospect; Margus Laan, Plymouth; Jeremy Leifert, Thomaston; Ken Long, Middlebury; Michael Opuszynski, Beacon Falls (by phone); James Sequin, Waterbury; Herman Schuler, Oxford (by phone).

**Staff:** Aaron Budris, Senior Regional Planner; Ben Muller, Transportation Planner; Joanna Rogalski, Regional Planner.

**Public:** 1 person

The meeting opened at 6:35 PM.

1. **Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call, and Public Participation:** The pledge of allegiance was recited. RPC members and NVCOG staff introduced themselves. At roll call eleven (11) RPC members were in attendance. At 7 PM one (1) RPC member joined by phone. A quorum was obtained for this meeting. One member of the public in attendance who cited CGS Sec. 1-225 (a-e).

### **2. Update: Water Planning/WUCC**

Aaron Budris gave an update about two Connecticut water planning processes occurring simultaneously: the State Water Plan and the State Water Supply Plan.

The **State Water Plan** is a comprehensive plan that looks at everything: the environment, water supply, water pollution, drought, basically anything having to do with water in CT. It's being overseen by the Water Planning Council, which has members from DEEP, DPH, PURA, and OPM. It's being overseen by two subgroups: the steering committee and the advisory group, and then several work groups under that that specialize in certain areas like watershed management for small systems, and looking at similar state plans. The report is being written by CDM Smith.

The **State Water Supply Plan** is only looking at drinking water supply, and it's being overseen by three Water Utility Coordinating Committees (WUCC), which each oversee their own region. Those WUCCs are made up of water companies, municipalities with public water systems, and one member from each COG. DPH hired Milone & Macbroom to write that report.

Other details about the **State Water Plan** include:

- **Origins:** The State Water Plan is in response to a UCONN water shortage in 2013. In response to outrage over a plan to pipe water from the Farmington River watershed water supply reservoirs across the state to UCONN, in June 2014 the state legislature passed Public Act



14163, which directed the Water Planning Council to develop a comprehensive water plan by July 2017, to be delivered to the legislature by January of 2018.

- **Progress 2014 – 2016:** Repeated delays and little progress. The project wasn't funded until October 2015, and it's taken a year to get contracts in place. In June 2016 the process to develop a comprehensive water plan began. A stakeholder engagement workshop was conducted at the end of September 2016.
- **Drought Preparedness and Response Plan (DPRP):** One of the State Water Plan workgroups focuses on the state drought plan. This workgroup recently drafted a new drought preparedness and response plan which has not been approved yet by the Water Planning Council (WPC). It's an update of a prior plan, and it lays out 5 levels of drought and what response is appropriate to each level. Once it is approved by the WPC it will be out for public comment, which may be in the next month or so.
- **Model Ordinance:** the original drought preparedness and response plan (DPRP) included a model ordinance. NVCOG is advising the WPC to update that model ordinance to better comply with the new DPRP. Currently there's only one town that has a drought ordinance (Greenwich). At this time, the only situation when a municipality may demand that people stop using water is if the Governor declares a state of emergency. Droughts are rarely statewide; they're usually regional. And water supply is super-regional. This new DPRP and the ordinances that you may or may not elect to pass in your towns should make the response more local rather than a one size fits all emergency declaration. That's where the State Water Plan is right now.

Other details about the **State Water Supply Plan** include:

- **Origins:** The State Water Supply Plan was in response to the drought in 1981. The legislature created the Water Supply Planning process in 1985, which sets up WUCCs and directs them to develop the drinking water supply plan. In that supply plan, WUCCs have to do a water supply assessment of all the water supply in their area, and establish exclusive service area (ESA) boundaries. Those ESAs are areas in which a water supplier has exclusive rights to supply public water. Once that's all set up and plans are written, their job is to mediate the scene for conflicting water supply issues.
- **WUCC reorganization:** Originally the state set up 7 WUCCs, but only four were convened and developed water supply plans. In 2015, this seemed to be ineffective. Since there wasn't enough DPH staff to oversee 7 regions, in 2015 DPH reorganized the state into 3 WUCC areas. Lucky for NVCOG, the WUCC areas follow COG boundaries. Previously, the NVCOG region was in 5 of the 7 WUCC regions; now we're in 1. All three WUCC areas convened in June 2016.
- **Progress 2016:** The first six months has been developing a preliminary water supply assessment (WSA) looking at the state of water supply right now. Those assessments will be used to delineate ESAs and all three plans will be combined into one statewide coordinating supply plan next year. The next milestone is December 2016 when the complete WSA will be published.
- **Public Comment period for preliminary draft of WSA:** The draft preliminary water system assessment (WSA) has been published and is out for public comment. Joanna Rogalski sent the RPC a link to the preliminary draft WSA. The WSA looks at existing water systems, existing and future sources of water supply, current and future water demand based on population



