

**The Fairfield Hills Master Plan Review Committee held a meeting on Thursday, October 25, 2010 at the Newtown Municipal Center, Newtown, Connecticut.**

Mr. Floros called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

**Present:** Michael Floros, Paul Lundquist, Michael Mossbarger, Robert Maurer, Ben Roberts, Alan Shepard, and Deborra Zukowski; **Absent:** Nancy Roznicki, Gary Steele, and Stephen Zvon

**Public Participation:** Ruby Johnson from 16 Chestnut Hill Road, distributed handouts and discussed how the Senior Center wants to expand in their building. She asked the committee look at population projections to determine what space the senior center may need in the future. She also discussed the Ambulance Association requesting to relocate to Fairfield Hills (FFH). Their proposal includes a plan showing the Ambulance, Fire, and Police Departments housed in the same vicinity. She also discussed editorials from the Newtown Bee regarding economic development (attachments A & B) and a memo by Stearns & Wheler, LLC, dated 01/10/07 regarding the sewer system at FFH. (Attachment C).

Mr. Shepard noted that FFH was never voted in to the water/sewer district and whether the Water and Sewer Authority would pay for the work at FFH has yet to be determined.

**Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Zukowski motioned to approve the minutes of 9/27/10. Mr. Lundquist seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as amended. Mr. Lundquist motioned to approve the minutes of 10/14/10. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as amended.

**Elizabeth Stocker, Director of Economic and Community Development**

Ms. Stocker provided an overview of her responsibilities and how they relate to the FFH campus. She discussed Planning and Zoning's leadership role in creating a new Adaptive Reuse zone specifically for the campus. She also worked with the master planning committees and Planning and Zoning and also is involved with EDC, the Fairfield Hills Authority and Mike Struna regarding the marketing of the campus.

Mr. Maurer asked about Ms. Stocker's involvement with grants. Ms. Stocker said recently they applied for an EPA town-wide environmental hazardous waste assessment grant for \$200,000, which can include some of the buildings on campus. She said there is another \$200,000 EPA grant to be used for abatement of asbestos and removal of hazardous materials. The lead-based paint was not removed but an assessment was done in the Stratford Building and two adjacent duplexes. Although the clean up is complete, there are details left to finish before the grant is closed out. There are also several Connecticut State grants (Small Town Economic Assistance Grant, aka, STEAP), some for tunnel removal and \$250,000 that was transferred from the Tech Park for purposes of abatement work and removing tunnels, upgrading the water system and the streetscape.

Mr. Maurer asked if she was involved with the grant for the duplexes and if more are expected. Ms. Stocker said there is another \$100,000 clean up grant that would cover the other two duplexes.

Mr. Mossbarger asked if it's required to be used on the duplexes. Stocker said the duplexes were indicated on the application.

Mr. Floros asked if a building is specified on the grant, does it have to be used on that building. Ms. Stocker said there is a time period where it could be change but that the current grant is already in process.

Mr. Lundquist asked what potential applications that could be use for FFH with the \$200,000 town-wide grant and what other areas in town are being considered. Ms. Stocker explained that last year they applied for a site specific grant, but were told that chances are better to apply for a town-wide grant. The other properties identified on the grant are Sandy Hook Marine & Auto and Edmond Town Hall.

Mr. Lundquist asked how specific the grant applications need to be. Ms. Stocker said the projects need to show it would help the overall health of the community. Mr. Lundquist then asked if the \$100,000 grant for the other duplex (not for KCC) is specific. She said the KCC duplex is already cleaned up from the other grant and that they were expecting all three grants would complete all the duplexes.

Mr. Shepard asked how much is the total clean up of the duplexes. Ms. Stocker said it had cost \$240,000 for the Stratford House and the first two duplexes. The additional \$100,000 should clean up two more of the duplexes. She noted that clean up costs include their soft costs, i.e., licensed environmental professional, lab work, and testing. Mr. Shepard then asked if they could expect to get three of the duplexes cleaned up for about \$350,000. Ms. Stocker said probably four.

Ms. Zukowski asked about cost share for the grants. Ms. Stocker said there was only a cost share with the initial clean up grant. Ms. Zukowski summarized the grants and asked if the only Town money used was \$40,000 needed for the initial clean up grant. Ms. Stocker said there were also in-kind services as well.

Mr. Mossbarger asked if the committee is locked into the money being used for the duplexes. Ms. Stocker said she believes so. She asked if there were other buildings the committee was targeting. Mr. Mossbarger was concerned if one area is locked down, it hinders the scope of the whole property.

Mr. Lundquist asked about the assessment grant and how much is known at this time about the hazardous materials. Ms. Stocker explained that the LEP has put together a matrix on the buildings, but there is still more preliminary work to be done (testing, monitoring, lab work, etc.)

