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EXECUTIVE SESSION
The Mansfield Town Council regular meeting was called to order by Mayor Elizabeth Paterson at 7:32 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Bellm, Haddad, Hawkins, Holinko, Paterson, Clouette, Schaefer, Martin, Thorkelson

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Thorkelson moved and Mr. Hawkins seconded to approve the minutes of August 25, 2003.

So passed unanimously.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL

Alison Blair, 115 Coventry Road, thanked the Council for the excellent Fireworks display for the 300th celebration. Everyone seemed to have a good time, the fireworks were awesome and the traffic personnel got people out of the parking area within a very short time. It was a well run and planned event.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

1. Issues Regarding the UConn Landfill including the UConn Consent Order, Public Participation Relative to the Consent Order and Well Testing.

On September 3 there was an Open House in the Council Chamber of residents of Mansfield and the UConn Community to review the engineering design plans for capping the UConn landfill and former chemical pits area. Representatives of the CT. Department of Environmental Protection, the US Environmental Protection Agency and members of the technical engineering team.

2. Bowhunting on Town-owned Land

Mr. Martin moved and Mr. Holinko seconded that the Open Space Committee share further comments or their suggestions for a referral service to connect trained bowhunters with landowners. Parks advisory comments on this would also be welcome, along with staff recommendations.
So passed unanimously.

3. Fee Waiver Ordinance

Mr. Matt Hart, Assistant Town Manager, Mr. Kevin Grunwald, Director of Social Services, Mr. Curt Vincente, Director of Parks and Recreation, an Ms. Becky Lehmann for the Social Service Advisory Committee, discussed recommendations.

By consensus the Council, after much discussion, recommended the second option.

4. Underage Drinking, University Spring Weekend and President Austin’s Task Force on Substance Abuse.

The Staff is working on an underage-drinking ordinance. Ordinances adopted by other municipalities, received from CCM, have been reviewed.

Mr. Haddad requested that 4a be added to the agenda Financial Report of June 30, 2003. By consensus item was added.


Mr. Schaefer moved and Mr. Martin seconded to accept the Financial Report of June 30, 2003 as presented.

So passed unanimously.

V. NEW BUSINESS

5. Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) 2004 State Legislative Program

Mr. Bellm moved and Mr. Martin seconded to place this item on the next agenda with further recommendations.

So passed unanimously.

Councilmembers discussed the following changes:

ELECTIONS

Change to: Eliminate the expanded Presidential ballots currently utilized in this state and permit same day registration with appropriate ID.

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Change to: Increase state assistance to Connecticut Legal Services
TRANSPORTATION

Change to: Expand mass transportation systems such as rail and bus service. This would relieve pressure on state and local roads and help spur development along existing transportation corridors.

Change to: Study the distribution of state gas tax funds to municipalities to determine whether or not they are receiving an equitable share of this revenue. Currently, this revenue is distributed to municipalities through grants administered by the state (Town Aid being one of them)

Mr. Thorkelson moved and Mr. Schaefer seconded that effective September 8, 2003 the Town Manager is authorized to present staff's recommendations to the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities for inclusion in its 2004 Legislative Program. This list is amended by consensus as written above.

So passed unanimously.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

VII. REPORTS OF COUNCIL COMMITTEES

VIII. REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mayor Paterson spoke of the newsletter about town employees. She felt it was a good way to meet new staff and see a photo of the new employees.

Mayor Paterson recently presented Betty Robinson with a certificate of appreciation from the Council and Town for her many years of service in the field of Parks, Recreation and Open Space. She has given much to begin the Friends of the Hollow committee.

Thanks also to the fire and emergency service persons that handled the traffic control so well for the fireworks display.

IX. TOWN MANAGERS REPORT

The fence at Bicentennial Pond has been removed and the family, which was concerned about it, has been notified.

The second crow has been founded to be positive for West Nile Virus.

1063 memberships have been sold to the Community Center.
Town Planner, Greg Padick, has site plans for the poultry building on Horsebarn hill on the University of Connecticut campus.

The University of Connecticut has hired Mr. Rick Miller as Director of Environmental Policy and he will be looking at the Hazmat on campus and discussing the procedure to move it on campus.

The Department of Public Works has cut the grass along the pathway in Mansfield Center.

The assessment for the Nathan Hale Hotel has been reduced due to the financial circumstances of the hotel.

The University will be developing a co-generating facility using natural gas.

X. FUTURE AGENDAS

XI. PETITIONS, REQUESTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

6. R. Miller re: East(Agriculture)Campus Open House
7. Eastern CT Workforce Investment Board re: Regional Designation as Workforce Investment Area
8. The Willimantic Chronicle-“Fire Department Plans Working”
9. The Daily Campus-“Housing Shortage Under Control”
10. The Daily Campus-“Alcohol Task Force Regulations Implemented”
11. G. Padick re: proposed Discontinuation of a 900’ Segment of Old Tolland Turnpike
12. UConn Advance-“University Seeking Input on Master Plan”
13. Mansfield 300th Steering Committee-Tercentennial Ball
14. Mansfield 300th Steering Committee-Tercentennial Fireworks Display

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Clouette moved and Mr. Schaefer seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

So passed unanimously.

Elizabeth C. Paterson, Mayor

Joan E. Gerdsen, Town Clerk
September 22, 2003

Town Council
Town of Mansfield

Re: Fee Waiver Ordinance

Dear Town Council:

Based upon comments that we received from the Town Council during our discussion at the previous meeting, staff has modified our proposal concerning the revisions to Mansfield’s fee waivers ordinance. The revised proposal is similar to the Option 4 that we had previously submitted, with a 90-percent and 50-percent fee waiver structure for most of the applicable services. Under this revised option we would add community center memberships to the ordinance, and modify the eligibility criteria and the existing fee waiver structure. The 100-percent fee waiver would be eliminated and applicants who presently qualify for a 100-percent waiver would be entitled to a 90-percent waiver for most of the covered services. And, for most of the covered services the existing eligibility criteria for a 50-percent fee waiver would remain in place.

However, in comparison to the previously submitted Option 4, we are dropping the scholarship component and the suggested new 25 percent fee reduction. We are also recommending specific eligibility criteria for a new after-school program offered by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Our reasoning for eliminating the scholarship component is that the scholarship is really a separate issue, as some members of the Council have suggested, and is not something that we would actually include in a revision to the ordinance. Furthermore, the difference between a 90-percent fee waiver and the originally proposed 75-percent fee waiver is significant and reduces the need for a scholarship fund. Using a $500 family membership as an example, with a 90-percent fee waiver a family would pay only $50 a year for that membership, whereas with a 75-percent waiver the family would pay $125 per year. Moreover, we wish to point out that if the town decides against creating a scholarship fund through tax dollars, the Advisory Committees would not be precluded from establishing such a program through private donations.

We are dropping the suggested new 25-percent fee waiver because, upon further review, we are concerned about the town’s ability to absorb the additional cost for that fee reduction. After we
gain some experience operating the center and assess the extent to which fee waivers are
awarded, we can better determine whether the 25-percent waiver would be appropriate.

Lastly, we are recommending specific eligibility criteria for a new after-school program offered
by the Parks and Recreation Department. The new after-school program began this fall for
Mansfield students in grades 1 through 5, and is presently located at the high school. Upon the
completion of construction, the program will move to the community center. Program activities
include homework time, sports, creative games, arts and crafts, and special events. The program
cost is $1,700 per child per year. Because of the relative expense and our expectation that the
program will prove highly popular, we do not think the town could afford to provide fee waivers
at the 90-percent and 50-percent levels for this particular program. Therefore, we suggest that
for the after-school program applicants who would normally qualify for a 90-percent fee waiver
would receive a 45-percent reduction and applicants who would normally qualify for a 50-
percent fee waiver would be entitled to a 25-percent fee reduction.

Cost Analysis
To prepare the anticipated cost to amend the ordinance as proposed, we have researched
demographic statistics from the 2000 census and reviewed our previous fee waiver history. As
shown in the attached "Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics," Mansfield’s median
family income for 2000 was $69,661. We have also prepared the table below to illustrate the
income guidelines for the proposed change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Income Guidelines for 90% Fee Waiver - Set at 130% of Federal Poverty Guidelines (annual gross)</th>
<th>Income Guidelines for 50% Fee Waiver - Set at 185% of Federal Poverty Guidelines (annual gross)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>16,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15,756</td>
<td>22,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,838</td>
<td>28,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23,920</td>
<td>34,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28,002</td>
<td>39,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,084</td>
<td>45,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36,166</td>
<td>51,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40,248</td>
<td>57,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Parks and Recreation Department’s previous experience with the fee waiver program shows
that approximately ten percent of program registrants qualify for some type of waiver. However,
as mentioned previously, we expect that the new after-school program will be popular and could
draw fee waiver participation in excess of ten percent. Based on the demographic statistics, the
previous fee waiver program history and our expectations for the after-school program, we
project the proposed change would add approximately $10,000 to the current Parks and
Recreation fee waiver program. With the current $40,000 budgeted subsidy, this would bring the
total estimated subsidy to approximately $50,000 per year for Parks and Recreation programs. The total estimated subsidy may be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Summary of Estimated Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current appropriated fee waiver subsidy (Parks and Recreation programs only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New community center programs waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New community center memberships waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New after-school program fees waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated fee waiver subsidy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
Staff recommends that the Town Council endorse the proposed change and submit the revision to a public hearing to solicit input from the community. Under the existing ordinance, the Town Council may change the eligibility criteria by resolution alone. However, because we are proposing to add services and programs that would qualify for a fee waiver as well as to modify the eligibility criteria, staff recommends that we follow our customary ordinance revision procedure.

In the case that the Town Council supports the proposed revision, staff has drafted a suggested amendment to the ordinance (see attached). The Town Attorney has reviewed the proposed amendment and we have incorporated his recommended revisions. The proposed new language for the amendment in bold inside [brackets] and the recommended deletions are crossed-out. For your convenience, we have also attached a copy of the current ordinance.

From staff’s perspective, the proposal would accomplish several goals. For one, the revision would incorporate community center memberships as programs eligible for a fee waiver under the ordinance. Second, by eliminating the 100-percent waiver, the proposal would require all applicants to make a financial commitment to each acquired service, thus discouraging excessive use and/or non-commitment. And, third, the overall new cost of $10,000 is manageable.

On a related issue, at our previous meeting the Town Council had requested that we examine ways to streamline the fee application process to both ensure that private information is kept confidential and to make the process easier for applicants. While we are confident that confidentiality measures are in place, we can certainly work to make the application process more customer-friendly. We will keep the Council posted of our progress in this regard.

Lastly, we would like to thank the Recreation and the Social Services Advisory Committees for the hard work and time that the members put into examining our fee waiver structure and developing recommendations to improve the ordinance.
If the Town Council supports the proposed revision to Mansfield’s fee waivers ordinance, the following motion is in order:

*Move, effective September 22, 2003, to schedule a public hearing for 7:30 p.m. at the Town Council’s regular meeting on October 13, 2003 to solicit public comment regarding the proposed amendment to the Mansfield Code of Ordinances, Chapter 122, Article III – Fee Waivers.*

Respectfully submitted,

*Martin H. Berliner*

Martin H. Berliner  
Town Manager

Attach:(3)
Town of Mansfield
Amendment to Mansfield Code of Ordinances Chapter 122, Article III – Fee Waivers

September 22, 2003 Draft

Amendment to Section 122-5 – Eligibility Criteria

A. [This subsection shall apply to all of the services subject to this ordinance and set forth in Section 122-10, with the exception of the after-school program listed in section 122-10(B) below.] Applicable fees not reimbursed by a third party will be reduced [by 90%] [100%] for [residents of the Town of Mansfield who present sufficient] persons presenting evidence that they [are enrolled in the] have been determined to be currently eligible for Medicaid (Title XIX) [program, or] that their current adjusted gross family or household income does not exceed 130% of the federally determined level of poverty. Fifty percent of fees will be waived for [residents] persons whose current adjusted gross family or household income does not exceed 185% of the federally determined level of poverty. [Unreimbursed] medical expenses exceeding 3% of adjusted gross income will be deducted in determining gross income for the purpose of this program. [The] These eligibility criteria [set forth in this subsection] may be changed by resolution of the Town Council.

B. [For the after-school program listed in section 122-10(B) below only, applicants who qualify for a 90% fee reduction per the immediately preceding subsection of this Article shall instead receive a 45% fee reduction, and applicants who qualify for a 50% fee reduction per said subsection shall instead receive a 25% fee reduction. The fee reduction rates set forth in this subsection may be changed by resolution of the Town Council.]

Amendment to Section 122-10 – Applicability

The following services are subject to this ordinance:

A. Recreation Programs, excluding bus trips and more than two summer camp sessions per child and [including the after-school program for which special rates of fee reduction are set forth in section 122-5(B) above].
B. Planning and Zoning fees
C. Inland Wetland Fees
D. Zoning Board of Appeals Fees
E. Subsurface Sewage Disposal & Water Supply Wells
F. Junk Car Disposal
G. Solid Water Disposal
H. Recycling Fees
I. Ambulance Fees
J. [Community Center Memberships and Programs]
ARTICLE II, Planning and Zoning Commission Fees [Adopted 6-14-1993]

ARTICLE III, Fee Waivers [Adopted 2-10-1997, effective 3-8-1997]

§ 122-3. Title.
This article shall be known and may be cited as the "Town of Mansfield Fee Waivers Ordinance."

§ 122-4. Intent.
It is the Town's intention to encourage participation and to provide services to all residents of the Town regardless of their financial status.

§ 122-5. Eligibility criteria.
Applicable fees not reimbursed by a third party will be reduced 100% for persons presenting evidence that they have been determined to be currently eligible for Medicaid (Title XIX) that their current adjusted gross family or household income does not exceed 130% of the federally determined level of poverty. Fifty percent of fees will be waived for persons whose current adjusted gross family or household income does not exceed 185% of the federally determined level of poverty. Medical expenses exceeding 3% of adjusted gross income will be deducted in determining gross income for the purpose of this program. These eligibility criteria may be changed by the Town Council by resolution.

§ 122-6. Requests.
Requests must be made on a Town of Mansfield application form.

§ 122-7. Verification of information.
The information on the application may be verified by Town officials at any time during the year.

§ 122-8. Review of waivers; changes to information.
Waivers need to be reinstituted on a yearly basis unless circumstances warrant a more frequent review. Any changes in family size or household income must be reported.


The information provided will be treated confidentially and will be used only for eligibility determinations and verification of data.

§ 122-10. Applicability.

The following services are subject to this article:

A. Recreation programs (excluding bus trips and more than two summer camp sessions per child).
B. Planning and zoning fees.
C. Inland wetland fees.
D. Zoning Board of Appeals fees.
E. Subsurface sewage disposal and water supply wells.
F. Junk car disposal.
G. Solid waste disposal.
H. Recycling fees.
I. Ambulance fees.
Table DP-3. Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000
Geographic area: Mansfield town, Tolland County, Connecticut
[Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see text]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>INCOME IN 1999</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 16 years and over</td>
<td>12,986</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>15,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>11,287</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>25,000 to 34,999</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>10,303</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>35,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>50,000 to 74,999</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of civilian labor force</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>$75,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 16 years and over</td>
<td>9,335</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median household income (dollars)</td>
<td>48,888</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government workers</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed workers in own incorporated business</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>with related children under 16 years</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With earnings</td>
<td>10,020</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregates</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van driven alone</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van carpooled</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation including taxi cab</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 to 74,999</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means of transportation</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>10,303</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean travel time to work (minutes)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed civilian population</td>
<td>10,303</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median family income (dollars)</td>
<td>69,661</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per capita income (dollars)</td>
<td>16,094</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, professional, and related occupations</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 to 74,999</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male full-time, year-round workers</td>
<td>42,154</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female full-time, year-round workers</td>
<td>32,292</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, health and social services</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (except public administration)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS OF WORKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Families with female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary workers</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government workers</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed workers in own not incorporated business</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related children under 18 years</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid family workers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related children 5 to 17 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Represents zero or rounds to zero. (X) Not applicable.
2. If the denominator of a mean value or per capita value is less than 30, then that value is calculated using a rounded aggregate in the numerator.

September 22, 2003

Town Council
Town of Mansfield

Re: Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) 2004 State Legislative Program

Dear Town Council:

Attached please find the Town Council's revised version of the town’s suggestions for inclusion within the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities’ 2004 Legislative Program. The Council had also requested that we carry this item forward to the September 22nd agenda for further consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Martin H. Berliner
Town Manager

Attach:(1)
To: Kachina Walsh-Weaver                              From: Matt Hart, Assistant Town Manager

Fax:                                                  Pages: 3

Phone:                                                Date: 9/11/2003

Re:  Suggestions for Legislative Program            CC:

☐ Urgent   ☐ For Review   ☐ Please Comment   ☐ Please Reply   ☐ Please Recycle

Attached please find the town of Mansfield's suggestions for the 2004 CCM Legislative Program. Please note that we may have some additional suggestions at a later point.