projections, and also issues and deficiencies. This report will be used to develop the ESAs. Comments are due next week. NVCOG staff suggests everyone review the preliminary WSA and to check if it addresses the concerns of you and your municipality. It's a pretty long document, but you need only refer to the sections that apply to your municipality and the water suppliers in your town. These more localized sections include the most recent information. If you have concerns or comments about the draft preliminary WSA, contact Aaron Budris, the COG representative for the western WUCC, and he will submit all comments to the WUCC.

The following websites are good resources for the State Water Plan and the State Water Supply Plan:

**State Water Plan:** <http://www.ct.gov/water>

**State Water Supply Plan:** <http://www.ct.gov/dph/cwp/view.asp?a=3139&q=387352>

The discussion was opened for questions and comments:

**Q from Mike Opuszynski:** When would you need feedback by?

**A:** The next WUCC meeting is on the 11<sup>th</sup>, so send me any comments by the 11<sup>th</sup> and we can discuss it at the meeting. The comments close on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

**Q from Herman Schuler:** I had sent some comments regarding Heritage, Aquarion, and the interconnect with Connecticut Water. I noticed that the comments are in the documentation in this report. Is there anything else that I need to do to emphasize these issues?

**A:** That will be included in the final report. That's sort of the one big issue that's come up repeatedly in several towns. It's definitely on our radar. I've expressed concern about it at the WUCC meetings, as well.

**Q from Herman Schuler:** Which issue would you be talking about: the service area or the cost for the interconnect?

**A:** The major issue right now is that there's conflicting ideas about how much water the Pomperaug Aquifer can actually supply. There's environmental groups that are concerned that the, if the power plant actually had to take the million gallons a day that would be their maximum take, that there would be a serious drawdown in the aquifer. I think that's where the use of that interconnect comes in.

**Comment by Herman Schuler:** Exactly, the interconnect took about four or five years to negotiate, then it was about a \$2million investment, about a million for the main and a million for the pump station. Heritage never turned it on, and it was put in place as the capacity safety for the Heritage system. But I never understood first of all why we would spend \$2million on an interconnect and then issue a time limit on the diversion permit.

**Response by Aaron Budris:** That was one of our comments on the first round, that those time limits make planning really difficult. Permits expire more so that they have some control over reassessing supply every so often. They don't want an interconnect that's drawing from a system that all of a sudden has a shortage of water.

**Comment by Herman Schuler:** I guess I understand that, but again you've got the Heritage system that according to the Pomperaug people is under duress, but it's being operated without the benefit



of the interconnect. That's a half million gallons per day, but the capacity of the pipe is two million per day with a pump station. I think it's a 16 inch main.

**Response by Aaron Budris:** And I think everyone's aware of the newer development that the Connecticut Water Company is in the process of purchasing the Heritage Village Water Association. They'll still be separate systems, but that might make it easier to negotiate opening the interconnect. But right now I think the hesitation is that the water from the interconnect would cost more than the water that's coming out of the ground.

**Comment by Herman Schuler:** Oxford has had some extraordinary growth, not including the power plant. The diversion permit shouldn't be time limited and shouldn't be limited below the capacity of the interconnect. And that would solve the Pomperaug issue. And you make the point that Connecticut Water is buying Heritage, but Southbury has an option to buy that water system, and has asked for six months to consider. And I get very concerned when a public utility is owned by the town, because it makes politics part of the operating process. We want Connecticut Water to own that system and to operate that system as a public utility, so that we don't have to be uncertain about it. I believe I'll be appointed as the Oxford rep to the Heritage board of directors tomorrow evening, so I should have a clearer voice on that.

**Q from Marie Chasse:** Is there anything you can recommend to help this move forward?

**A:** One of the reasons to have these WUCCs is to head off that issue, by ensuring that a water company that does not have the ability to service an area is not given permission to do so. And all of the service areas will be redrawn. One of the things is building more interconnects; we want more ways to move water in and out of an area. And so all of these issues are going to be involved in the WUCCs.

**Q from Marie Chasse:** Does anyone else want to add to this conversation?

**Q from Ken Long:** Correct me if I'm wrong, but the diversion permit is through DEEP, rather than DPH. While the interconnect permit may be through DPH.

**A:** That's correct, and they have two different expiration dates.

### **3. Update: Municipal LID and MS4 Regulatory Assessment and Action Plan Project**

Aaron Budris gave an update on NVCOG's project regarding Municipal LID ordinances and compliance with MS4 permitting. Over the summer an NVCOG intern did a comprehensive assessment of all nineteen towns' regulations and ordinances to check compliance with the new MS4 permit. NVCOG will be developing a sort of pamphlet to send out to each town to outline what we see as regulatory shortcomings and suggested improvements that might want to be made. The project deadline is the end of October. An updated report will be made at the full RPC meeting in December 2016.

### **4. Discussion: Outdoor Wood Furnaces (OWF)**

Joanna Rogalski gave an update on the issue of outdoor wood furnaces (OWF) and ordinances regulating their use, and issue first raised by Beacon Falls during the July 2016 Executive Committee meeting. NVCOG received emails from Herman Schuler (Oxford RPC representative) and Tricia Taylor from the EHHI, a lobby group encouraging CT towns to pass ordinances banning the use of OWF's. Herman Schuler argued why they should be allowed, and Tricia Taylor gave arguments for why they should be banned. DEEP has some guidelines for OWF. One correction from the August 2016 meeting is that OWF's are not pizza ovens; these are units used for heating buildings. DEEP has brochures and guidelines available. That being said, each municipality can decide to ban or allow these as they desire.



Miss Rogalski asked Mike Opuszynski, Beacon Falls RPC representative, if he had any updates about the issue. Mr. Opuszynski did not and took the opportunity to thank everyone who contributed information which he forwarded to the Beacon Falls conservation, P&Z, and the Board of Selectmen. The information is being reviewed and no activity has happened at this time. He will keep everyone updated. Miss Rogalski added that Tricia Taylor stated that she was available should the RPC need more assistance with this issue.

Herman Schuler added that as a result of looking into the OWF issue, between EPA and DEEP guidelines OWF's can't be put in residential areas. Oxford has several OWF's in the industrial areas, and they are used on farms to provide heat for greenhouses. Mr. Schuler believed that the EPPI was recommending that zoning regulations be amended to ban them entirely, however they are effectively banned in residential areas. OWF's installed on farms to keep a greenhouse operating produces benefits: they reduce farmers' costs and extend the growing season. Mr. Schuler wouldn't consider amending zoning regulations on a blanket basis so the farmers can't use their own wood to extend their season.

A question arose as to the enforceability of the DEEP and EPA guidelines. Miss Rogalski referenced the DEEP brochure and stated that DEEP mentioned a cutoff date and some other enforcement mechanisms. She will send out that brochure to the whole RPC for their reference. A final question was asked regarding the approval of OWF use so long as the OWF's do not affect a residential use.

#### **5. Discussion: NVCOG Regional Economic Profile 2015**

Ben Mueller discussed the regional economic profile for 2015. Ms. Rogalski had distributed this document to the full RPC before the last full RPC meeting and asked for the RPC's comments. Mr. Mueller attended the last Executive Committee meeting and reminded the representatives of NVCOG's request for comments. To date, Mr. Mueller has received no comments. The draft being reviewed today is the same draft submitted at the August 2016 full RPC meeting. Mr. Mueller stated that he was seeking an endorsement from the RPC for the draft.