We appreciate your assistance.
TOWN OF MANSFIELD
SUGGESTIONS FOR CCM'S 2004 STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM
September 8, 2003

**Education**
- Increase funding for the Education Cost Sharing Grant (ECS)
- Increase funding and separate Special Education funding
- Support adequate funding of the Operating Budgets for the state's public colleges and universities

**Elections**
- Eliminate the expanded Presidential ballots currently utilized in this state and permit same-day registration with appropriate safeguards

**Environment**
- Expand the bottle bill to include non-carbonated beverage containers and channel the new unclaimed deposit revenues to fund recycling-related programs; or set up a task force to study the improvement and expansion of the bottle bill with a 2-year implementation. Also, increase the deposit revenue from 5 cents to 10 cents.
- Study and set-up a comprehensive construction and demolition debris recycling/reuse infrastructure in Connecticut
- Ban CRT's from landfills and incinerators
- Ban non-recyclable (contaminating) plastic beer containers

**Health, Welfare and Social Services**
- Increase funding for Dial-A-Ride
- Support better coordination and evaluation of substance abuse prevention programs
- Include parents at income levels up to 185% of the poverty line in the HUSKY health insurance program
- Provide more realistic Medicaid rates set at actual cost for convalescent and dental care
- Expand the state Assisted Living program
- Increase the asset level for eligibility in the home care subsidy
- Increase state per capita grant contribution to Health Districts
- Increase annual allocation to Tobacco Trust Fund from Tobacco Settlement Funds
- Increase state assistance to Connecticut Legal Services

**Housing and Community Development**
- Support the "Housing Plus" and Beyond Shelter" programs that link rent subsidies, transitional housing and follow-up services to prevent homelessness

**Land Use, Planning and Zoning**
- Authorize municipalities to increase the real estate conveyance tax to finance open space acquisitions and public improvement enhancements of commercial areas (e.g. beautification, lighting, benches, signage, etc.)
Licenses and Permits
- Convert annual fishing licenses issued free to persons with permanent disabilities to free lifetime licenses, similar to free lifetime licenses issued to persons over 65. Also extend this free lifetime benefit to persons who have suffered a permanent loss of a limb. This conversion would provide a greater service to the recipient and save municipal administration costs.

Municipal Labor Relations
- Amend municipal employee collective bargaining statutes to clarify the statutory definition of “department head” for purposes of excluding such personnel from collective bargaining. The definition of “department head” should include staff reporting directly to the chief executive officer and staff directly supervised by a board or commission.

Public Safety
- Encourage the state to study regulations pertaining to distractions while driving
- Provide funding to implement the Connecticut Department of Public Works’ capital improvement program for the state’s eight regional fire schools

Transportation
- Revise statutes concerning truck prohibition on local streets so that non-delivery trucks can be prohibited from local streets by the Legal Traffic Authority (LTA). Also allow weight restrictions on local roads by the LTA.
- Require the DOT to provide technical assistance on Traffic Calming to municipalities
- Provide funding to implement phase II stormwater regulations in Connecticut municipalities
- Increase the total amount and funding percentages for the local bridge program (currently maxed out at 33%)
- Require the DOT to study and revise construction inspection requirements for enhancement and TEA-21 projects (they are currently inappropriately high)
- Enable municipalities to collect disturbed roadway excavation permit fees that include damages to roadways that were recently paved, surfaced or reconstructed
- Increased rural transit and commuter bus funding
- Expand mass transportation systems such as rail and bus service. This would relieve pressure on state and local roads and help spur development along existing transportation corridors.
Dear Town Council:

At its last meeting, the Town/University Relations Committee established a sub-committee of town and university representatives to review the report prepared by President Austin’s Task Force on Substance Abuse. The sub-committee’s additional charge is to develop suggestions where the Town/University Relations Committee could assist or facilitate the implementation of the Task Force recommendations.

In her role as the co-chair of the Town/University Relations Committee, the Mayor has appointed the following five representatives to the subcommittee: Martin Berliner, Town Manager; SGT Michael Darcy, Mansfield Resident State Trooper; Kevin Grunwald, Director of Social Services; Frank Christison-Lagay, EO Smith High School; and the Mayor herself. Most of these representatives either were members of President Austin’s Task Force or were otherwise involved in its proceedings.

Our hope is that the subcommittee will assist the Town/University Relations Committee and the community in our efforts to address this most important issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin H. Berliner  
Town Manager.
THIS PAGE LEFT
BLANK
INTENTIONALLY
Re: Grant Application to Support Mansfield School Readiness Grant Program

Dear Town Council:

Attached please find excerpts from an application in the amount of $71,900 to support Mansfield’s School Readiness Program. The purpose of the school readiness program is to:

- Significantly increase the number of spaces in accredited and/or approved programs for young children to provide greater access to high-quality school readiness programs;
- Significantly increase the number of spaces for young children to receive full-day, full-year school readiness and child day care to meet family needs and enable parents to become employed; and
- Establish a shared cost for such school readiness and child day care programs among the state and its various agencies, the communities and families.

Financial Impact

This grant provides the state’s contribution for financial support for the establishment of school readiness programs for young children ages 3 and 4 years to eligible local and regional communities with one or more severe need schools. As defined in Connecticut General Statutes Section 10-16p(a)(3) “a school in which forty percent or more of the lunches served are served to students who are eligible for free or reduced price lunches pursuant to federal law and regulations. The grant provides subsidies to families for 15 full-time early care slots at three accredited childcare and educational centers. Of the total anticipated grant award of $71,900, approximately 6 percent is allocated for administrative expenses to manage the program, with the balance of the funds going directly to the participating centers to subsidize the cost of these slots.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Town Council authorize the submission of the grant application. The Mansfield School Readiness Program has operated successfully for the past five years with the strong support of the Mansfield School Readiness Council. The program provides affordable, high quality early care and education to children whose families are unable to afford such programs, and supports educational achievement and success in later school years.
If the Town Council concurs with this recommendation, the following motion would be in order:

 Move, effective September 22, 2003 to authorize the Mayor to submit an application in the amount of $71,900 to the Connecticut Department of Education to fund Mansfield's School Readiness Program for fiscal year 2003/04.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Martin H. Berliner
Town Manager

Attach: (2)
CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Educational Programs and Services
Bureau of Early Childhood Education and Social Services

SECTION III

SCHOOL READINESS GRANT PROGRAM
Municipalities with One or More Severe Need Schools
(A Competitive Grant Program)

The State Department of Education supports this grant program.

GRANT PERIOD
July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

GRANT COVER PAGE
To Be Completed and Submitted with the Grant Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Agency:</th>
<th>Local Program Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Name, Address, Telephone, Fax)</td>
<td>Mansfield School Readiness Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Mansfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four South Eagleville Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, CT 06268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: (860) 429-3315 Fax: (860) 429-6863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Contact Person:</th>
<th>Program Funding Dates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Grunwald, Director</td>
<td>From July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Department of Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four South Eagleville Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storrs, CT 06268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: (860) 429-3315 Fax: (860) 429-7785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Funding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We, Elizabeth Patterson and Gordon Schimmel, the undersigned authorized chief administrative officials, submit this proposal on behalf of the applicant agency, attest to the appropriateness and accuracy of the information contained therein, and certify that this proposal, if funded, will comply with all relevant requirements of the state and federal laws and regulations.

In addition, funds obtained through this source will be used solely to support the purpose, goals and objectives as stated herein.

Signature: (Chief Elected Official)  
Name: (typed)  
Agency:  
Title: Mayor  
Date: 9-17-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature: (Superintendent)</th>
<th>Title: Superintendent of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: (typed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRANTEE NAME: Town of Mansfield

TOWN CODE: 078

GRANT TITLE: School Readiness Grant Program
Municipalities with One or More Severe Grant Programs

PROJECT TITLE: School Readiness Grant Program
Municipalities with One or More Severe Grant Programs

ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION: FUND: 0000 SPID: 016 ACTIVITY: 00000103

GRANT PERIOD: 07/01/2003 – 06/30/2004

AUTHORIZED AMOUNT:

CURRENT DUE:

LOCAL BALANCE:

CARRY-OVER DUE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>BUDGET AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111A</td>
<td>Administrators / Supervisors Salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111B</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112A</td>
<td>Education Aides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112B</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Personal Services – Employees Benefits</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Inservice (Professional Development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Pupil Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Parent Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Other Professional Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>$660.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Purchased Property Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Pupil Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Other Purchased Services</td>
<td>$67,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Instructional Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Administrative Supplies</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>Other Supplies</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Other Objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$71,900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original Request Date

Revised Request Date

State Department of Education
Program Manager Authorization
September 22, 2003

Town Council
Town of Mansfield

Re: Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with CSEA, Local 760 - Professional and Technical Employees

Dear Town Council:

As you know, we had reached an impasse in our negotiations with the CSEA, Local 760 – Professional and Technical bargaining unit and were scheduled for a mediation session with a state-appointed mediator. We conducted the mediation session on August 29th and were able to reach a tentative agreement that the bargaining unit members have subsequently ratified.

The highlights of the tentative agreement are as follows:

1) Duration – three years (July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2006)

2) Wages
   a. Year 1 – 2.75 percent general increase
   b. Year 2 – 2.75 percent general increase
   c. Year 3 – 2.75 percent general increase

3) Employee health insurance cost share – under the present agreement, employees are paying approximately five percent of premium for the Anthem Blue Cross Century Preferred PPO plan and three percent of premium for Anthem’s Bluecare POS plan. Effective year one of the proposed contract, the employee cost share would increase to seven percent of premium for the Century Preferred PPO and would hold at three percent for the Bluecare POS. (Because the POS plan has better discounts and is a more affordable option for the employer, we wish to hold the premium cost share to create an incentive for more employees to enroll in that plan.) Effective year two of the proposed contract, the employee would pay nine percent of premium for the Century Preferred PPO and 3.5 percent for the Bluecare POS. In year three, the cost share would increase to eleven percent for the Century Preferred PPO and four percent for the Bluecare POS.
4) Overtime – for new community center personnel, the proposed agreement contains provisions concerning overtime compensation that are beneficial to the town. For example, community center staff whose normal work schedule includes a holiday will receive a day off in lieu of the holiday, as opposed to overtime pay. We thought the addition of these provisions was imperative due to the nature of the operations and the schedule of the community center.

5) Payment in lieu of health insurance – increase the payment in lieu of health benefits option to provide an incentive for employees with dual coverage to drop their insurance with the town. The town’s current health insurance premiums for single coverage under the Century Preferred PPO are $3,950.76 for single coverage, $8,428.44 for two-person coverage and $10,621.92 for family coverage. The proposed payments in lieu of coverage are $1,000 for single coverage, $1,400 for two-person coverage and $1,750 for family coverage. Also, we would add a payment in lieu of health insurance option of $750 per year for non-Medicare eligible retirees.

6) Position upgrades – under the proposed successor agreement, we would increase the pay ranges for the secretary and receptionist positions by one pay grade, and would reclassify the position of revenue clerk to “assistant to the collector of revenue” with an increase of one pay grade.

7) Prescription coverage – revise the prescription coverage under the Century Preferred PPO plan to a three-tier formulary in which employees would have a $5 co-pay for generic drugs, $15 co-pay for brand name drugs and $25 for non-list prescriptions. This change alone would save the town approximately $250 per employee per year.

We anticipate that the first year costs for the proposed contract would total approximately 2.63 percent, which exceeds the two-percent that was budgeted. However, the projected increase for the life of the three-year agreement would average 3.07 percent per year. This increase compares very favorably to recently negotiated contracts around the state, which still average in excess of three percent. Furthermore, the proposed agreement would enable us to make significant progress with respect to more equitably sharing insurance costs between the employer and the employee.

As mentioned, the union members have ratified the tentative agreement. The Town Council now has three options: 1) approve the agreement; 2) disapprove the agreement; or 3) take no action, in which case the agreement would become effective after a 30-day period. Staff believes that the proposed agreement is a fair package for both the union and the town, therefore, we recommend its approval by the Council.
If the Town Council supports this recommendation, the following motion is in order:

*Move, effective September 22, 2003, to authorize the Town Manager to execute the proposed collective bargaining agreement between the Town of Mansfield and CSEA, Local 760 – Professional and Technical Employees for the term beginning July 1, 2003 and ending June 30, 2006.*

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Martin H. Berliner
Town Manager
TOWN OF MANSFIELD
Community Center Building Committee Meeting
September 2, 2003
MINUTES

Present: J. Pandolfo, A. Rash, M. Paquette, D. Hoyle, R. Moore, C. Kueffner, S. Goldman

Staff: Town Manager M. Berliner, Capital Projects and Personnel Assistant L. Patenaude, Director of Parks and Recreation C. Vincente

Others: Construction Manager, D. Yoder, Construction Manager, K. Boutin, Architect, D. Harazim

1. Call to Order

S. Goldman convened the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the August 18, 2003 meeting were accepted.

3. Audience to Visitors

None

4. Additions to the Agenda

None

5. Staff Reports

a. Construction Manager’s Report – K. Boutin gave a brief update on the progress of the work at the site. Ken also reported that finishes are starting. D. Hoyle asked about the plaster in the pool. Rizzo has been on site getting ready to plaster by filling in voids, setting up scaffolding, etc. Plaster is on a truck coming from Florida.

M. Berliner explained change order numbers #59 (walks from bituminous concrete to Portland cement concrete and #60 (Fernco Fittings between the rain leaders and the underground storm drains). S. Goldman moved to approve both change orders, J. Pandolfo seconded, motion passed unanimously.

M. Berliner then went on to explain change order #61 (landscaping labor). The item had been previously credited to the owner and is being put back in the project. M. Berliner explained that Beebe is on site and will do a good job with the landscaping so to move the project along, he has authorized them to do the work. M. Paquette moved to approve change order #61. D. Hoyle seconded. Motion passed with one abstention.
C. Kueffner questioned PR 34 (change paint on Walls in Locker Room). D. Harazim replied that it was something that was missed – it should have been epoxy paint to begin with. M. Berliner stated that it will add protection against mold. K. Boutin said that it is both the toilet rooms and the locker rooms. M. Berliner stated that K. Boutin will negotiate on that price.

C. Kueffner questioned PR 32 (Carpet in lieu of VCT in Lobby 201). C. Vincente stated that it would be quieter in the upper lobby area. K. Boutin said that the lead time was four to six weeks. A. Rash suggested that the carpeting be done at a later time. K. Boutin also said that part of the price was a restocking fee for the VCT. A consensus was made to do the carpet at a later time.


6. Old Business

None

7. New Business

C. Vincente passed out a draft of the dedication plaque. A. Rash mentioned that it was a good idea to list prior Council members.

M. Berliner reported that UConn will let us fill the pool at no cost. He asked if anyone was aware of any potential problems that might hold us up.

The next meeting is September 15th at 7:00 p.m. Cynthia van Zelm from the Downtown Partnership will be at this meeting.

M. Paquette moved to adjourn at 7:25 pm. C. Kueffner seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Patenaude,
Capital Projects and Personnel Assistant
ADMINISTRATION

- **Town Dues:** We have received full dues payment from all nine member towns. Thank you!
- **State Grant in Aid:** With the state budget finally in place, OPM has confirmed that regional planning organizations will be receiving the same amount in SGIA funding for FY 04 as they received in FY 03. They also confirmed that, at this time, there is NO FUNDING IN PLACE FOR RPO's FOR FY 05, the second year of the biennial budget.
- **Technical Assistance Contracts Update:**

**FY 03 summary:** The following technical assistance contracts were completed in FY 03, and WINCOG has received full payment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaplin</td>
<td>zoning regulation changes &amp; zoning map</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>zoning map</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland '03-1</td>
<td>linking assessors database to digital tax map</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland '03-2</td>
<td>mapping for POCD</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland '03-3</td>
<td>POCD preparation assistance</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical assistance contracts active in FY 04:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willimantic River Alliance</td>
<td>grant administration ($5,000)</td>
<td>nearing completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>POCD</td>
<td>contract pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UPCOMING DATES OF INTEREST

- September 9  ConnDOT "listening session" on state's long range transportation plan  
  4:00pm - 6:00pm, ECSU Student Center, room 205
- September 12 Meeting for Windham Region Municipal "points of contact" for homeland security assessment process, 8:30 a.m. Coventry Town Hall Annex
- October 1    Regional Planning Commission, 7:30 p.m.
- October 3    Next WINCOG Meeting

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- **CEDS:** Work on the CEDS update continues to take a back seat to other more time-sensitive activities.

TRANSPORTATION

- **ConnDOT Listening Session for Long Range Plan:** Just a reminder that ConnDOT has scheduled several listening sessions around the state to improve public input into its long range planning process. A meeting for residents of the Northeastern Connecticut and Windham regions will be held on Tuesday, September 9, at the ECSU Student Center, Room 205, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

- **Non-Metropolitan Planning Process:** Today's agenda includes, at ConnDOT's request, the opportunity to review and comment on ConnDOT's final draft document Connecticut Process for Consultation and Cooperation with Local Officials in Non-Metropolitan Areas. This is to satisfy a federal requirement that ConnDOT have a written policy on this issue. Essentially the draft simply documents the process that has been in place for the past several years.