Motion: To endorse the NVCOG Regional Economic Profile 2015 to the Council.

Motion made by Mike Opuszynski, seconded by Nancy Clark

VOTE: Unanimous

#### **6. Discussion: Jurisdiction over distributed antenna systems (DAS); PURA docket #16-06-38**

Miss Rogalski discussed the latest news about the DAS jurisdiction issue. Last week Wednesday there was a technical meeting with PURA regarding the issue of jurisdiction over small cell antennas. A final decision from PURA is expected to be released October 31<sup>st</sup>. Tomorrow, at the Connecticut Association of Zoning Enforcement Officers (CAZEO) meeting, the Acting Executive Director of the CT Siting Council will speak about this issue of jurisdiction. Joanna Rogalski will be attending tomorrow and will provide a summary. A representative from Mobilitie has approached NVCOG and wants to give a presentation on the hybrid transport network. They have told NVCOG that they would like to speak with the CEOs of NVCOG about this issue. NVCOG staff has decided we'd rather learn as much technical information as possible before we provide that direct connection to the CEOs. NVCOG staff would like anyone who has a direct interest in this to chime in with your concerns. NVCOG staff also were thinking about having a smaller meeting with towns that have already been approached by



Mobilitie. By their tally, they've approached Waterbury, Wolcott, Prospect, Cheshire, and Shelton. Mayor Bob (Chatfield) is very concerned about this in Prospect. Mobilitie has also approached RiverCOG. John DiCarlo and Joanna Rogalski have spoken with a planner at RiverCOG to understand what the Mobilitie presentation was like. NVCOG staff wants to make sure that as this technology moves forward we get the best for each of our towns. NVCOG wants to provide as much information as possible so towns can make informed decisions.

**Q from Jeremy Leifert:** How are the antenna systems different from the cell phone towers?

**A:** These are smaller cells to provide a 5G network. They can be as short as 40-60 feet, but can be up to 120 feet. The emails I sent out show a better representation of what these antennas look like. What these particular techs are used for might be autonomous vehicles, as those need smaller cell systems to switch off.

**Comment by Gil Graveline:** They came to Prospect and are proposing two of these 120' poles. And it isn't the pole itself, it's the location of the pole.

**Response by Joanna Rogalski:** And they're only approaching towns where there's public ROW they want to put a pole in. The state also owns some land they want to use, and they're approaching those towns as well.

**Comment by Jim Sequin:** They approached us (Waterbury) for some on land owned by ConnDOT, and then told us that we received those by mistake, so I know they're also approaching ConnDOT.

**Comment by Joanna Rogalski:** The information I've gotten from the Siting Council is that there was a letter of comment to the PURA docket. Jurisdiction often depends on the use of the pole or water tower or so on. There's a lot of confusion about this issue in CT right now, and that's what this docket with PURA is looking to straighten out.

**Comment by Jim Sequin:** I think they put the utility on an existing utility pole, that's PURA. What they're looking at is becoming a company that puts out its own poles as a utility, even in towns which bury their utilities. It's often less expensive for them to put their own pole in than to deal with collocating or leasing.

**Comment by Joanna Rogalski:** My personal concern is what will happen down the line: will there be additional poles put in, what about backup power for the units? A lot of the California examples had battery packs added in later. If you can find my email from before, it included lessons from California towns. I just think that towns should come to Mobilitie with informed technical questions upfront.

**Comment by Gil Graveline:** On the larger poles they proposed were hollow and had the equipment inside. But the smaller poles will have little boxes, maybe at eye level maybe not.

**Response by Joanna Rogalski:** We'll have to ask for design options, because there's got to be more than one way to do this.

## 7. Administrative Items

### a. Approval of August 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Sue Goggin of Naugatuck provided some amendments: a dog park was approved but not downtown, and a mixed use development was approved.

Motion: To approve August 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes as amended.