- **Transportation Enhancement Projects:** This program, which funded Willimantic's Veteran's Memorial Greenway (Kendall Spur), Coventry's Mill Brook Walkway, many bike/pedestrian enhancements in the Eastbrook Mall, UConn, and Mansfield Center areas of Mansfield, and completion of sections of the Charter Oak Greenway, among others) is in jeopardy. Funding for the program has been removed from the appropriations bill to be acted on this fall. You may wish to contact your congressional representatives and urge that this funding be restored.
TRANSIT

• Prepaid Fares: Discussions are continuing with UConn and the Town of Mansfield to encourage the participation of the UConn undergraduate student body in this program. Because there is no easy way for bus drivers to distinguish among the graduate/undergraduate/employee UConn ID’s, UConn’s participation in the prepaid fares program must be all or nothing. The UConn Transportation Department and the Graduate Student Senate are willing to support the program, and we should hear within the next week or two about the support of the undergraduates. We hope that by the end of September, the program will be fully in place.

• New Service to the Mohegan Sun Casino: Funded by a transfer of Jobs Access funds from the southeastern region, WRTD will be starting a new run to serve employees of the Mohegan Sun Casino, covering one shift per day. The Mohegan Sun is aggressively recruiting in Willimantic, and early indications are that this 20-passenger bus will be quite full from the start. WRCC will operate the service.

LAND USE PLANNING

• Regional Planning Commission: At their August 6th meeting, the Regional Planning Commission reviewed and responded to the following referrals:

  a. #03-06-27-CA: Columbia: A proposal to add three new Columbia Lake Watershed Protection Overlay Zones and to make various other regulation changes. Conformance with Regional Land Use Plan. No intermunicipal impacts.
  b. #03-07-14-CY: Coventry: A proposal to change the maximum building projection from 3 feet to 5 feet. Conformance with Regional Land Use Plan. No intermunicipal impacts.
  c. #03-07-28-CY: Coventry: A proposal to amend the regulations pertaining to accessory residential uses. Conformance with Regional Land Use Plan. No intermunicipal impacts.

The Regional Planning Commission also approved revisions to the Windham Region Land Use Plan relating to lighting and signage. The commission will refrain from forwarding the changes to WINCOG until more revisions and updates are compiled.

At their September 3rd meeting, the Regional Planning Commission reviewed and responded to the following referral:

  a. #03-08-15-TD: Tolland: A proposal to make multiple revisions to the zoning regulations. Conformance with Regional Land Use Plan. No intermunicipal impacts.

The Regional Planning Commission also discussed possible new regional projects. The commission is looking at either an analytical project that could be used for education or a functional project, such as bridge rehabilitation along the Willimantic River Greenway.

• On September 16, WINCOG will host a meeting of the Eastern CT Resource Conservation and Development Area (ECRC&D). The ECRC&D has recently completed its work plan for the 2003-2004 period and is reaching out to area COG’s to see how we can all work together to reach our mutual goals. Staff planners from the following COG’s will attend: Capitol Region, CT River Estuary, Midstate, Northeastern CT, Southeastern CT, and Windham Region.

• Scotland Plan of Conservation and Development: Final revisions are being made to the plan. The Scotland Planning and Zoning Commission expects to act on the document at their next meeting on September 17th.
- **Ashford Plan of Conservation and Development**: The Ashford PoCD subcommittee has made several short presentations to town commissions to introduce the plan update and also to solicit input. At the last meeting, a member of the Woodstock Conservation Commission made a presentation on conservation planning. The subcommittee is reviewing a previous draft of the plan and has created several working committees to work on sections of the plan. These committees are Economic Development, Natural Resources and Recreation, Historic/Cultural/Aesthetic, Municipal Services/Facilities/Infrastructure, and Mapping.
EMERGENCY PLANNING GRANT UPDATES

- **Emergency Operating Plans (EOP) and CERT – FEMA Funding through OEM:** On August 28, three representatives from Tectonic Engineering, met with a steering committee to discuss the consultants’ approach and process to be followed in reviewing municipal EOPs and preparing a terrorism annex for each participating municipality. The following Windham Region representatives participated: John Jackman, Emergency Planning Director, Mansfield; David Dagon, Mansfield Fire Chief; John Walsh, Willimantic Fire Chief; Don Muirhead, Emergency Planning Director, Windham; Tony Scalora, OEM Area IV Coordinator; and your director. Among the issues discussed was the relationship between the consultants’ process and the upcoming statewide homeland security assessment, in which municipalities will be asked to participate. As a result of this conversation, WINCOG staff agreed to organize a September 12 meeting of those individuals who will serve as the municipal “points of contact” for the assessment to identify intermunicipal issues that are likely to arise, and will need to be resolved, in the course of the assessment.

- **Bioterrorism Planning – federal funding through DPH:** WINCOG hosted a meeting of the health district directors in the Windham and Northeast regions with Cyndi Stem, the consultant hired by the CT Association of Districts of Health (CADH) to assist with regional bioterrorism planning.

- **Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Planning Grant – FEMA Funding through DEP:** WINCOG has received, and is reviewing, a draft contract between DEP and WINCOG for the development of a regional Pre-disaster Hazard Mitigation Plan. WINCOG will be receiving $70,000 in FEMA funding, to be matched by $23,333 in local cash or in-kind services.

CENSUS AFFILIATE ACTIVITIES

- **Data Requests:** Staff responded to requests from: 2 town staff, 1 non-profit organization, and 1 municipal volunteer.
- Staff provided extensive assistance with census data in the preparation of Windham’s “Weed and Seed” grant application.

LOCAL ASSISTANCE

- **Ashford** - Worked on Town POCD under contract.
- **Hampton** - Provided census and local road mileage data to first selectman.
- **Windham** - Continued to participate on Windham Ad Hoc Economic Development Committee.
- **All Towns** - Processed statutory referrals from or affecting various member towns (see Planning, above)
  - Provided follow-up information regarding upcoming statewide homeland security assessment.

MEETINGS

- **August**
  - Meeting with Windham Recreation Director re: Weed and Seed application (BB)
  - WINCOG Executive Committee (BB)
  - Meeting with CADH consultant and area health district directors (BB)
  - DPH Focus Area A meeting (bioterrorism planning) / Middletown (BB)
  - Ashford Plan of Conservation & Development subcommittee/Ashford (JB)
  - GIS User-2-User Network Remote Sensing Workshop/ Storrs (JB)
  - Curb-Cut Management Seminar/ Storrs (JB)
  - Statewide Homeland Security Assessment training / Cromwell (BB)
  - Prepaid fares meeting with representatives from Rep. Denise Merrill’s office, UConn Undergraduate Student Senate, and Mansfield Transportation Committee / Storrs (MP)
  - Green Valley Institute Quarterly Meeting/ Brooklyn (JB)
  - Homeland Security Assessment Training / Cromwell (BB)
  - Meeting with Tectonic and emergency planning steering committee (BB, JB)

- **Sept.**
  - RPO / EOP update meeting / Newington (BB)
Activities

- Continued working with ConnDOT on funding issues and budgets for capital equipment.
- Continued working with the Town of Mansfield and the UCONN community on the prepaid fares program.
- Worked with representatives of various media outlets on WRTD advertising campaign.
- Conducted ongoing meetings with Arrow representatives to address fleet maintenance issues.
- Developed new service proposal under Jobs Access program for Commuter Service between Willimantic and Mohegan Sun Casino and secured funding for same.
- Secured Revenue Anticipation Note for Transit District with Fleet Bank.
- Accepted delivery of 2 new paratransit vehicles.
- Compiled documents, statistical data and invoices for FTA/ConnDOT and DSS as requested.

Meetings

August, 2003
5 WRCC - WTW issues
7, 18 Mohegan Sun Casino - new service proposal; grand opening of commuter store
12 WBMW - advertising
14 Conway & Londregan - RAN note
15 Fleet Bank - RAN note
21 WTW Operations Meeting
21 Town of Mansfield - prepaid fares program
22 WTW Policy Committee Meeting
Meeting w/ Matthews Bus rep accepting delivery of 2 new paratransit vehicles
27 UCONN Undergraduate Student Gov't - prepaid fares proposal
28 CT Works, WRCC, Mohegan Sun - new service
Open Space Preservation Committee
Minutes of August 19, 2003

Members present: Jim Morrow, Vicki Wetherell, Steve Lowry, David Silsbee, Curt Vincente.

David Silsbee acted as secretary.

Curt reported on progress with the Vernon property. The final paperwork for the DEP grant has been submitted after much work. The Nipmuck trail rerouting has been completed and the trail is in good shape.

The possible acquisition of the Hanks Hill Road pond property as a town park area was discussed. Concerns were expressed about the liability of owning the pond and dam. A field trip to the property was scheduled for Saturday morning, August 23rd to evaluate the property.

Two other large properties in the Wormwood Hill area were also discussed and will be included in the field trip.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25
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Mansfield Parks Advisory Committee, Draft Minutes for September 3, 2003


I. The meeting was called to order at 7:37 pm. The minutes from the August meetings were accepted.

II. Annual PAC selections for 2003-2004. Three PAC positions are open for recruitment. A new brochure about PAC will be at Town Fair. Our officers this year will be Sue Craig as chairperson and Jean Haskell as Secretary.

III. Continuing Business

A. PAC’s recommendations for the new POCD were discussed and accepted, and will be forwarded to Greg Padick by Jean.

B. PAC Reports

1. Management. The Land Management Plan Assignment List was reviewed and twelve properties were agreed on as PAC concerns: Schoolhouse Brook, Common Fields, Coney Rock, Dunhamtown, Eagleville, Fifty-Foot, McGregor, Merrow, Mt. Hope, Old Spring Hill, Shelter Falls, and Torrey. David Silsbee volunteered to organize their management plans for a steady PAC review process for the coming year. A sample steward’s quarterly management report was exhibited.

2. Volunteers. The new NAV brochure is ready for Town Fair. Steward recruitment continues. A newsletter will be mailed to current volunteers encouraging them to attend the fall training/workdays. Work continues on the steward job manual.

3. Communications. The group and research permits were approved for use, correcting for group size appropriateness.

4. Enhancements. Suggestions for a special project waiting list included: Merrow Meadow bridge, cleanup of Schoolhouse Brook pond and dam area, Woodduck houses and bench at Eagleville, stonewall restoration at Old Spring Hill Field. Dena Mehalakes, instructor at Mansfield Middle School, will be working with her students, Jennifer and Sue on a trail guide project for Schoolhouse Brook.

5. Budget. Jennifer reported that PAC is allocated a budget for printing, supplies, and training for this year through June, 2004. Next year’s proposal process begins in January.

6. Education. A new FOMP subscription brochure was presented and is ready for Town Fair. The fall event will be “Let’s Talk Turkey” Nov. 2, at Mansfield Historical Society/Fifty-Foot, leader Jack Barclay.

7. There were no reports for Acquisition, Science, Executive.

C. Park Updates. The Mt. Hope picnic table and benches have been completed. Jacquelyn and Sue will clear the back trail at Merrow Meadow.

D. Non-PAC Reports. A sample OSPC checklist from 1994 was considered out of date and PAC would prefer to see a current “checklist” process, perhaps as it is written in the new POCD. David Silsbee brought up for discussion that the Town has an opportunity to buy Hanks Hill Pond, and it was decided (for Jean) to send a memo from PAC to OSPC that we recommend considering this purchase as an effort to create and develop neighborhood parks.

IV. New Business

A. PAC subcommittees assignments. PAC members volunteered as follows for this year: Management, David Silsbee; Volunteers, Jean Haskell; Education, Sue Craig. If absent for a meeting, please send in your report by email so it can be presented at the monthly meeting. PAC recruitment can be targeted for interests in Acquisition, Budget, Communications, Enhancements, and Science.

B. PZC Woods File# 1210. Discussion results will be sent (by Jean) to PZC questioning the quality of the proposed open space easement, as to its extreme slope and amount of wetland, and whether this is a fair representation of the whole property or just the unbuildable land.

V. Future Agendas. Organize the winter (and spring?) FOMP event before October 31, so it can be included in the Winter Parks and Rec Magazine. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mansfield Conservation Commission
Minutes of the August 20, 2003 Meeting
Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Building

Present: Quentin Kessel, Lanse Minkler (Vice Chairman), John Silander, and Frank Trainor.


Town Staff: Grant Meitzler

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 PM.

2. The minutes of the August 20, 2003 were approved with editorial corrections.

3. Town Plan of Conservation and Development: The CC will continue to monitor the proposed changes to this plan.

4. IWA Referrals.
   a) W1222 - Aspen/Brine – Spring Hill Road. Map date 7/20/03. This application is for an attached garage within 150 feet of wetlands. Kessel moved and Trainor seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the wetlands as long as the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place and removed after the site has stabilized. The motion passed unanimously.

   b) W1223 - Best – Brookside Lane. Map date 7/18/03. This application is for an addition within the 150 foot regulated area. Kessel recused himself. Silander moved and Trainor seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the involved wetlands as long as the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place during construction and removed after the sites have stabilized. The motion passed unanimously (3 yes, 1 recusal).

   c) W1224 - Parrow - Browns Road. Map date 7/30/03. This application is for a three lot subdivision. The CC appreciates the proposed easement and the preservation of wetlands; however, the CC asks that the zoning agent verify that sufficient non-wetland area is included in the easement. The CC further urges IWA to ask that the driveway and septic system on Lot 1 be adjusted to avoid negative impacts on the existing stone walls. The CC also feels that every effort should be made to preserve the other stone walls in the subdivision. No vote was taken on this application.

   d) W1225 - Holt - Browns Road. Map date 8/4/03. This application is for a four lot subdivision. Kessel moved and Silander seconded that there should be no significant negative impact if appropriate sedimentation and erosion controls are in place during the construction and removed after the site is stabilized. The term "appropriate" is used because the CC feels the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map appear to be inadequate. The motion passed unanimously.
5. PZC Referrals:

PZC File # 1210 - Holt - Browns Road - 54 lot subdivision. The CC is disappointed that the cluster concept was not carried further with this plan. The question was raised as to how short a section of Town road might have permitted two double driveways and thereby placed all four homes within the interior of the subdivision. The wish was expressed that the plan might have provided a fuller demonstration of the cluster concept.

9. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Quentin Kessel
Secretary
I. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the May 1, 2003 meeting were accepted as written.

II. COMMUNICATIONS/REPORTS:

A. Discussion with SSD Director:
Kevin Grunwald reported that a new job description has been written for the position of Senior Services Coordinator, and recruitment and interviewing will begin soon. He also reported that the youth counselor position at E.O. Smith High School will be jointly funded by the Town and the Region for one more year in its present format, and will be totally taken over by the Region in 2004. Over the course of the next year the Department will explore how the Town's portion of this funding can be best utilized to support staffing for departmental needs.

B. Review of Department activity and other items in packet: minutes of other advisory committees were included.

C. Program funding updates
   • Graustein Foundation: revised budget and action plan submitted.
   • School Readiness Grant: still awaiting State decision on eligibility.
   • Senior Services Nurse/Wellness Center: continues to be funded by Senior Services through the McSweeney Center.
   • General impact of State budget cuts/closure of Willimantic DSS office: staff are reporting increased demand for services at a local level.

D. Other

III. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Complete discussion of mission and purpose of SSAC, and act on the proposed document:
There was some discussion re: issues raised by M. Hauslaib and B. Lehman relative to the proposed number of members and the term limits. B. Lehman had suggested expanding membership to 7, and both agreed that the membership should be as representative of the community as possible (clergy, businesses, etc.). It was decided that the membership of the committee will remain at 5 and that term limit requirements will be utilized as guidelines for membership. K. Grunwald will incorporate language from the Town Ordinance into this document. A motion was made and approved to accept the document with revisions.

B. Report on status of adoption of a mission statement for the Mansfield Department of Social Service: no progress on this to date.

C. Update on SSAC collaboration with Recreation Advisory Committee on Community Center fee reduction policy/schedule: A memo has gone to the Town Manager for his review, and the proposed changes to the ordinance need to be rewritten. The committee requested that it should be pointed out to C. Vincente that the Community Center membership form does not have a check-off for the scholarship fund. K. Grunwald will do this.

D. Review of draft proposal to establish the Mansfield Community Fund: It was suggested that we look at tying the needs assessment process into a larger initiative of identifying unmet needs and resources of Mansfield residents. This will help us to prioritize the way in which these funds will be utilized by identifying gaps in services. It was decided that a group of volunteers will initiate this process over the summer and come back to the committee with recommendations in September. It was also recommended that the first thing that needs to be done is to find out if there are any parameters around how this money can be disbursed, particularly if it is used to subsidize non-profit programs and other organizations.

E. Other

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Marilyn Gerling, retiring Senior Center Coordinator, presented her reflections on meeting the needs of seniors and was recognized by the SSAC.

B. After a discussion of a proposal to expand membership of the SSAC by adding two members at the September 4 meeting, it was decided to maintain the membership at 5 members.
C. Other

V. PLANS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
  • September 4: Agency funding review process
  • October 2: Orientation to Social Services' Programs and Advisory Committees
  • November 6: Agency funding requests
  • December 4: Legislative meeting

VI. ADJOURNMENT: meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.
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MANSFIELD COMMISSION ON AGING
MINUTES
Monday, June 9, 2003, 2:30 PM – Senior Center

PRESENT:  K. Grunwald (staff), Barbara Ivry, Susanna Thomas (chair), Carol McMillan, Carol Phillips, Jean Kenny (staff), Marilyn Gerling (staff), Phil Seckar, Elizabeth Norris

REGRETS:  Nora Stevens, Ray Moore, Mary Thatcher, Beth Acebo

I.  Call to Order: meeting called to order at 2:31 PM by Susanna Thomas, Chair

II.  Appointment of Recording Secretary: K. Grunwald agreed to take minutes

III. Acceptance of Minutes of the May 12, 2003 meeting
Reflect that Phil Seckar was in attendance; minutes accepted with that correction.

IV.  Correspondence - Chair and Staff
Jean Kenny reported that she has received correspondence from the State Department of Aging that the office of alternative homecare’s local offices are closing and will be consolidated in the DSS offices in Hartford. This program is administered locally by Community Companions and Homemakers (Nancy Trawick-Smith).

Jean also reported that homecare services are only covered by long-term care insurance if they are provided by a licensed nursing agency. VNA East does not provide these services because they do not provide long-term services.

V.  Optional Reports on Services/Needs of Town Aging Populations
A.  Health Care Services
    Wellness Center and Wellness Program - J. Kenny: Jean distributed copies of her reports and discussed recent Wellness Center activity.

B.  Social, Recreational and Educational
    Senior Center – Marilyn Gerling; Senior Center Assoc. - Tim Quinn: It was noted that John Bruhacher should be invited to the next meeting as the new President of the Senior Center Association.
Marilyn Gerling submitted copies of her monthly report and discussed highlights. She reported that the Senior Center Association’s Annual meeting will be at Zenny’s Restaurant on June 16 starting at 5.

C.  Housing
    No discussion
D. Related Town and Regional Organizations
Senior Resources of Eastern CT – Carol McMillan reported that grant review meetings are currently underway. She also reported the WRCC will be holding their meeting at the Senior Center in July.
Town Plan of Conservation and Development – Carol Phillips reported that there would be a public hearing on the plan on June 16 at 8 PM in the Town Council Chambers. The goal is to complete the update by the end of 2003. She reports that there is nothing specific in the plan relative to the needs of seniors.
Town Community Center – Ray Moore
K. Grunwald clarified some questions about Restricted Use membership relative to taking classes at other times of the day.

VI. Old Business
Status of search for Senior Center Director: K. Grunwald reported on the status of hiring for the Senior Services Coordinator’s position.
Plans for the Fall – membership and topics for study
S. Thomas reported that there are no specific topics that have been identified to work on for next year. Nora Stevens as the Chair of the Nominating Committee has identified that there is a need to replace Phil Fichlander. Other committee members will be moving on to their next term (three year terms). Elections for officers will be held at the September meeting.

VII. New Business
Barbara Ivry has been attending meetings of SSHH (Society to Support the Hard of Hearing). She has been attending meetings of the Ashford chapter, and is interested in starting a local chapter to meet on weekdays. The group provides advocacy, support and education. She will be putting an announcement about this in the September issue of Senior Sparks. She has discovered that there are funds available for assistive technology, which a local chapter may be eligible to apply for.
J. Kenny reports that there have been efforts to start groups here in the past with the assistance of UConn, but that there did not appear to be a demand for these services. She agreed to work with Barbara on this initiative, and reported that there have been some efforts made to pay attention to renovations, provide lip-reading classes in the Senior Center and to provide assistive technology for Town Council meetings. S. Thomas reported that there is also a need for support groups for family members of people who are hearing impaired.
A. Phil Seckar reported that he would be going to Minnesota to celebrate his mother’s 100th birthday!

VIII. Adjournment: meeting adjourned at 3:34 PM
(the next meeting set for Monday, Sept. 8, 2003 at 2:30 at the Senior Center)
MANSFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 10, 2003

Members attending: J. Atwood, G. Bruhn, D. Spencer

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m.

No new business.

Discussed the proposed new development (Windswept) on East Road. Ads placed in the Real Estate Magazine showed pictures of the proposed houses. Since one of the lots is in the Spring Hill Historic District, we discussed the plans. We all felt the house pictured is not appropriate for the Historic District. A reminder will be sent to the Town Planner that the plan must be approved by the Historic District Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Isabelle Atwood
Acting Clerk

MANSFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
September 9, 2003

Members attending: J. Atwood, J. Newmyer, D. Spencer

The minutes of the June 10 meeting were approved.

Peter Friedland, 17 Chaffeeville Rd., appeared to discuss his application for a certificate of appropriateness for a barn to be built at the above address to be used for storage and as a pottery and car renovation workshop. The lot is 1.3 acres; the barn would be a post-and-beam structure. D. Spencer noted that a metal chimney as well as a masonry one would be historically appropriate. A hearing will be called for October 14, 8:00 p.m., the next regular meeting of the Commission.

G. Bruhn will contact the Town Planner regarding the design of the house proposed for the lot in the Windswept Development of the Spring Hill Historic District. It was suggested that the developer be advised that the design must be approved by the Historic District Commission and that the building must be historically appropriate.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jody Newmyer
Clerk
Present: Stephens (Chair), Zimmer, Hultgren (staff)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Stephens at 8:05 p.m.

The minutes of the March 18, 2003 meeting were reviewed and no corrections made.

Hultgren updated members on his attempts to contact the University Student Government President to gain support for the fare-free bus program. He said there was a possibility of them doing an e-mail vote this summer, but most likely they wouldn't consider the matter until their first USG meeting in the fall (late August).

Hultgren reviewed the status of the Separatist Road bikeway, the Route 44 bikeway and the Mansfield Center enhancement projects.

The Plan of Conservation and Development update would likely be ready for comment this fall.

The next meeting was set for August 12, 2003.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lon R. Hultgren
Director of Public Works

cc: Town Manager, Town Clerk, Town Planner, Assistant Town Engineer, Transportation Planning Aide, Social Services Director, UConn Transportation, H. Koehn, file
TOWN/UNIVERSITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, July 8, 2003
Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
Council Chambers

Minutes

Absent: M. Berliner, R. Hudd, AJ Pappanikou, E. Paterson, W. Simpson
Staff: M. Hart, G. Padick, C. van Zelm

1. Opportunity for Public to Address the Committee

None

2. April 8, 2003 and May 13, 2003 Meeting Minutes

Phil Barry made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 8, 2003 and May 13, 2003 meetings. Bill Rosen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Update re: Mansfield Downtown Partnership

Cynthia van Zelm, Executive Director of the Partnership, reported that the Partnership had received three responses to its request for qualifications (RFQ) from potential developers. The Partnership will now move forward to interview all three respondents. With respect to other activities, the Partnership has produced a new brochure and continues to work to expand its membership. In addition, the organization recently conducted its annual meeting and the membership elected Janet Jones to the Board of Directors. Lastly, the Town has received a rural business enterprise grant from the US Department of Agriculture to be applied toward Storrs Center development activities. Town and Partnership staff collaborated to prepare the successful grant application.

4. UConn Landfill

Larry Schilling reported that effective June 5, 2003 the University received the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) conditional approval of the University's long-term monitoring and closure plan for the landfill. The DEP's approval is conditioned upon: 1) linking various private properties on Meadowood Road to the University's water system; and 2) establishing long-term monitoring wells on Separatist and Meadowood Roads. Once the University receives final
approval for the long-term monitoring and closure plan, the University must still apply for various other permits from the DEP as well as a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers.

5. Substance Abuse Task Force

Tom Callahan explained that Martin Berliner served as a member of the Task Force, and would be in the best position to comment on the recommendations set out in the Task Force report. In Martin’s absence, Matt Hart reported that one of the recommendations was for the town to consider adopting an ordinance regulating underage drinking on private property, and that town staff was presently working on a draft.

6. Update on Town of Mansfield Plan of Conservation and Development

Greg Padick, Mansfield Town Planner, gave a status report regarding the process the town has followed to update its Plan of Conservation and Development. There are several issues that concern both the town and the University:

- Water and sewer connections at Four Corners
- Commercial areas generally
- Mixed use projects
- Design standards for commercial areas
- King Hill Road commercial area
- North Campus area
- More specific references to UConn

Rich Miller spoke to the importance maintaining greenways.

7. Update on University Master Plan Process

Larry Schilling explained that the master plan update process started this past spring, and that the consultants were presently collecting information and conducting a space needs assessment. The consultants will conduct additional meetings this fall upon the students’ return, and plan to complete the update by spring of 2004. Tom Callahan added that much of the UConn 2000 program is complete, and that the University is updating the master plan to prepare for the UConn 21st Century capital improvement program. As part of this process, the master plan team will conduct public meetings to solicit public comment.

8. Other Business

a. University Spring Weekend – Bill Rosen moved that representatives from the University of Connecticut and the Town of Mansfield shall present to each meeting of the Town/University Relations Committee: a) suggestions for improving conditions at UConn’s Spring Weekend 2004; and b) progress reports
on suggestions already accepted until the final plans have been approved and put into operation. Audrey Barberet seconded. Bill read excerpts from the minutes when he presented the same motion the previous year. From his perspective, there is no drawback to adding this as a recurring agenda item. With respect to Spring Weekend, the issue affects not just the University but the entire community. We have not progressed very far; and we were again lucky in 2003 to avoid serious injury. We have to recognize the dangers, and the potential is too great not to try to do something. We need to change the mindset of the event to achieve real change, and we need cooperation and informed opinions. There is no harm in talking. Audrey Barberet re-stated her support of Bill's motion, and Carole Henry applauded his tenacity with respect to this issue. The motion passed by acclamation.

b. **UConn Co-op v. Town of Mansfield** – Tom Callahan asked for a future briefing concerning this lawsuit.

c. **Bill Rosen departure** – Tom Callahan reported that Bill Rosen was moving out-of-state, and that this was his final meeting as a member of the committee. The members thanked Bill for his service, and wished him all the best.

The committee adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m. Due to vacation schedules, the August 2003 meeting has been cancelled and the committee will re-convene on September 9, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Hart
Assistant Town Manager
Mansfield Conservation Commission
Minutes of the July 16, 2003 Meeting
Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Building

Present: Robert Dahn (Chair), Jennifer Kaufman, Quentin Kessel, John Silander, Robert Thorson and Frank Trainor.

Absent: Denise Burchsted and Lanse Minkler.

Town Staff: Grant Meitzler

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 PM.

2. The minutes of the June 18, 2003 were approved with editorial corrections.

3. Fenton River Water Level: Kessel reported that it was ankle knee deep (approximately 12 inches) between rocks where he crosses the river by the University pumping station A. Thorson noted that Remo, one of the USGS geologists participating in the "Long-Term Impact Analysis of the University of Connecticut’s Fenton River Water Supply Wells on the Habitat of the Fenton River" project expressed worry that this summer's season may not be dry enough to complete the study. If this is the case, University officials understand the study may not be completed until the following summer.

4. Open Space/Park Management Issues: Dahn and Kessel agreed it would be best to wait until October when the leaves would be off the trees to mark the Torrey Property boundaries.

5. Town Plan of Conservation and Development: The CC will continue to monitor the proposed changes to this plan.

6. Kaufman announced that the Town was applying for a cost-sharing grant to the National Resources Conservation Service for assistance in controlling invasive species on the following Town properties: "Fifty Foot," the old Spring Hill Field at the intersection of Spring Hill and Maple Roads, and the Mount Hope and Eagleville Parks. Trainor moved and Kessel seconded that the CC tell the Town Council that the CC enthusiastically support the Town in this effort. Kaufman agreed to forward this information to the Council.

7. IWA Referrals.
   a) W1217 - Perfetto – Route 32. Map date 4/15/03. This application is for a changes in a prior application to permit office use in a building approved earlier for warehousing. This will require provision for additional parking. Concern was expressed that the parking shown might be excessive and it was suggested that the lot on the east side be left as a gravel lot until full utilization of the proposed area becomes necessary. Kessel moved and Trainor seconded that there should be no significant negative impact...
on the wetlands as long as the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place and removed after the site has stabilized. Additionally measures must be taken to control parking lot runoff into the pond. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention (Thorson).

b) W1218 - Town of Mansfield – Birch Road Bikeway. Map date 3/3/03. This application is for an extension of the Hunting Lodge Bikeway along Birch Road to Route 44 and on to Four Corners. Kessel moved and Kaufman seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the involved wetlands as long as the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place during construction and removed after the sites have stabilized. The motion passed unanimously.

c) W1219 - Barreca - Candide Lane. Map date 6/9/03. This application is for a new single family house on an undeveloped lot remaining from the early years of the subdivision on Candide Lane. Kaufman moved and Kessel seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the wetlands if the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place during the construction and removed after the site is stabilized. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention (Thorson).

d) W1220 - Crow - 88 Hillyndale Road. Map date 7/2/03. This application is for the construction of an addition to a house within the regulated area. Kessel moved and Trainor seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the wetlands if the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place during the construction and removed after the site is stabilized. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention (Thorson).

8. Other Business:

a) Silander commented on the telecommunications tower proposed for installation on Town land along Clover Mill Road. Silander moved and Kessel seconded that the CC should express its concern that the proposed tower will have a negative impact on the viewshed from various points in the Town's largest park system. It was agreed that the CC should testify to this effect at the public hearing. Kaufman will discuss this with Town Manager Berliner.

b) Thorson reported being "grossed out" by the condition and appearance of Mirror Lake. The algal scum covering it advertises a water pollution problem that the University should be ashamed of. Thorson has written to the University's Larry Schilling about this but has not received a reply. Trainor noted that this was an unusual algae (Hydrodictyon) for this area and that it should be relatively easy to harvest. Harvesting the algae is a good practice in that it does help to clean the water during its growth and can be used for compost (if it proves to be non-toxic). The question was raised, why with the sorry condition of both Mirror Lake and Duck Pond (or Swan Lake), the University does not have a device for the removal of the algae and duckweed. It was agreed that since the condition of these bodies of water reflects poorly on both the University and the Town of Mansfield, that the CC ask the Town Council to discuss this problem with the University. Kaufman will bring the matter to Town Manager Berliner's attention.

9. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 P.M.
Respectfully submitted,

Quentin Kessel
Secretary
Mansfield Conservation Commission  
Minutes of the August 20, 2003 Meeting  
Conference Room B, Audrey P. Beck Building

Present: Quentin Kessel, Lanse Minkler (Vice Chairman), John Silander, and Frank Trainor.


Town Staff: Grant Meitzler

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 PM.

2. The minutes of the August 20, 2003 were approved with editorial corrections.

3. Town Plan of Conservation and Development: The CC will continue to monitor the proposed changes to this plan.

4. IWA Referrals.
   a) W1222 - Aspen/Brine - Spring Hill Road. Map date 7/20/03. This application is for an attached garage within 150 feet of wetlands. Kessel moved and Trainor seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the wetlands as long as the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place and removed after the site has stabilized. The motion passed unanimously.

   b) W1223 - Best - Brookside Lane. Map date 7/18/03. This application is for an addition within the 150 foot regulated area. Kessel recused himself. Silander moved and Trainor seconded that there should be no significant negative impact on the involved wetlands as long as the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map are in place during construction and removed after the sites have stabilized. The motion passed unanimously (3 yes, 1 recusal).

   c) W1224 - Parrow - Browns Road. Map date 7/30/03. This application is for a three lot subdivision. The CC appreciates the proposed easement and the preservation of wetlands; however, the CC asks that the zoning agent verify that sufficient non-wetland area is included in the easement. The CC further urges IWA to ask that the driveway and septic system on Lot 1 be adjusted to avoid negative impacts on the existing stone walls. The CC also feels that every effort should be made to preserve the other stone walls in the subdivision. No vote was taken on this application.

   d) W1225 - Holt - Browns Road. Map date 8/4/03. This application is for a four lot subdivision. Kessel moved and Silander seconded that there should be no significant negative impact if appropriate sedimentation and erosion controls are in place during the construction and removed after the site is stabilized. The term "appropriate" is used because the CC feels the sedimentation and erosion controls shown on the map appear to be inadequate. The motion passed unanimously.
5. PZC Referrals:

PZC File # 1210 - Holt - Browns Road - 54 lot subdivision. The CC is disappointed that the cluster concept was not carried further with this plan. The question was raised as to how short a section of Town road might have permitted two double driveways and thereby placed all four homes within the interior of the subdivision. The wish was expressed that the plan might have provided a fuller demonstration of the cluster concept.

9. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Quentin Kessel
Secretary
To: Town Council/Planning & Zoning Commission  
From: Curt Hirsch, Zoning Agent  
Date: September 3, 2003

Re: Monthly Report of Zoning Enforcement Activity  
For the month of August 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>This month</th>
<th>Last month</th>
<th>Same month last year</th>
<th>This fiscal year to date</th>
<th>Last fiscal year to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Permits issued</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Compliance issued</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site inspections</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints received from the Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints requiring inspection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential/Actual violations found</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement letters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices to issue ZBA forms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Zoning Violations issued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Citations issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning permits issued this month for single family homes = 4, multi-fm = 0  
2003/04 Fiscal year to date: s-fm = 7, multi-fm = 3
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Mansfield Republican Town Committee
2003 Municipal Elections
Slate for endorsement

|                           | 2. JC Martin (I)    | P.O. Box 219 Mansfield Center, CT 06250 | 423-5631 |
|                           | 3. Chris Paulhus     | 720 Middle Tpk. Storrs, CT 06268       | 487-5223 |
|                           | 4. Alison Whitham Blair | 115 Coventry Rd. Mansfield Center, CT 06250 | 423-1776 |
|                           | 5.                   |                                         |          |

| Board of Education (K-8) - 6 year term | 1. John Thatcher | 62 Independence Dr. Mansfield Center, CT 06250 | 456-9932 |
|                                         | 2.               |                                             |          |

| Board of Education (K-8) - 2 year term | 1. Sam Matos     | 150 Crane Hill Rd. Storrs, CT 06268         | 423-0157 |
|                                         | 2.               |                                             |          |

| Board of Assessment Appeals - 2 year term | 1. Willard "Bill" Stearns (I) | 2 Stearns Rd. Storrs, CT 06268 | 423-9665 |
|                                           | 2.                   |                                         |          |

| Planning & Zoning Commission - 6 year term | 1. Roswell Hall | 62 Crane Hill Rd. Mansfield Center, CT 06250 | 456-1027 |
|                                            | 2.               |                                             |          |

| Planning & Zoning Commission - 4 year term | 1. Peter Plante (I) | 7 Oak Dr. Mansfield Center, CT 06250 | 450-0696 |
|                                            | 2.               |                                             |          |

| PZC Alternates - 2 year term | 1. Bryan Mutch (I) | 458 Middle Tpk. Storrs, CT 06268 | 429-5848 |
|                             | 2.               |                                             |          |

| Zoning Board of Appeals - 4 year term | 1. Doryann Plante | 7 Oak Dr. Mansfield Center, CT 06250 | 450-0696 |
|                                       | 2.               |                                             |          |

| ZBA Alternates - 2 year term | 1. Virginia Reynolds | 162 Maple Rd. Storrs CT 06268 | 429-1003 |
|                              | 2.               |                                             |          |

| Constables - 2 year term | 1. Louise Lent (I) | 19 Daleville Rd. Storrs, CT 06268 | 429-9113 |
|                         | 2. Ed Passmore (I) | 668 Middle Tpk. Storrs, CT 06268 | 429-6799 |
|                         | 3. Dolly Whitham (I) | 99 Birchwood Heights Storrs, CT 06268 | 429-9155 |
|                         | 4.               |                                             |          |

| Region 19 (9-12) Board of Education - 4 year term | 1. Richard Pellegrine | 269 Clover Mill Rd. Storrs CT, 06268 | 429-9568 |
|                                                  | 2. Nicki Mutch     | 458 Middle Tpk. Storrs, CT 06268        | 429-5848 |
MINUTES

MANSFIELD PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting, Tuesday, September 2, 2003
Council Chambers, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building

Members present:  A. Barberet (Chairman), R. Favretti, B. Gardner, J. Goodwin, R. Hall, K. Holt, P. Kochenburger, P. Plante, G. Zimmer
Alternates present:  B. Mutch, B. Pociask, B. Ryan
Staff present:  C. Hirsch (Zoning Agent), G. Padick (Town Planner)

Chairman Barberet called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

Minutes:  8/4/03 - Barberet noted she had listened to the tapes of the meeting. Favretti MOVED, Gardner seconded to approve the Minutes as submitted; MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8/19/03 field trip - Holt MOVED, Favretti seconded to approve the Minutes as submitted; MOTION CARRIED, Holt, Gardner, Goodwin and Favretti in favor, all else disqualified.

Zoning Agent's Report - The August Activity Report was acknowledged.

Members noted that cars continue to be displayed for sale in various locations around town, particularly along Rt.195 in Mansfield Center and Rt. 32 at Browns Rd.  Mr. Hirsch reported that he has obtained removal cooperation from all the owners he notified. Members asked staff to investigate options for more permanent solutions in locations with repeated violations.

Modification request, Lot 22, Maplewoods, Sec. 2 subdivision - An 8/29/03 letter from Dong-Guk and Eun-Ju Shin and a 9/2/03 report from the Zoning Agent were distributed at the meeting. After discussion regarding a proposed driveway revision, Favretti MOVED, Holt seconded that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the Development Area Envelope revision for Lot 22 of the Maplewoods, Sec. 2 subdivision as described in the 8/29/03 letter from Dong-Guk and Eun-Ju Shin, as depicted on the 8/29/03 plan. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Modification request for parking lot revisions at Storrs Commons - M. Taylor, representing Storrs Associates, presented proposed parking lot island revisions. He related that they were in the process of repaving the parking areas and making other improvements and that some revisions were considered necessary due to long-term maintenance problems involving curbed islands that are frequently damaged. He said he would consider suggestions for appropriate alterations to his proposal. Members discussed the proposal and related landscaping impacts. Mr. Zimmer emphasized the importance of landscaping and site aesthetics in the rear parking area. After further discussion, Hall MOVED, Gardner seconded that the Planning and Zoning Commission officers, with staff assistance, be authorized to approve parking lot modifications, subject to appropriate consideration of landscaping and aesthetic impacts in the rear parking area. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Public Hearing, proposed efficiency unit at 117 Spring Hill Rd., B. Bellm, o/a, file 1206 - The continued Public Hearing was called to order at 8:45 p.m. Members and alternates present were Barberet, Favretti, Gardner, Goodwin, Hall, Holt, Kochenburger, Plante, Zimmer, Mutch, Pociask and Ryan. The legal notice was read and written comments from the Town Planner (8/28/03) were noted. The applicant submitted neighborhood notification receipts. There were no further questions and no public comment; the Hearing was closed at 8:48 p.m. Afterwards, members agreed to consider action on the application immediately. Hall MOVED, Holt seconded to approve with conditions the special permit application (file 1208) of Bruce Bellm for an efficiency apartment on property located at 117 Spring Hill Road, in an RAR-90 zone, as submitted to the Commission and shown on a site plan dated 6/16/03 and other application submissions and as presented at Public Hearing on 8/4/03 and 9/2/03. This approval is granted because the application as hereby approved is considered to be in compliance with Article X, Section M, Article V, Section B and other provisions of the Mansfield Zoning Regulations, and is granted with the following conditions:

1.  This approval is granted for a one-bedroom efficiency unit in association with an existing single-family home having up to three additional bedrooms. Any increase in the number of bedrooms on this property shall
necessitate subsequent review and approval from the Director of Health and the Planning and Zoning Commission;

2. This approval is conditioned upon continued compliance with Mansfield’s zoning regulations for efficiency units, which include owner-occupancy requirements and limitations on the number of residents in an efficiency unit;

3. This special permit shall not become valid until it is filed upon the Land Records by the applicant.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Public Hearing, proposed efficiency unit at 2024 Storrs Rd., N. Sultan, applicant, file 1211 – The Public Hearing was called to order at 8:55 p.m. Members and alternates present were Barberet, Favretti, Gardner, Goodwin, Hall, Holt, Kochenburger, Plante, Zimmer, Mutch, Pociask and Ryan. The legal notice was read and written comments from the Town Planner (8/28/03) were noted. No one was present to represent the applicant. Mr. Padick related that staff had notified the applicant’s representative that more information was needed regarding the number of existing and proposed bedrooms and the suitability of the existing sanitary system, which was built for a 3-bedroom house. After discussion and determination that no members of the public wished to comment, the Hearing was recessed until 9/15/03.

Public Hearing, special permit application for proposed office and workshop at 699 Storrs Rd., T. Casey, appl. R. Morneau, owner, file 554-2 - The Public Hearing was called to order at 9 p.m. Members and alternates present were Barberet, Favretti, Gardner, Goodwin, Hall, Holt, Kochenburger, Plante, Zimmer, Mutch, Pociask and Ryan. The legal notice was read and written comments from the Town Planner (8/28/03); Asst. Town Engineer (8/29/03); Health Director (8/28/03); Fire Marshal (8/29/03); Design Review Panel (8/27/03); Committee on Persons with Disabilities (9/1/03). Mr. Casey submitted 10 neighborhood notification return receipts, to fulfill the requirements, and briefly reviewed his proposal to use the property for contractors’ storage/workshop, offices and equipment maintenance. Following the original submission, a revised map dated 8/25/03 was submitted to modify proposed parking on the site. Mr. Casey confirmed that no outside storage is proposed and only limited site work as described in the Statement of Use is planned. He also confirmed that the proposal includes 4 service vehicles/trucks, to be parked outside. Members discussed site landscaping with Mr. Casey, who agreed to replace and/or supplement existing plantings along Rt. 195 to enhance screening, and to submit a detailed landscaping plan. He also said he plans to modify the location of the planters onsite; he does not plan any structural changes, other than removal of plywood that currently covers window areas; no lighting or signage revisions are currently planned (3 fixtures are now situated on the building and an existing freestanding identity sign is located along Rt. 195); no backhoes, building materials or construction equipment would be stored outside on the site. He said his intended use would not produce noise problems for neighbors; no interior window signage is planned, and he would comply with handicap parking requirements. During discussion, many noted that this is a non-conforming use within a residential zone. After further discussion and clarification, Mrs. Barberet invited public comment.

Dru Burnham related that she owns rental property at 700 Storrs Rd., directly across the street from the site, and had particular concerns about parking, signage, hours of operation for the proposed use and probable resulting devaluation of nearby properties. She related that the previous use operated during normal daytime business hours and the site was cleaned up at the end of each day. She expressed concern about noise impacts from early morning arrivals and late evening returns and billboard-type signage that exists on the applicant’s trucks. She also questioned vendor traffic, future expansions in use, potential onsite storage of equipment and materials, and whether the existing sign conforms to our regulations, noting that the use is a non-conforming one in a residential zone. She felt that if the application is approved, shorter hours should be required and no outside parking of trucks should be allowed.

Betsy Parker, 700 Storrs Rd., is presently a tenant in Mrs. Burnham’s rental property (above) and owns undeveloped land east of Rt. 195, near the site, on which she hopes to build in the future. She related that the previous use had limited neighborhood impact and that, while she did not oppose the proposed use, she was very concerned about the proposed hours of operation, the number of trucks to be stored outside, the large and very visible lettering on the box trucks, very bright site lighting, noise, visibility of parking areas, and overall site aesthetics. She pled with the Commission to protect the view on the drive south on Rt. 195 from the Altmaveigh Inn to Mansfield Center, also noting the proposal’s status as a non-conforming use in a residential neighborhood.

Ron Mills (abutting property-owner to the south) provided some history of the subject property, including the fact that his property and the subject site share a well and there may be some contamination of groundwater, due
Curt Hirsch, Zoning Agent, asked Mr. Casey to comment on the possibility of behind-the-building parking for vehicles/equipment. Mrs. Holt had also recommended this area for parking or storage. Mr. Casey responded that he plans to park as many pieces of equipment and employee vehicles there as possible, but would not be able to accommodate all of them.

Mr. Casey stated that the listed hours of operation are extremes that rarely occur. He added that his business seldom operates on Saturday, and never on Sunday.

Mr. Zimmer asked if the existing lighting intensity could be reduced and whether the proposed onsite parking could be screened from view from Rt. 195. Mr. Casey agreed to review screening possibilities and requested an opportunity to present revised plans, to which members agreed. At 9:45, the Hearing was recessed until September 7th.

Public Hearing, special permit application for proposed professional office uses at 922 and 930 Stafford Rd., R. Perfetto, o/a, file 1054-3 – Holt and Goodwin disqualified themselves and Mutch and Pociask were designated to act in their stead. The Public Hearing was called to order at 9:45 p.m. Members and alternates present were Barberet, Favretti, Gardner, Hall, Kochenburger, Plante, Zimmer, Mutch, Pociask and Ryan. The legal notice was read and written comments from the Town Planner (8/28/03); Ass’t. Town Engineer (8/28/03); Health Dep’t. (8/28/03); Fire Marshal (8/29/03); Design Review Panel (8/27/03); Committee on Persons with Disabilities (9/1/03).

R. Perfetto, applicant, and engineer E. Pelletier explained the application to use existing buildings on Stafford Rd. for office uses. Mr. Pelletier presented revised plans dated 9/2/03, which were prepared to address staff comments and referral reports. Noted revisions include changes required by the IWA approval, increased width to some parking spaces, a new drive isle in the northern parking lot, and refuse enclosure and paving details. A lighting specifications sheet also was submitted for exterior lighting on the northern building. Mr. Pelletier noted that the number of proposed parking spaces has been reduced to 73, which is still 3 more than the applicant determined are needed to comply with zoning requirements.

Mr. Favretti questioned the proposed landscaping within the planned grassed swale. Members also indicated that the proposed 9-ft.-wide parking spaces in front of the northern building may be too narrow for the intended office use. Mr. Pelletier indicated that the proposed handicap parking spaces will be at grade with the entrance of the northern building.

No one from the public wished to comment and there were no further questions from Commission members, so the Hearing was closed at 10:10 p.m.

Other Old Business
Special permit application for proposed telecommunication tower and related facilities north of Clover Mill Rd., adjacent to Mansfield Town Garage site, TCP Communications/Town of Mansfield, o/a, file 1209, MAD 10/8/03 – Members discussed the application and information presented at the 8/4/03 Public Hearing. Questions were raised about the height of the proposed fence and screening of the equipment area near the base of the proposed tower. After reviewing some elements of the proposal, Mr. Favretti volunteered to work on a motion for consideration at the next meeting.

Subdivision application, 4 proposed lots on Browns Rd., K. Holt, o/a, file 1210 – Holt and Goodwin disqualified themselves; the item was tabled until the meeting on 9/15/03.

Modification request, Natchaug Hospital addition, Storrs Rd., file 937-4 – Noting that S. Larsen, representing Natchaug Hospital, was present, Mr. Padick reviewed his 8/28/03 memo and the 4 proposed modifications detailed in an 8/26/03 letter with attachments from Tecton Architects, PC. After discussion, Holt MOVED and Favretti seconded that the PZC Chairman and Zoning Agent be authorized to approve the modification request of Natchaug Hospital as described in an 8/26/03 letter from R.A. Amatuli of Tecton Architects, PC; MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Review of application for discontinuance of Old Tolland Turnpike – Members briefly discussed with Mr. Padick his 8/27/03 memo. It was noted that some years ago a study had been done for the Town which identified Town roads to be discontinued. It was suggested that some of these old roadways may be appropriate for recreational use. Staff was asked to review this issue.
2003 Plan of Conservation & Development update – An 8/26/03 memo from the Town Planner was noted, which acknowledged that the Plan update will not be completed until 2004.

Verbal updates from the Town Planner

Storrs Center “Downtown” project – Minutes and an agenda for the 9/2/03 Downtown Partnership Board of Directors meeting were distributed. It is expected that arrangements for a preferred developer will be finalized in September.

UConn landfill – A public information session to go over final closure plans is scheduled for 9/3/03.

UConn poultry building – Plans for a new poultry building south of the northern section of Horsebarn Hill Rd. have been submitted to the Planning Office. Mr. Padick briefly went over the plans with members.

UConn Master Plan update – A public session to review land uses in the agricultural campus east of Rt. 195 has been scheduled for 6 p.m. on Thursday, Sept. 11th.

UConn Co-generation facility – A co-generation facility planned by the University will be located adjacent to the existing heating/cooling plant near the engineering buildings. The project includes a new 175 ft.-tall emissions stack. State permits for the facility and gasoline improvements associated with it will soon be sought.

Town/University Relations Committee – The next meeting is scheduled for 9/9/03 at 4 p.m.

AT&T proposed telecommunication tower – The CT Siting Council is expected to approve a new tower between Baxter and Cedar Swamp Roads on the Villa Hills Golf Course property, subject to an 80-ft. shift of the planned tower location. It was noted that a modification of the golf course site plan may be necessary.

New Business

Freedom Green requests:
1. Release of escrow funds, Phase III
2. Reduction of escrow funds, Phase IVA
3. Authorization to begin construction in Phase IVB

An 8/28/03 memo from the Town Planner, 8/13/03 and 9/2/03 letters from D. Poitras and an 8/26/03 letter from Advance Property Management were noted. Mr. Padick explained that all parties had been informed that this issue will not be discussed until the 9/15/03 meeting and that he expects a supplemental letter from the developer regarding the completion of Phase IVA improvements. With this in mind, the Commission did not discuss the issue further at this meeting.

Subdivision application. 3 proposed lots on Browns Road. B. Parrow, o/a. file 1211 - Holt moved, Barberet seconded to receive the subdivision application (file 1211) submitted by Brian Parrow for a 3-lot subdivision entitled “Well House” on Browns Road, opposite Fern Road, owned by the applicant, as shown on plans dated 7/30/03 revised through 8/14/03 and as described in other application submissions, and to refer said application to the staff for review and comment. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Subdivision application. 1 proposed lot on Moulton Rd. R. Raynor, appl. B. Larson et al., owner, file 1212 - Holt disqualified herself and Mutch was designated to act. Mutch moved, Gardner seconded to receive the subdivision application (file 1212) submitted by James Raynor for a proposed 1-lot subdivision (Raynor subdivision) on property located on Moulton Road owned by Barbara Larson et al., as shown on plans dated 8/27/03 and as described in other application submissions, and to refer said application to the staff for review and comment. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Field trip – scheduled for Tuesday, 9/9/03, at 1 p.m.