Motion made by Nancy Clark, seconded by Ken Long

ABSTENTIONS: Leslie Creane



VOTE: Unanimous

b. Summary of Executive Committee meeting held September 13, 2016

Joanna Rogalski gave a summary of the last Executive Committee (EC) meeting. The Annual Report for FY 2016 was discussed. The EC members comments included: online version was easy to get through, the links were appreciated for details, the pictures were helpful, it wasn't boring, and there was a good representation of the entire region. The Executive Committee would like this report to be directly shared with municipal planning offices. The Regional POCD update for 2018 was also discussed. NVCOG staff would like to begin work on it in January 2017. The RPC will be the primary point of contact, and this regional plan will be based on municipal plans. The Regional POCD must be complete by 2018. NVCOG staff would like to have a digital version, and the Executive Committee would appreciate a Grant Resources section. If you have any input on how to make this a more useful document for the municipalities, we would appreciate that. NVCOG would like to set up a planning work program, similar to the Unified Planning Work Program for federally-funded transportation projects. This work plan will be related to SGIA funding. (State Grant in Aid.) Also discussed was the Economic Profile document and the distributed antenna systems through Mobilitie.

The EC did not have a quorum and took no votes.

c. Referrals

Miss Rogalski reported that there have been seven referrals since the August meeting. Three (3) response letters have been submitted. Of those 7 referrals, one from Prospect might be regionally-significant. Prospect's referral regards the location of the gas service stations and about how many gas service stations can be built in an aquifer region. Because aquifers often transcend regional boundaries, this referral may be regionally significant. Referrals are advisory documents, so municipalities may choose to act on the suggestions or not.

d. Correspondence

Joanna Rogalski referred to Mobilitie approaching NVCOG as discussed during agenda item #6.

e. Election of Secretary and Vice-Chair for 1 year terms

Nancy Clark stated that the nominating Committee had not met since its creation in August 2016. She asked if the current secretary, Michael Opuszynski, was willing to continue serving as secretary. Michael Opuszynski stated that he was willing. Marie Chasse, the current vice-chairperson, was also willing to continue serving as vice-chairperson.

Motion: To nominate incumbents Marie Chasse for Vice-Chairperson and Mike Opuszynski for Secretary of the NVCOG RPC for one term.

Motion made by James Sequin, seconded by Gil Lindner

VOTE: Unanimous

## **8. Roundtable - Points of Interest/Local Activities**

**Thomaston — Jeremy Leifert, Land Use Administrator**



I guess just a brief update from Thomaston. Our planning & zoning commission is working on— back in 2012 we did a comprehensive update to our zone map and we picked up a handful of issues, mistakes on the map, so we’re going through property by property kind of grouping them into separate public hearings to correct a lot of issues. Some have no public comment, there’s a couple that we’ve had a bit of public show up to our meetings. We’re kind of slogging through it as a fall-winter project, so slowly but surely. These are corrections to our official zoning map. We did a comprehensive, town wide update in 2012, and we’ve been picking up on some mistakes lately here and there that we didn’t pick up on. We’re working off a list we’ve compiled over the last couple of years and making the corrections now. Outside of regular applications that’s the big thing we’re working on now.

**Derby — Leslie Creane, Chief of Staff**

In Derby we just started public input process that similar to the one that Bethel did if you’re familiar with that in terms of the development of the south side of Main Street Route 34 after the widening of that by DOT. We started that, we had 125 people attend our first public meeting that was a participatory meeting. We were very excited about that and that’s going along extremely well. We’re having another public meeting at the end of this month, and then there’ll be a week-long charrette to design that space. The bridge on Route 34 widening, that project is ongoing, I’ll leave it at that. We’re also looking at our zoning regulations and updated some of our CDD zones, the downtown zone, and looking at implementing some form-based code throughout the city.

**NVCOG — Ben Muller, Transportation Planner**

The only thing I’m working on that’s directly relevant: we’re ramping up our pedestrian plan for the region. In its early stages, but part of that is reviewing existing ordinances, subdivision regulations, zoning codes, and seeing how those interact with pedestrian issues. I’ll have something out about that in short order that I’ll forward along to Joanna to distribute to the RPC.