Communications and Bills – As listed on the agenda or distributed at the meeting. Holt moved, Favretti seconded to pay the Town Attorney’s 8/31/03 bill in the amount of $783; motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine K. Holt, Secretary
DATE: September 10, 2003
TO: Members of the Town Council
THROUGH: Martin Berliner
FROM: Gordon Schimmel

RE: Mansfield Middle School and “Adequate Yearly Progress”

As I promised during our presentation to you on Monday, August 25th, I wish to forward the handouts that were part of my discussion with the Board of Education on September 4th. The first and second pages are copies of the letter I received from the Connecticut State Department of Education explaining the broad outlines of the “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) testing process. It is the most succinct description I have of NCLB expectations, based on results of the Fall 2002 Connecticut Mastery Test.

The letter serves as a useful guide to interpreting the page three, a chart detailing the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) scores for Mansfield Middle School. You will note that when the “confidence interval” is factored in, the school scored well above the minimum standard set by the state in reading and mathematics. As I mentioned during my presentation, we had less than 40 students in the English Language Learners, Black, and Hispanic subgroups, which is why no scores are reported for these groups. Also, note that economically disadvantaged students scored well in math and reading, a tribute to the work of our staff.

Clearly, the adjusted scores in mathematics (55%) and reading (48%) for students with disabilities do not meet the minimal proficiency level as set by the State of Connecticut (65% in mathematics and 57% in reading). To understand how individual students performed, please refer to the chart on the last page of this attachment created for the Board of Education. As an example, the total number of students taking the test in our 8th grade class was 24. In aggregate, a total of 5 achieved either at the “Proficient”, “Goal”, or “Advanced” level in mathematics and a total of 4 achieved either the “Proficient”, “Goal”, or “Advanced” level in reading. However, a total of 15 scored below the NCLB standards (“Basic” or “Below-Basic”) in mathematics, and a total of 16 scored either at “Basic” or “Below-Basic” in reading.
In addition, 4 students could not take an appropriate test at their grade level in mathematics and in reading and were required to take an “out-of-level” test. According to Federal guidelines, any student taking an out-of-level test is automatically counted as “not proficient” and these numbers are added to the “Basic” and “Below-Basic” total to arrive at the score for the entire sub-group. All of these students eventually might achieve proficiency when given additional support; we are making new efforts to provide additional assistance to these students and we hope to see some improvement in two years when they take the test again.

At the time I made my presentation, you asked why many more middle schools in the state were not cited as not making “Adequate Yearly Progress”. So far our investigations have provided two different reasons for this phenomenon: many schools did not meet the minimum 40 student threshold to have results reported publically; this situation will occur for any middle or junior high school configuration that includes only grade 6 through 8. Because Mansfield Middle School is configured as a 5th through 8th grade school, it is much easier to reach the minimum threshold of 40 students in any sub-group because both grades 6 and 8 are aggregated for reporting purposes. By contrast, a 6th through 8th grade middle or junior high school only reports results for grade 8 under the present system, sixth grade results are credited to the 5th grade at the elementary level. Second, the staff of some schools freely acknowledge that they spend a great deal of time preparing students at the “Basic” and “Below-basic” level for the CMT. Those who dislike “teaching to the test” will have cause for concern; when the reputation of an entire school can be jeopardized by the inability of a particular sub-group to achieve at an arbitrary level set by the State of Connecticut, and the Federal NCLB regulations, teachers naturally will give increased attention to students whose scores could change the outcome.

The Board of Education spent nearly an hour discussing the nuances of this legislation, the testing process, and the instruction of our students, so this short summary may seem incomplete. If you have questions, please give me a call. I would be happy to set up a meeting with Jeff Cryan, our building principal, Fred Baruzzi, our Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, and myself if you wish to discuss the NCLB process further.
August 19, 2003

Dr. Gordon Schimmel
Superintendent
Mansfield Public Schools
4 South Eagleville Road
Mansfield, CT 06268-2222

Dear Dr. Schimmel:

In accordance with the requirements in No Child Left Behind (NCLB), based on the department’s analysis of 2002 CMT results, which were attributed back to the school each student received instruction for the 2001-02 school year, Mansfield Middle School did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the 2001-02 school year. Attached is a chart which identifies the school, the reason for not making AYP (whole mathematics achievement, subgroup only, etc.) and also includes the numerical results. The criterion used to make this determination is part of Connecticut’s K-12 Accountability System which is compliant with the requirements of the federal law No Child Left Behind, 2001 (NCLB). The Accountability System was adopted by the State Board of Education at its June 4, 2003 meeting and approved by the United States Department of Education on June 9, 2003.

Adequate Yearly Progress Criteria:

1. Whole school:
   - 65% Proficient in Mathematics
   - 57% Proficient in Reading

2. Each Subgroup with at least 40 students:
   - White: 65% Proficient in Mathematics
   - Black: 57% Proficient in Reading
   - Hispanic
   - Students with Disabilities
   - English Language Learners
   - Economically Disadvantaged

3. Additional Academic Indicator
   - Whole school:
     - 70% Basic or above in writing or improvement from previous year

4. Participation in Standard Test, Out of Level or CMT/CAPT checklists in a school or subgroup with at least 40 students
   - 95% of enrolled students

Box 2219 • P.71
5. In addition, a confidence interval is applied to the test results, which accounts for the inherent measurement inaccuracies of any test and the judgment errors which can occur due to the fluctuation of the test takers from one year to the next. The resulting confidence interval is established at the 99 percent confidence level. Therefore, the final percent proficient used for AYP analysis was based on applying the confidence interval, (which varies across schools depending on the number of students in tested grades), to the actual percent of students proficient in mathematics and reading, thus producing an adjusted rate.

6. 2002 CMT results were attributed to the school of instruction during 2001-02. Students were removed from the analysis who had not attended the full 2001-02 school year. Participation rate was calculated based on data obtained from each student's test document. The number of students who took all sections of the standard CMT, Out of Level, or CMT/CAPT Skills Check List were divided by the number of all eligible test takers. This process yields a total of 151 elementary and middle not making AYP for the 2001-02 school year. The names of the schools and the reason for not making AYP, will be posted on the state website, as required by NCLB, 2001.

If a school does not make Adequate Yearly Progress for 2 consecutive years, it will be identified as a school "In need of improvement" by August 1, 2004. For those identified schools which receive Title I money, parents of the students in these schools will need to be offered the option of sending their children to a school within the district, which has made AYP, for the 2004-05 school year. All schools identified as "In need of improvement" regardless of Title I funding will be required to develop, within 90 days, a school improvement plan, submitted to this Department.

The Bureaus of Innovation and Choice, Information Management and Analysis, Curriculum and Instruction and Special Education will be available to work with these schools and assist with the analysis of data, review of curriculum, and professional development needs, to determine the changes required to meet the needs of all students in the school.

If you have any questions about the identification process, please contact Dr. Abigail L. Hughes, Associate Commissioner, Division of Evaluation and Research, at 860-713-6800.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Theodore G. Sergi
Commissioner of Education
### Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status: 2001-02 School Year

Based on the fall 2002 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) results attributed back to school attended in 2001-02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Targets:</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
<th>% At or Above Proficient</th>
<th>% At or Above Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Performance for Mansfield School District

**Mansfield Middle School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
<th>% At or Above Proficient</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole School</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
<td>Confidence Interval</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>Less than 40 students in this subgroup</td>
<td>Less than 40 students in this subgroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Less than 40 students in this subgroup</td>
<td>Less than 40 students in this subgroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Less than 40 students in this subgroup</td>
<td>Less than 40 students in this subgroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Academic Indicator: Writing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYP Target Met?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Number of students in tested grades: 322**

Note: It is possible for a subgroup to be of sufficient size (40 or greater) for the calculation of the participation rate, but not of sufficient size (less than 40) for the calculation of the percent at or above proficient. This is due to the inclusion of absent students and students who have not been in a school for the full academic year from the calculation of the percent at or above proficient. If a school does not have the required 95 percent participation with 40 or more students, it will not have made AYP, regardless of the subgroup size for the percent at or above proficient calculation.
## Fall 2002 CMT Results

### Special Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Achievement</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Out-of-Level Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CT CMT Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Math</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reading</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Math</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reading</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NCLB Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Math</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reading</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All special education students are placed in educational programs as determined through the IEP process.
Town of Mansfield  
Attn: Town Manager, Martin Berliner  
4 South Eagleville Road  
Mansfield, CT 06268

Dear Mr. Berliner:

Notification has been received that the request for a $49,738 Rural Business Opportunity Grant (RBOG) from the Town of Mansfield was not funded from the final cycle of reserve funding for FY 2003.

The Town of Mansfield’s application for the $49,738 can be held over for FY 2004. At this time we do not know if there will be individual State allocations of RBOG funds for FY 04 or if all funds will be retained at the National level. This RBOG application would again have to compete for funding based on next year’s processing rules, and the results could be the same as they were these past two years.

Please advise us if you would like this application held over for FY 04 or if it should be withdrawn. We could also consider converting the application to the RBEG program which would improve its chances of being funded. Please let us know which avenue you decide to pursue with this application request.

Sincerely,

SUSAN D. BURNS  
Rural Development Specialist

Cc: Mansfield Downtown Partnership
27 Charles Lane
Storrs, CT 06268
September 10, 2003

Elizabeth Paterson, Mayor
Town of Mansfield
4 South Eagleville Road
Mansfield, CT 06268

Dear Mayor Paterson

We were disturbed by the September 9th Chronicle article discussing the Town Council’s plans to subsidize memberships in the Community Center for families and individuals unable to pay the regular fees. We strongly oppose any such use of taxpayer money and urge the Council not to do so.

We support aid to needy individuals to help pay for necessities such as food, rent or health care. However, membership in the Community Center is far from a necessity. It falls more in the category of a luxury. The Center itself is an unneeded and unnecessary facility constructed at great cost to all town taxpayers. If such a facility is wanted by some, it should have been constructed and operated by private industry, not the town. It is bad enough that taxpayers are burdened unnecessarily with the cost of this Center, but now the Council has decided that there is an entitlement to membership for any who cannot afford to pay – again, at taxpayer expense. There is no entitlement here.

We pay a lot in property taxes and do not wish to see that money wasted. We were opposed to construction of the facility initially because we considered it unneeded and we doubted it would ever become self-supporting. We are upset by the prospect of having to pay more to support any level of subsidy. If the Council insists on subsidies, we suggest you fund it by voluntary contributions made specifically for that purpose.

Marianne K. Marcotte
Wayne W. Marcotte
APPLICATION REFERRAL

Mansfield Planning & Zoning Commission

TO:  
- ✔ Public Works Dep't., c/o Ass't. Town Engineer  
- ✔ Health Officer  
- ✔ Design Review Panel  
- ✔ Committee on the Needs of Persons with Disabilities  
- ✔ Fire Marshal  
- ✔ Traffic Authority  
- ✔ Town Council  
- ✔ Recreation Advisory Committee  
- ✔ Parks Advisory Committee

The Planning and Zoning Commission has received a [ ] lot subdivision application and will consider the application at a Public Hearing/regular meeting on Sept 15, 2003. Please review the application and reply with your comments to the Planning Office before Sept 11. For more information, please contact the Planning Office, 429-3330.

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant: Katherine H
Owner: Soe
Agent(s): The Minutti Group / Dctum Engineering
Proposed use: [ ] lot subdivision
Location: N side of Browns Rd about 1500 feet west of 195
Zone classification: RWR-90
Other pertinent information:
- Proposal includes a 2.4 acre open space parcel that the subdivider would prefer to incorporate into a private homeowners association
- The Proposal includes 3 lots off a common driveway
- Reduced set of plans attached - Full set available in Planning Office

signed [Signature]

9/02

P.79
Name of subdivision: "The Woods"

Name of subdivider (applicant): Katherine Holt
Address: P.O. Box 163, Mansfield Center, Ct. 06250-0163
Phone #: 1-860-456-0922
Signature: [Signature]
Date: 08.04.03

OWNER (IF OTHER THAN SUBDIVIDER)
Name: [Name]
Address: [Address]
Signature: [Signature]
Date: [Date]

SUBDIVISION DATA
Location: Browns Road
Zoning district: RAR - 90
Total # of acres: 11.2 acres
Total # of lots: 4 lots

EXTENSION OF TIME
Pursuant to Section 8-26d, subsection (b) of the Connecticut General Statutes, the undersigned applicant hereby consents to an extension of time within which the Planning and Zoning Commission is required by law to approve, modify and approve or disapprove a subdivision plan known as

and located at/on

It is agreed that such extension of time shall not exceed 65 days and it is understood that this extension of time is in addition to the first 65-day period after the receipt of the application by the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: [Date]
Annotated aerial of Holt property NTS

The "Woods" Subdivision @ 11.2 acres
Parcel "A" @ 30.05 acres

Overall Holt Site @ 41.25 acres

Notes:
- Overall Holt site: 41.25 acres
- Parcel "A": 30.05 acres
- The "Woods": 11.2 acres

APPROVALS

Drawn By: PM
Prepared By: MB

Owner & Applicant: Estheret Felt
Dr. Box 195 Newfield, Connecticut

Project Number:
Overall Holt site: 41.25 acres
Parcel "A": 30.05 acres
The "Woods": 11.2 acres

Prepared: 11/30/2005
Solomon, Flanagan & Sockell

Drawn By: PM
Prepared By: MB

Site Address: 195 Mansfield, CT

Sheet: 11 of 17
ENGINEERING & SURVEYING, LLC
101 COMPTON ROAD
MANSFIELD CENTER, CT 06250
(860) 359-1443
(860) 359-1444
Fax: (860) 359-1445
Website: www.ecsct.com
E-mail: info@ecsct.com

Site Development Plan
Browns Road & Route 195 Mansfield, CT

"The Woods"

OPEN SPACE

SCALE: 1" = 40'

LEGEND

PROPOSED

ENGINEERING
STUDY

APPROVALS

ENGINEERING & SURVEYING, LLC

NAME: ________________________

DATE: ________________________

APPROVED BY: ________________________

TITLE: ________________________

MSS: ________________________

PMT: ________________________

DATE: ________________________

NUFFIELD

132 CANTON ROAD
MANSFIELD CENTER, CT 06250
(860) 359-1443
(860) 359-1445
Fax: (860) 359-1445
Website: www.ecsct.com
E-mail: info@ecsct.com
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Annotated Aerial of Holt Property NTS

- The "Woods"/Project lot lines
- Steep Slopes (greater than 20%)
- Stone walls
- Wetlands
- High Point with Winter Views
- Views from the Site
- Views into the Site
- Protected Open Space
- Hemlock Grove
- Mixed Deciduous Forest
- Utility Road
- Halt Trail

Notes:
- The "Woods"/Project lot lines
- Steep Slopes (greater than 20%)
- Stone walls
- Wetlands
- High Point with Winter Views
- Views from the Site
- Views into the Site
- Protected Open Space
- Hemlock Grove
- Mixed Deciduous Forest
- Utility Road
- Halt Trail
Open Space: The open space is 2.4 acres or 27% of the project area. The proposed open space provides a wildlife corridor between the Joshua's Trust land to the west and Forest A (30.06 acres) to the east. The proposed open space also contains the most prominent high point on the site with extensive winter views to the north. Due to the proximity of the proposed homes, the applicant would like to have the open space as part of a neighborhood association, instead of full public access.

Lot 1: To reduce the visual impact from Browns Road, the house is located behind a small hill and all deciduous the development occurs behind a buffer of existing woods (60' width minimum). The house has a walk-out basement to take advantage of the natural topography. The septic system will be graded to provide the homeowners with a flat lawn area.

Lot 2: Again, a substantial buffer of existing woods (60' minimum) will remain to reduce the visual impact from homes on Browns Road and adjacent homes. This lot will have the best distant views as the first septic fields are located below hill from the house and in direction of the best views. The clearing for the septic fields will also enhance the views. The house has a walk-out basement to take advantage of the natural topography.

Lot 3: The house is located 500' from Browns Road (375' lower) and will have minimal or no visual impact from Browns Road. The house is located in close proximity to the shared drive to reduce the amount of site disturbance and provide the homeowners with a private view towards the west. A large oak tree will be visible beyond the cleared field (septic). The house will have a walk-out basement with a garage on the basement level.

Lot 4: The house is located 680' from Browns Road (400' lower) and will have no visual from Browns Road. The house is located to the north of the site to reduce the impact on the adjacent wetland system. There is a small ridge which allows the runoff from the house area to flow away from the eastside wetland finger. The walk-out basement allows the existing grade or the wall corner to remain as is.

Open Space: The open space is 2.4 acres or 27% of the project area. The proposed open space provides a wildlife corridor between the Joshua's Trust land to the west and Forest A (30.06 acres) to the east. The proposed open space also contains the most prominent high point on the site with extensive winter views to the north. Due to the proximity of the proposed homes, the applicant would prefer to have the open space as part of a neighborhood association, instead of full public access.
Memo to: Planning & Zoning Commission
      Town Council
From: Gregory J. Padick, Town Planner
Date: 9/10/03
Re: Proposed telecommunication tower, Knowlton Hill Road, Ashford

Please find enclosed information describing two nearby sites for a proposed 150 foot high telecommunication tower in Ashford. The proposed tower is under the jurisdiction of the CT Siting Council and Mansfield has been notified prior to submittal of formal application due to the proposed tower’s location within 2,500 feet of the Town line.

A more detailed report will be provided after staff review.
TECHNICAL REPORT

of

TOWER VENTURES II, LLC

for the

Construction, Operation and Maintenance

of a

Telecommunications Facility

Knowlton Hill Road,

Ashford, Connecticut

Submitted to

The Towns of Ashford,

Mansfield, and Willington

September 2, 2003
I. INTRODUCTION

Tower Ventures II, LLC (Tower Ventures) respectfully submits this Technical Report with attachments (Report) to the Town of Ashford, the Town of Mansfield, and the Town of Willington (collectively referred to as Towns) pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) §§ 16-50g et seq., as amended. This submission pertains to an application to be filed with the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (Certificate) that will allow Tower Ventures to install a wireless telecommunications facility and associated equipment (Facility) at one of two sites on Knowlton Hill Road (Ashford Tax Assessor’s Map 43E, Lot 4) in Ashford, Connecticut. This application falls within the jurisdiction of the Council pursuant to C.G.S. §§ 16-50i(a)(6), 16-50k and 16-50x. The purpose of this Report is to provide the Towns with information concerning the public need for the Facility, the site selection process and any environmental effects associated with the proposed Facility. Because the towns of Mansfield and Willington are located within 2,500 feet of the proposed Facility, this Report is being submitted to these towns as well.

II. SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Tower Ventures is a wireless infrastructure company that owns, operates and maintains telecommunications towers throughout the State of Connecticut and the Northeast. It has regional offices located in Ludlow, Housatonic and Pittsfield, Massachusetts, as well as in Haddam, Connecticut, and York, Maine, with its home office located in Providence, Rhode Island. Tower Ventures specializes in providing wireless infrastructure to licensed wireless carriers and data providers. It has substantial experience in this area, leading to the successful development of new wireless facilities throughout the Northeast. Tower Ventures’ management team is made up of a group of professionals previously employed by companies including Bell Atlantic Mobile (Verizon Wireless), Cingular Wireless, AT&T Wireless, Sprint PCS, Telecorp and Omnipoint (T-Mobile).

Tower Ventures focuses on developing quality communication facilities to be shared and used by numerous wireless providers. As a result of its substantial wireless experience
and solid relationships with the various service providers, Tower Ventures is able to locate facilities in areas where multiple wireless carriers’ needs exist. Tower Ventures engages in significant site research, interaction with the local municipalities, and communication with the carriers prior to developing a new site in an effort to provide wireless telecommunications facilities that will be a benefit to the community as well as to the service providers. The Ashford Facility is an excellent example of a joint effort between Tower Ventures and a wireless carrier to site a telecommunications facility that satisfies the needs and concerns of all.

The property on which one of the facilities would be located is owned by the Estate of Royal O. Knowlton and three of his heirs (Property). The parcel is 95.3 acres and is located on Map 43, Block E, Lot 4 of the Ashford Tax Assessor’s Map, which currently has not been assigned an address from the Town of Ashford. The Property is located in a Residence A (RA) Zone. The area surrounding the Property is primarily undeveloped, vegetated land with some scattered residences. The proposed use is permitted by Special Permit in an RA Zone, in accordance with the provisions of Article IV of the Ashford Zoning Regulations (Regulations).

Tower Ventures is proposing to build one Facility which would be located on one of two areas of the Property. At the first proposed site, Tower Ventures is proposing a 150’ tall steel monopole and a 75’ by 75’ fenced compound area within a 100’ by 100’ lease area on the north-central portion of the Property (Site A-1). The equipment compound will be enclosed by an 8’ tall chain-link fence. Vehicular and utility service to Site A-1 will extend from Knowlton Hill Road via an existing dirt road and then will follow a newly-constructed gravel road for the remaining 300' to the compound area.

As an alternative to Site A-1, Tower Ventures proposes to construct the same 150’ tall steel monopole and a 75’ by 75’ fenced compound area within a 75’ by 75’ lease area. This Facility would be located, however, on the north-western portion of the Property (Site A-2). The equipment compound would also be enclosed by an 8’ tall chain-link fence. Vehicular and utility service to Site A-2 would extend from Howard Avenue via a newly-constructed
gravel road for 345’ to the compound area. A copy of the Site Plans for Site A-1 and Site A-2 are annexed hereto under Attachment A.

At either Site A-1 or Site A-2, the Facility would be designed to accommodate the antennae and equipment of five (5) additional carriers at antenna centerline heights of 137’ AGL, 127’ AGL, 117’ AGL, 107’ AGL, and 97’ AGL, as well as municipal or public safety antennas. No water or sanitary facilities are required at either Site A-1 or Site A-2. Once built, the Facility will generate minimal traffic because T-Mobile’s personnel will visit the site only about once a month to perform routine maintenance and inspection.

The proposed Facility also provides a valuable opportunity for tower sharing in this area, along Route 44 and in an area bordered the Town of Mansfield to the south and the Town of Willington to the west and where there are no existing structures of any significant height to allow for the co-location of carriers interested in co-locating on the Facility.

III. CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL JURISDICTION

As discussed below, pursuant to the Public Utility Environmental Standards Act, C.G.S. §§ 16-50g et seq., the location and type of the proposed Facility is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Council. C.G.S. §§ 16-50i (a) (6), 16-50k, and 6-50x (a). The Council has jurisdiction over all facilities as defined in C.G.S. § 16-50i (a). This jurisdiction includes “telecommunication towers ... used in a cellular system, as defined by the Code of Federal Regulations Title 47, Part 22 . . . .” C.G.S. § 16-50i (a) (6).

Further, in a recently decided case entitled Sprint Spectrum, L.P. v. The Connecticut Siting Council, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the decision of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, wherein it was determined that facilities proposed by Sprint PCS satisfied the definition contained in C.G.S. § 16-50i (a) (6). Subsequently, by letter dated January 25, 2002, the Council issued an opinion that “all privately-owned speculation towers developed to provide space for personal communications service (PCS)” are now considered by the Council to be facilities under the jurisdiction of the Council pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-50i (a) (6).

Pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-50l (e), applicants are required, at least 60 days prior to filing an application with the Council, to (1) make a good faith effort to consult with the
municipality in which a Facility will be located regarding the selected sites, and (2) provide a technical report to Town officials. The Town may choose to conduct public hearings and meetings as it deems necessary for it to advise the applicant of its recommendations concerning the proposed facility. Within 60 days of the initial consultation, the Town shall issue its recommendations to the applicant. Within 15 days of filing an application with the Council, an applicant must provide the Council with (1) the technical report submitted to the Town and (2) a summary of the Town's comments and recommendations.

Tower Ventures plans to submit its application to the Council at the beginning of November 2003. Upon receipt of an application, the Council will assign a docket number and set a hearing date. At that time, the Town may choose to become an intervenor or a party to the proceedings. Other procedures followed by the Council include serving the applicant and other participants with interrogatories, holding a pre-hearing conference, and conducting a public hearing. The public hearing on this application would be held at a location in the Town. Once the public hearing is completed, the Council will issue findings of fact, an opinion, and a decision and order, which can include issuing a Certificate for either Site A-1 or Site A-2, or a variation of either site. Prior to construction, the Council will require the applicant to submit a Development and Management plan, which is a final site development plan showing the location of structures and details of site development such as grading and landscaping. Upon receiving Council approval, Tower Ventures will submit a building permit application to the Town of Ashford building official.

The procedures described above are governed by the Connecticut General Statutes, the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, and the Connecticut Siting Council's Rules of Practice.

IV. NEED FOR THE FACILITY
A. FCC Requirements

In 1996, the United States Congress recognized a nationwide need for high quality wireless telecommunication services. Through the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act"), Congress sought to promote competition, reduce regulation to encourage technical innovation, and recognized the public need for quality nationwide wireless
telecommunication services. Tower Ventures assists carriers in fulfilling their license requirements by providing them with a variety of services, including locating, leasing, zoning and constructing personal wireless facilities for the carriers’ antennas and equipment.

B. Coverage within the Towns of Ashford and Mansfield

The purpose of the proposed location is to provide service to the Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington area, and specifically along Route 44. A Facility at either Site A-1 or Site A-2 will improve service in the areas surrounding it by providing consistent coverage and added capacity, in conjunction with T-Mobile’s other sites in this area. This Facility would provide benefits for both residents and businesses in the Towns. T-Mobile has identified a need for the proposed Facility because of gaps in coverage between the “CDT” site at 20 Seles Road in Ashford and the University of Connecticut tower farm site in Storrs.

The demand for high quality wireless telecommunications service use in this area of Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington is significant because it is part of the heavily traveled Route 44 corridor and is home to many business and industrial entities, as well as persons living in the area who commute to and from Hartford and Providence, Rhode Island. Adequate and reliable telecommunication capabilities are, therefore, beneficial to persons who are traveling through, working, or living in the area.

Tower Ventures has included under Attachment B propagation plots from T-Mobile demonstrating its coverage (1) without the proposed Facility, (2) with the proposed Site A-1, and (3) with the proposed Site A-2. These propagation plots demonstrate the carriers’ need for coverage in this portion of Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington. The analyses utilize signal propagation maps and display the geographical area served by the carriers’ wireless facilities within this coverage area. The area that is colored displays coverage from T-Mobile’s other existing facilities. As these propagation maps demonstrate, T-Mobile experiences a significant coverage gap in this area of Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington.

V. SITE SELECTION

To provide sufficient service to the areas that do not receive coverage, a wireless facility must be placed within a very specific region. The area within which the facility must be located generally is in the center of the area that is not receiving coverage, which is called a
Search Area. The precise area, however, is greatly dependent upon ground elevation, topography, and tree coverage. To find a suitable location for this Facility, Tower Ventures conducted an exhaustive survey of sites to identify the best possible location and carefully reviewed the type and location of surrounding properties. Attachment C lists other sites that Tower Ventures considered and provides the reason each was ultimately rejected.

Only after determining that there are no buildings or structures of sufficient height in or near the Search Area, Tower Ventures searched for an appropriate location for a facility, which would serve the needs of multiple carriers. Its goal in selecting a site, such as that proposed herein, is to locate a Facility in such a manner as to allow telecommunication carriers to build and operate high-quality communication systems with the least environmental impact. Tower Ventures determined that both Site A-1 and Site A-2 satisfy this goal, as well as the goal of filling existing coverage gaps.

Furthermore, Site A-1 and Site A-2 each permit telecommunications carriers to provide coverage in the most inconspicuous manner possible because only one Facility is required, the monopole is as low as it can be while still providing the necessary coverage, and the sites are set back a significant distance from the nearest street and nearby residences.

With the proposed Facility at this site, it is evident that coverage will be provided throughout the cell and the previous coverage gaps experienced by T-Mobile will be completely eliminated or significantly reduced. Additionally, by receiving a Certificate, Tower Ventures can provide one telecommunications tower that can service multiple carriers, as well as the towns of Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY

The design of the proposed Facility was developed to meet the public need for high quality wireless service while minimizing any potential environmental impacts. Included under Attachments D, E, and F are a number of items that substantiate the fact that the proposed Facility will have a minimal environmental impact.

A. Visibility

Tower Ventures prepared a Visual Resource Evaluation, included under Attachment D, which includes existing condition photographs and photosimulations of the proposed
Facility at either Site (Visual Resources). These Visual Resources demonstrate that, even from most of those areas where the Facility at either Site A-1 or Site A-2 will be visible, the tower is unobtrusive. The compound will have a *de minimis* visual impact as the area is screened by mature vegetation. Accordingly, the proposed Facility will not result in an unacceptable adverse visual impact.

B. Power Density

In August, 1996, the FCC adopted a hybrid ANSI/NCRP Standard for exposure to Radio Frequency (RF) emissions from telecommunications facilities, such as the one proposed in this Application. The ANSI standard was adopted by Connecticut in C.G.S. §§ 22a-162 and 22a-162a “for the purpose of preventing possible harmful effects in human beings from exposure to electromagnetic fields in the frequency range of 300 kilohertz (KHz) to 100 gigahertz (GHz).”

To ensure compliance with the applicable standards, Tower Ventures performed maximum power density calculations for the proposed Facility according to the methodology prescribed by the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65E, Edition 97-01 (August 1997) (OET Bulletin 65).

The power density calculations are conservative, worst-case approximations for RF power density levels at the closest accessible point to the antennas (in this case, at the base of the tower) and with all antennas transmitting simultaneously on all channels at full power.

Attachment E shows the calculated power density and the percent of the Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE), assuming the Effective Radiated Power (ERP) is equal in all directions. In other words, no power-level adjustments were made due to the vertical pattern of the antennas, and all watts per channel were used for each location (which is a worst-case assumption). The highest power density is at the base of the tower, which is the closest accessible point to the antennas. For the proposed 150-foot tower at either Site, the power density for the antennas is 0.034731 mW/cm², which is 3.4731% of the maximum limit prescribed by the FCC. These calculations show that the power density is well below the FCC-mandated limits in all locations around the tower, even with extremely conservative assumptions. See Attachment E.
C. Other Potential Impacts

Tower Ventures analyzed the proposed Facility to determine if any other environmental impact would result. Included in this analysis is an examination of eight criteria specified under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), including wilderness areas, wildlife preserves, endangered species, historic places, floodplains, and wetlands. As set forth in the attachments included under Attachment F, the proposed Facility will not implicate any of the NEPA criteria.

Furthermore, the proposed Facility will be passive in nature. It will not create any smoke, ash, heat, glare, pollution, or noise. No sanitary facilities are required because a technician will visit the Facility only occasionally to perform routine maintenance. No hazardous substances will be located at the Facility. The Facility will not require marking or lighting and will not require notice to the Federal Aviation Administration. See letter dated August 13, 2003, attached hereto under Attachment G.

In addition, as Attachments A and F demonstrate, no wetlands or watercourses were identified (or delineated) within the proposed development area. No direct impact to federal wetlands are associated with Tower Ventures’ construction activities and no significant change in surface features (e.g., wetland fill, deforestation or water diversion) will result, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) categorical exclusion checklist. Wetlands were delineated to the east of the compound at Site A-2, but the proposed compound will be located entirely outside the 100’ upland regulated area.

The limits of disturbance of all construction activities will be confined to the minimum extent possible. All erosion and sediment control measures shall be installed, when necessary, in accordance with the “Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control” (Revised 1988) and amendments, as published by the Connecticut Council on Soil and Water Conservation.

Based on the above, Tower Ventures submits that the proposed Facility and the construction and maintenance of the carriers’ antennas and equipment will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.
VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the facts contained in this Report, Tower Ventures submits that the construction of a telecommunications facility at either Site A-1 or Site A-2 will not have a substantial adverse environmental effect. A public need exists for high quality mobile and portable wireless service in the areas of Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington surrounding the site. The FCC and the United States Congress provided a competitive framework for wireless telecommunications carriers to provide such service by enacting the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Because the Facility will provide the opportunity for six carriers to co-locate, Tower Ventures' proposal fulfills the legislative mandate to eliminate the unnecessary proliferation of telecommunications towers in Connecticut.

Specifically, Tower Ventures submits that it has demonstrated (1) the public need for the Facility to permit wireless telecommunications carriers to provide their services; (2) that the proposed Facility will not result in any adverse environmental impacts; (3) that the shared use of the Facility is feasible; and (4) the proposed Facility will not substantially affect the scenic, historic, recreational or ecological quality of the site. Finally, the proposed Facility will help provide a level of service in Ashford, Mansfield, and Willington that is commensurate with current public demand for telecommunications service, as well as to meet such demand for the foreseeable future.

Correspondence and/or communications regarding this report may be addressed to:

Hurwitz & Sagarin, LLC
147 North Broad Street
Milford, Connecticut 06460
Attention: Scott T. Penner, Esq.
(203) 877-8000
## Alternate Site Analysis

**Contact:** David Vivian  
**Phone:** 413-593-3168  
**Mobile:** 413-218-6042  
**Fax:** 413-593-3214  
**Email:** davidvivian@juno.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Assessor's M/L</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton, et al</td>
<td>99 Knowlton Hill, Ashford</td>
<td>43/D/1</td>
<td>217.1 acres – too far east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadlerock</td>
<td>Squaw Hollow Rd, Ashford</td>
<td>43/A/8 &amp; 19</td>
<td>27 &amp; 229 acres – DEP spill site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d/b/a Becker Const.</td>
<td>Karosi Rd, Ashford</td>
<td>38/A/2</td>
<td>38.3 acres – too far north; tough access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton, et al</td>
<td>Marsh Rd, Willington</td>
<td>01/10</td>
<td>134 acres – wetlands access &amp; Nipmuck Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin</td>
<td>Boston Tpke, Willington</td>
<td>06/5-A</td>
<td>35.86 acres – owner unresponsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaBarre</td>
<td>Boston Tpke, Willington</td>
<td>06/5</td>
<td>47.29 acres – owners unresponsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton, et al</td>
<td>Mason Rd, Willington</td>
<td>01/10</td>
<td>134 acres – too far west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmadge</td>
<td>1 Boston Tpke, Willington</td>
<td>01/9</td>
<td>50 acres – owner unresponsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasser</td>
<td>Elise Rd, Storrs</td>
<td>4/45/13</td>
<td>55.2 acres – too far south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>129 Summit, Storrs</td>
<td>4/45/40 &amp; 41</td>
<td>26.3 &amp; 35.1 acres – too far south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua’s Tract</td>
<td>Knowlton Hill, Storrs</td>
<td>5/48/7-1</td>
<td>44.1 acres – wet access; too far south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagy</td>
<td>861 Wormwood Hill, Storrs</td>
<td>11/48/10</td>
<td>77.8 acre – wet access; too far south</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note from G. Pandolfo: The color version of this map indicates that year-round visibility of the proposed towers extends into the following areas of Mansfield:

- Candidate A: a narrow north/south oriented strip directly south of the Ashford Town line about 100 feet east of Woodland Rd and a small area east of Woodland Hill Rd near the Town Hall Hill intersection.