**Middlebury — Ken Long, Zoning Chair**

Ridgewood of Middlebury is still building, moving right along. The final house that was at [???] Blvd is now gone. The state still has not advised us what they plan to do with the property, aside from probably fence it off. The wildlife love it out there, got a lot of turkeys and deer. The new gas station in the center of town will probably be open by the end of the month. The zoning board is working on, has picked a contractor to redo all of our regulations, as they haven’t been comprehensively reviewed in several years. One of the issues is addressing the setbacks in commercial zones on 63 and 64. We have a ZBA meeting tomorrow night that will address a setback issue on 63. The building department has seen a number of residential plans recently. We’d prefer commercial, but it’s good to have some development coming through.

**Prospect — Gil Graveline, Planning and Zoning Chair**

We completed our CVS store, 1 building, that’s big for Prospect. A lot of controversy at the beginning about traffic volumes, but now that it’s completed everyone loves it. There’s no traffic problem, as anticipated. The next thing we’re working on, as CVS tipped our hand by building in sidewalks, we’re building some new sidewalks through the center of town. We’re working on some regulations for that: what size, who will build them, what side, who will shovel them. We’ve had a chance to look at these finer points, and we’re looking at the gas station, for example, and thinking how did that get there. So we’re working on a lot of little items: fine-tuning. Some of these phrases that they used to use a few years ago don’t exist anymore.



**Waterbury — James Sequin, City Planner**

We updated our new POCD to include our newly-adopted sanitary sewer service area map. Between the legislature requiring that inclusion in July and us needing the POCD done in November and WPCA not being done until March, we had to adopt and incorporate it. We had a couple of zone changes, including one that was very controversial: 84 Vistas by BJ's. They want to flatten the top of the cliff and put in ultimately 240,000 sqft of retail space up there. They envision it to be sort of like the Buckland area in Manchester where stores are multi-level on various cliffs. That's what they're envisioning. They're hitting every commission, including the City Planning Commission 3 times. They need to resubdivision, replace dedicated open space, get an easement across city property, zone change, wetlands, etc. The neighbors are against the project, and have appealed the resubdivision. They're trying to figure out how they can repeal the aldermanic action in the zone change. It's interesting. The second one is in a neighborhood that has come out dramatically against multi-family, and their hearing is running the same night as the 84 Vistas. We'll likely need two separate rooms. Don't worry about your zone changes, when we did our comprehensive zone changes in Waterbury we built it into the process: we told the Commissioner we'll come back in 6 months and 12 months with changes. You don't know how it's going to work until you start to use it when you make major changes.

**Naugatuck — Sue Goggin, Town Planner**

In Naugatuck we just received an application for a private high school, including dorms, faculty housing, and some single-family homes on the site, about 55 acres of land. We're excited for it. We just started working with the state's attorney office to bring criminal charges for zoning violations. We met with Waterbury's blight people to learn some things we can do. We also have an Environmental Review Team doing the report for proper uses for a large open space parcel owned by the BRO (bureau?). We're having a road safety audit in a couple of weeks to look at installing a bicycle lane in our downtown area.

**Q from Sue Goggin:** I would like to ask: outdoor fire pits and outdoor ovens? Do any of your towns have regulations on those? These are the pizza ovens. RPC members will look at their zoning codes, and Naugatuck should check with the Fire Marshall to see if it's allowed.

**A from Leslie Creane:** There's zoning regulations in Hamdens to look at that specifically exempt those from other zoning regs. It's with the pellet stoves and furnaces.

**Plymouth — Margus Laan, Town Planner**

We're trying to develop some new gun regulations as part of our moratorium. We finally got a zoning and wetlands officer back part-time rather than partial part-time (3 days a week).

**Southbury — Nancy G. Clark, Planning Commission**

The theater is on everyone's mind. The projected opening date is late spring perhaps June. There's a new gas station and deli that isn't taking action just yet. DOT is looking at improving the intersection between 188 and 67. We've had a town-wide tag sale, a volunteer celebration, and so on. Otherwise just lot line revisions.

**Beacon Falls — Michael Opuszynski, Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission**

We've been pretty busy. We've had a variety of town-wide activities. We've started work on our Riverbend Park: a new park we're hoping to open up soon right along the Naugatuck River at exit 23. One of the things we're also investigating is to extend our Greenway along Main Street all the way down to



the new Riverbend Park, so essentially from downtown to the park at the exit. In addition, we're investigating our parking situation along Main Street, primarily along the north-bound side, to see if we can change that from two to one lane like the south-bound side so we can improve the parking around the downtown area. We've also had some roadwork improvements around the elementary school. We've had some good progress there, and that work is wrapping up shortly. We're also investigating adding some solar panels to our public works and wastewater treatment plant sites to see if we can go a little greener.

**Oxford – Herman Schuler, former Economic Development Director for the Town of Oxford**

The steel company that makes chainsaws and lawn equipment should be moving in shortly. About a 250,000 sqft building. We opened the Quarry Walk on September 21<sup>st</sup>. Market 32 opened, so finally Oxford has a food store. Stop in on route 67 and you'll be very impressed. For a guy that has a handicap, I can't find handicapped parking because it's so busy. The inline stores are opening shortly as well. They've started vertical construction on some of the massive foundations they need for the steam turbines, and they finished the road that's been on the town plan for 15 years. It's a gorgeous industrial road that goes from the center of the new industrial park across to the airport. The town hasn't accepted it, yet, so we can't use it, but I have driven it and it is impressive. Our brewer and exotic beverage distributor just finished a new building.

**Woodbury — Robert Clarke, Zoning Chair**

Planning has hired a consultant to attend their meeting next week regarding the 2020 POCD, which they have been working on. They're going to start going full bore. On September 20<sup>th</sup>, the Planning Commission and the Zoning Commission held a joint meeting regarding changes in the zoning regulations to amend the multiple residence district so that we can create floating zones within the town to increase denser development. This is a result of zoning conversations with realtors and developers who feel that there are not enough places in town so that those people who want to leave their homes and no longer need larger homes and move into a smaller unit, or people who come into town, younger people particularly, to find something affordable. That is going to be discussed at our next meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup>. We've also in terms of zoning amended the fair housing statement of our zoning regulations. Inland wetlands is holding a public hearing at its next meeting November 14<sup>th</sup> regarding the application of Dollar General for construction of a store on Main Street South just north of the intersection with 64 on the west side. The biggest, effective September 22<sup>nd</sup>, our Town Planner resigned and took a position in her home town in New Milford, so we are looking for a Town Planner.

**Marie Chasse — Bristol, Planning Commission**

We have a new City Planner, Robert Flanagan was given the position of our city planner. If you know him and interact with him. We're really pleased about that. Overall, applications, whether they are site plans or subdivisions for the planning commission have been really slow. If we see a new application, once a month, it's a lot. Our downtown hasn't really moved at all. They did get a new development company so they're working on that and trying to push forward with that. The most exciting news we have is that we have the consultants (Fitzgerald & Halliday) working on our Route 6 project. They gave us an overbrief at our meeting last month as far as some of the things they're look at as improvements from town to town. We'll be having a couple of future meetings inviting different boards to gather input on the document and everything, so we're really excited to make Route 6 possibly a little more pedestrian friendly at some point in our lives.



9. Other

**Q from Nancy Clark:** Are any of the towns in our region experiencing impacts from the drought?

**A from Marie Chasse:** Bristol went to alternate use of water for lawn watering and so on a voluntary basis.

**A from Jim Sequin:** Mayor of Waterbury requested voluntary conservation measures because the reservoirs are down.

**Comment by Marie Chasse:** Sounds like there's been some action but nothing drastic.

**A from Joanna Rogalski:** Watertown's Town Manager also asked the town to conserve voluntarily as they share the Waterbury town system.

**Comment by Aaron Budris:** Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is available. We sent out a solicitation to CEOs, town engineers, and public works directors. I can forward that information along to the RPC as well. We have a deadline of next week on that as we haven't had much come in. There's also a DEEP Recreational Trails grant open right now. So there's some funding ideas if you guys have some trail or pedestrian projects. The TAP will cover sidewalks, but it's not one of the priorities. If you have a project ready to go they'll certainly consider it.

10. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

Motion made by James Sequin, seconded by Ken Long

VOTE: Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted by

Joanna B. Rogalski

Regional Planner, NVCOG