Comparative Viewshed Map

Candidate B - same area east of Woodland Rd described above

CT-01519 (Two Candidate Locations)
Candidate A: Knowlton Hill Road
Candidate B: Howard Road
Ashford, Connecticut

NOTE:
Viewshed analysis conducted using ESRI's ArcView Spatial Analyst.
Viewshed results updated according to field investigations.
Proposed tower heights are 150 feet.
Forest cover calculated at height of 66 feet.
Viewshed analysis conducted for fall conditions.
Potential seasonal views estimated based on in-field observations made during balloon test.

DATA SOURCES for viewshed analysis:
- 7.5 minute digital elevation model (DEM) at 30 meter resolution produced by USGS, 1982
- Forested areas derived from 1980 digital orthophotos with 1-meter pixel resolution - digitized by VHS, 2003
- Base map comprised of Coventry and Spring Hill USGS Quadrangle Maps.
- Coordinates of proposed site.
- Candidate A - Lat 41 50 22.8 Long. 72 12 27.1
- Candidate B - Lat 41 50 27.7 Long. 72 12 35.1
- Protected properties data layer provided by CTDEP, July 2001
- Scenic Roads derived from State and Local listings

Map Compiled August 27, 2003
MUNICIPAL EARLY CHILDHOOD SUCCESS INITIATIVE

In Connecticut's 169 towns and cities, there are 467,000 children ages birth to eight years old. These very young people represent nearly 14 percent of the state's population. More important than numbers, it is the welfare of these children that most concerns families and public official our communities. Building cost effective ways to address early childhood needs is among the most vital role municipal government can play in the lives of its citizens.

Believing that giving young children the "best start" means involvement at the local level, Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) and the Commission on Children (COC) have teamed with the National League of Cities (NLC) to launch this Connecticut initiative. The goals are simple:

- Help municipal leaders – mayors, first selectmen, councilmembers, town/city managers – become more knowledgeable about what is meant by early childhood success, and what are meaningful policies for kids birth to 8.

- Provide real time, practical information to all municipal leaders about the things a community can do – some at low or no cost – to make sure that what happens in a town/city is just "kid friendly", but "kid enhancing".

- Assist, at least in first year, a modest number of "Focus Communities" with support to help them identify early childhood policies and services important to them, and work to implement strategies to make young children and their families in these towns healthier, safer, and better positioned to learn and grow.

How Can This Benefit My Community?

First off, to say 2003 and 2004 will be hard on municipalities is an understatement.

Still, by becoming involved in the Municipal Early Childhood Success Initiative mayors, first selectmen, town/city managers can learn what their government can do to insure young children get a better start. Just collecting and articulating what is happening now in town is a step. Many communities are doing more than they know for children 0 to 8, not just in school, but also in literacy, childcare, health, etc. We can help a community to catalog what is happening, and better integrate these activities.

Want to take a closer look at childcare in your community? At school readiness? At after school services? At health screening? The Initiative can help a leader assess what is there, what a new or expanded focus might be, and connect your administration with experts to offer fresh ideas, and help in implementation.
What Will The Initiative Offer?

**Information**...Link your administrators with our websites at CCM and COC, not only to offer basic information, but a non-jargon, easy to use resource site for reliable information on early childhood development. Provide a clearinghouse, a place for Connecticut mayors, first selectmen, town/city managers and other municipal leaders to exchange information. Over time, you will see Connecticut examples of local early childhood programs; ideas to try.

**Best Practices**...Want to know if services available in your town/city are based on proven research? Want to know if particular approaches have been proven elsewhere? Are they cost effective? The Initiative can help, and with support from NLC, we will connect your community with folks who have already done it. Why reinvent a wheel?

**Assessment**...with help from NLC, we can offer tools with which administrators can assess what is happening regarding youngsters’ birth to 8 years. This will help demonstrate the links, the connections, and gaps in your services and policies affecting early childhood success.

**Training, Seminars**...In 2004, CCM will feature a limited number of free opportunities at a central location for leaders to learn in detail about particular approaches, and how to effectively launch and maintain initiatives that promote early childhood success.

**Pick the Focus, We Will Help You Advance It**...For “Focus Communities”, we will offer extra help to a mayor, first selectman or town/city manager to choose an area of concentration - perhaps a single activity or a policy initiative. Along with NLC, we can bring in outside resources and technical support, and advice to help make it happen.

**Learn Together**...we have created a Municipal Task Force on Early Childhood Success to examine public policies in this arena. The Task Force will be a place for mayors, first selectmen and town/city managers to exchange ideas, find support, and avoid pitfalls.

How Does My Town/City Join?

**Become a Focus Community.** When folks from CCM and COC come to call, ask questions, probe, and if you think we can help, tell us you want to be involved, sign on as a Focus Community.

**Join the Municipal Task Force.** Three meetings a year, interesting subjects, speakers, and a chance to interact with peers around important issues in early childhood.

**Give Us Feedback.** Tell us what you want, what you need, what direction you want early childhood in towns and cities to take? We will work with NLC to respond. Call Us.

Jim Finley, CCM  
203-498-3000; jfinley@ccm-ct.org

Elaine Zimmerman, COC  
860-240-0290; Elaine.Zimmerman@po.state.ct.us

Jeffrey Daniels, coordinator  
Early Childhood Success Initiative  
860-233-5552; jeffreydaniels@sbcglobal.net
Minutes of the Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting  
Friday, May 30, 2003  
11 am – 12 pm  
Bishop Center Room 7


- Members Absent: Lori Aronson, Janine Caira, Bruce Carlson, John DeWolf, Ron Dubois, Susan Fisher, Karla Fox (co-chair), Sara Harkness, Richard Kelley, Leslie Maddocks, Fred Maryanski, Dana McGee, Peter Miniutti, Michael Nichols, Alvin Wilson, Ernie Zirakzadeh

- Ex-Officio: Cynthia van Zelm

- Consultants:  
  Steve Troost / SmithGroup JR
  Neal Kessler / SmithGroup JR
  R. Umashankar / SmithGroup JR
  Barbara Chance / Chance Management Advisors
  Kirsten McGregor / Chance Management Advisors
  Jay Brotman / Swigals+Partners
  Frank Markley / Paulien and Associates

Richard Schwab called the meeting to order at 11:08 am.

1. Announcements by the chair
He stated that Karla Fox could not attend the meeting due to an illness. He stated that it would be a shorter meeting than planned and would spend most of the meeting having discussions with the consultants.

2. Acceptance of the Minutes of the Last Meeting
The motion was made by Peter Tanaka and it was seconded by Cynthia Adams. It was accepted unanimously.

3. Master Planning for the 21st Century UConn
The attendees and consultants introduced themselves. A motion was passed and approved to accept the minutes from the previous meeting. SmithGroup JR and Chance Management Advisors presented a summary of “top-level” analysis conclusions regarding the campus’ physical organization and parking system. A copy of the presentation is attached.

In summary, many important issues relate to circulation. This is due to new roadway configurations, parking garages, and pedestrian traffic generators (e.g., the Coop and residential housing). The circulation dynamics have changed, and while improvements have been made, new challenges have developed. Other important issues relate to way-finding and strategic building infill balanced by appropriate quantities of open space.

Following the presentation, an open discussion occurred and the following notes were recorded.
Discussions

1. Concern was expressed that nighttime parking (convenient to the campus core) is often not available for faculty, as students are allowed to park on campus for free after 4:00 p.m. This issue is exacerbated when there are special events at Jorgensen or athletic events at Gampel. It was noted that parking utilization data was gathered for the peak morning and afternoon periods, which typically covers the worst situations. Parking Services responded that they only receive a few complaints about evening parking supplies. This issue will be further assessed.

2. Transit system utilization has increased over the past five years and is directly related to the increase in student population on campus, a more efficient operation, and more effective routing/headways. There is some concern that there are now too many busses and they are becoming a nuisance in select areas like the busway and pedestrian corridor in front of the Wilbur Cross Building. System recommendations may need to consider point-to-point routes rather than loops or improved separation of pedestrians. This issue will be further assessed.

3. While survey data for the W Lot indicates that it is underutilized, it appeared to be full. Parking Services responded that this is primarily attributed to the presence of construction equipment and further elimination of parking within the academic core (e.g., the Tech Quad). Parking supply and distribution will be assessed.

4. The consultants were asked if they would have a continuing role in evaluating the UCONN 2000 and 21st Century UCONN projects to assure they are consistent with the master plan's objectives. SmithGroup JJR responded that it does not currently have any form of a retainer agreement with the university for involvement in project reviews. The team will, within the scope of the current project, engage in conceptual level site planning to guide the form and fit for 21st Century UCONN projects within the context of the existing campus.

5. The number of students on campus with special needs continues to increase. The master planning effort must be continually cognizant of this group's needs.

6. Concern was expressed that the master-planning effort is only focusing on the campus core. Some desire a comprehensive approach to identify conservation and development of the university's entire land holdings. It was noted that the 2000 Outlying Parcels Master Plan addressed some of the land in question and that there is a growing concern regarding conservation of undeveloped land on the East Campus area for which an increase in the current scope of services is anticipated.

7. The 1998 Campus Master Plan and this update are often viewed externally as plans for development. The university has large holdings of agricultural and forested land that is valued both by the campus and the Mansfield community. The update must emphasize land conservation for open space both within the core and on adjacent parcels. SmithGroup JJR noted that careful land use planning could increase the quantity of open space while at the same time increase building square footages. The open space system will be addressed in greater detail during subsequent phases of the planning process.

8. The area around Mirror Lake is a very important asset, especially as the campus and town compositions change (e.g., the Downtown Mansfield development).
9. The Town of Mansfield is undergoing an update to their comprehensive plan for conservation and development as required by state statute. As a result, there is an increased sense of awareness to conservation of land and preservation of natural resources across communities in the state.

10. A suggestion was made to develop a Japanese garden in the area bounded by the Homer Babbidge Library, Information Technology Engineering Building, and School of Business.

11. The odor resulting from manure spreading on adjacent agricultural fields is often overwhelming. This issue could grow as more housing is constructed near these fields (e.g., Charter Oak Apartments and Husky Village).

12. The lack of separation between construction traffic and students at various locations on campus is a safety consideration that must be addressed. This is especially true within the central forum. Even more disconcerting is the amount of use by delivery and service vehicles within this pedestrian area. Enforcement will need to be increased to curb past patterned behavior.

4. Public participation
There were none.

5. Future Meeting Date(s)
The committee would meet in September. Please stay tuned.

6. Adjournment
Motion was made by Ted Yungclas and seconded by Meg Malmborg. The meeting adjourned at 12:11 pm.
University of Connecticut

Campus Master Plan Update - East Campus Study

September 11, 2003

Agenda

- Purpose of Study
- Overview of Conservation and Development requirements
- Upcoming UConn activities on East Campus
- Master Plan Update
- Breakout Group Discussions
- Reporting Out
- Voting
- Adjourn
-----Original Message-----
From: Miller, Rich [mailto:Rich.Miller@uconn.edu]
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2003 5:04 PM
To: Capt. John Flaherty (E-mail); Curt Johnson (E-mail); Fox, Karla; Glenn S. Warner (E-mail); Greg Padick (E-mail); Meg Reich (E-mail); Mike Callahan (E-mail); Pam Schipani (E-mail)
Cc: Makowski, Laurie; Betsy Frederick (E-mail)
Subject: UConn Site Study Advisory Comm. - First Meeting

To: Members of the UConn Hazardous Waste Storage Site Study (HWS3) Advisory Committee

From: Rich Miller, Director of Environmental Policy, UConn

Re: First Meeting - RSVP with Your Availability

Greetings and thank you all again for agreeing to participate in UConn's advisory process for this comparative site study. I hope you had an enjoyable Summer.

We are planning to convene this advisory group for our first meeting and have reserved two possible dates: Tuesday, Sept. 30 OR Wednesday, Oct. 1. This meeting, like future meetings of the group, will include a light dinner for the members at 6:00 p.m., followed by the meeting to begin between 6:30 and 7 p.m. Our goal is to conclude by 8:30.

Please respond to me and/or my assistant Laurie Makowski (486-4037) by indicating which of the above dates is preferable for you, or which presents a conflict. Also, let us know if you have any ongoing conflicts on a particular weeknight (we'll typically plan to meet on a Tuesday, Wed., or Thursday night).

I'll attach a nearly final advisory group membership list (we may still seek to add a member). Please provide us with any changes or edits to your contact information.

Although most of you have already seen it, I'll also attach a summary about the study and the advisory group. I'll follow up soon with the meeting date.

Thanks,
University of Connecticut
Hazardous Waste <90-Day Storage Facility
Comparative Site Study

- The University is committed to determining whether there is a more appropriate location on campus for its hazardous waste storage facility than the current location on the east (Agricultural) campus. The facility is used for holding, for 90 days or less, hazardous waste that is generated at the main campus, primarily by our science labs. After temporary storage, the waste is transported off-site for treatment or disposal at commercial facilities, in accordance with state and federal regulations. Concerns about the appropriateness of the current site have been expressed because of its location within the Fenton River watershed and proximity to the direct recharge area of the Fenton wellfield, which provides the University with a portion of its drinking water supply.

- Rich Miller, UConn's Director of Environmental Policy, will oversee the study by:
  - Hiring a technical consultant experienced in advising institutions that have located similar hazardous waste storage facilities on their premises, and knowledgeable about applicable federal and state requirements
  - Convening and chairing an advisory group of stakeholders to review and respond to the information provided by the technical consultant. Stakeholder representatives will include: UConn faculty and staff, statewide environmental organizations, town officials and local residents
  - Charging the advisory group with assessing the advantages and disadvantages of the current location versus an alternative site in the vicinity of the sewage treatment plant (The group may also identify and assess another potentially acceptable campus location for the facility.)
  - Establishing the factors that the technical consultant and the advisory group are to consider in evaluating site options, including risk to the environment and natural resources resulting from accidental releases, compatibility with surrounding land use and the University's Master Plan, public safety, operational efficiency, cost considerations, regulatory requirements and approvals, security/accessibility, adequacy of space, traffic safety and proximity to areas where the waste is generated.
  - Providing additional opportunities for public review and participation.

- The University is committed to making a significant investment in an upgraded hazardous waste storage facility once a final site decision is made. In the interim, a new modular, moveable, unit will be installed this summer to improve the operations of the current facility.

- Both the technical consultant and advisory group are expected to complete their work over the next six months.
HWS3 ADVISORY COMMITTEE

John Flaherty
University Fire Captain
Public Safety, Unit 3165
486-4925
John.Flaherty@uconn.edu
captjohnsgreyhound@hotmail.com

Glenn Warner
Associate Professor
Director, Institute of Water Resources
Natural Resources Mgmt., U-4087
486-140
Glenn.Warner@uconn.edu
gwarner@mint.caq.uconn.edu

Curt Johnson
Senior Attorney
CT Fund for the Environment
205 Whitney Avenue, 1st Floor
New Haven, CT 06511
cjohnson@cfenv.org

Karla Fox
Associate Vice President
Chair, Master Plan
Advisory Committee
Provost Office, U-2086
Karla.Fox@uconn.edu

Pamela Schipani
Associate Director
Residential Life, U-4049
486-2926
Pschipani@uconn.edu
Pschipani@domino.mail.uconn.edu

Greg Padick
Town Planner
Town of Mansfield
4 South Eagleville Road
Mansfield, CT 06268
padickgj@mansfieldct.org

Mike Callahan
Chairman, Windham Water Works Commission
174 Storrs Road
Mansfield, CT 06268
callahanjm@mail.ataengrs.com

Meg Reich
Willimantic River Alliance
343 Bassetts Bridge Road
Mansfield, CT 06268
455-0532
mevr1@earthlink.net
September 4, 2003

Dear Mr. Berliner,

I am proud and excited to announce that Southeast Elementary School will be receiving the Green Flag award for Environmental Leadership by the Center for Health, Environment and Justice. The Green Flag award recognizes Southeast's efforts in promoting recycling, integrated pest management, indoor air quality, and use of nontoxic chemicals within the school. In addition to receiving this award, Southeast has been distinguished by being named an exemplar school nationally for its recycling program.

The award ceremony will take place at Southeast on Wednesday, September 17, from 2:30 to 3:00 p.m. Southeast would be honored if you could attend this ceremony.

Please RSVP to Mickey Maheu at 423-1611 ext. 110 or at maheummn@mansfieldct.org. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mickey Maheu
Grade 2 Teacher