Ms. Zukowski discussed two types of economic development (economic-based or consumer service businesses) and asked Ms. Stocker what percentage of each business does she foresee. Ms. Stocker said she can provide the information a later date. Ms. Zukowski asked in terms of a healthy ratio of economic development vs. residential tax burden, where is the Town now and is there enough land outside of FFH to bring the Town to a healthy level. Ms. Stocker said identifying the level of economic development needed has not been identified. She explained what has been defined in the POCD and in the strategic plan, they would like to continue the growth in economic development. Ms. Zukowski asked if the current zoning laws maintain that level. Ms. Stocker said we have the ability to grow and be sustainable. She explained the P & Z Commission creating alternatives such as the South Main Design District, Sandy Hook Design District, the Hawleyville area, and the Tech Park. She said a lot depends on utilities and environmental restraints. FFH has good potential with existing infrastructure, a transportation system, and at one time accommodated a huge amount of employment.

Mr. Lundquist asked if the Tech Park and FFH compete. Ms. Stocker said the two sites are complimentary. Mr. Lundquist asked if a 30-year lease places FFH at a disadvantage. Ms. Stocker said the lease option is not set in stone. Mr. Lundquist asked how the tech park would be put forth. Ms. Stocker said it hasn't been defined, but EDC can entertain several options.

Mr. Mossbarger asked for Ms. Stocker's opinion on the proposal for Cochran House. Ms. Stocker said it is worthy of consideration and said housing was historically part of the best use plan for the campus. She does not feel that 160 units is a lot, although large for Newtown standards. She noted that P & Z adopted new regulations to allow housing above businesses and there is a movement across the country where people want to live in smaller homes, closer to amenities and closer to each other. She said Newtown has the opportunity to provide these things.

Mr. Maurer said smart growth seems to be more popular and it stops the sprawl and allows for more open space. Ms. Stocker said housing on FFH would allow for larger parcels in town, provide diversity, and preserve the character of the town.

Ms. Zukowski said thinks about village centers in relation to smart growth and asked if it make sense to have smart growth at FFH or should it be used for another purpose. Ms. Stocker said it would help generate economic growth and provide neighborhood services.

Mr. Lundquist asked Ms. Stocker what her vision is of smart growth at FFH. Ms. Stocker said if there were commercial and community uses mixed in, it would be sustainable growth, using less resources, have a lower carbon footprint, etc. It in itself is not smart growth, there are other elements that have to go with it.

Mr. Roberts asked in an ideal world, what would Ms. Stocker like to see on the campus. Ms. Stocker said she see's a combination of uses that would provide a synergy; recreation (passive and active), an educational institution, cultural uses (performing and visual arts), etc. She said you have to think out of the box and that maybe a master planner should be hired and that it is very difficult to do it piecemeal.

Mr. Shepard asked why would someone invest in the buildings when they can go somewhere else and get a higher rate of return. He asked what proposals have come forward and if there are Town funds involved. Ms. Stocker said there were leases worked out for Woodbury Hall and Newtown Hall, and an intent to lease all of the duplexes, but the economy has stalled all interest. One benefit to this is that there is State and Federal money available. The grants have helped.

Mr. Maurer commented on Chris Lyddy's comment in the News Times about FFH' fee and leasing structure and the views on the campus. Ms. Stocker said that Mike Struna has not proposed a leasing structure that she knows of.

Mr. Lundquist asked Ms. Stocker if the buildings should be taken down. Ms. Stocker said when investing a substantial sum of money, there needs to be a clear vision to convince people to invest. She used the example of the revitalization of Sandy Hook center. You need to believe in what you're doing, be able to support the beliefs, and maintain a momentum. She said uncertainty is a cause for failure. Mr. Lundquist then said a lack of action is a detriment to the development of the campus.

Mr. Roberts said in regards to Ms. Johnson's statement that economic development can cause a tax increase, he asked Ms. Stocker if there is an argument to be made for FFH not being developed. Ms. Stocker said there are many studies supporting that economic development pays for itself. She said FFH has the infrastructure and that there is too much value in the property to not let it be developed. She said the only way you would turn a fully developed campus back into open space is if there were environmental problems. Mr. Roberts said the town already owns the property and in order to preserve other privately held pieces of land, it would have to be paid for with new money.

Ms. Zukowski said in order to provide the correct information to the public, what would be considered a healthy mix of residential and commercial and is FFH necessary to meet that target. Ms. Stocker said she can research this information.

### **First Selectman Llodra**

Ms. Llodra discussed results from a school enrollment study may impact the future use of its facilities and that their recommendations will impact the larger municipal space needs study that will be completed. If there are reuse possibilities for municipally-owned properties (not on FFH) then the results can effect the work the committee is completing, for example, the discussion of the Police Department moving to FFH, where if a school were vacant, it could relocate to that building.

Ms. Llodra then discussed Kevin's Community Center (KCC) and said the \$500,000 grant was specified to be used to rehab a building on the campus. The professional estimator stated the cost to rehab the duplex is \$460,000 and does not include the cost of an elevator. With an elevator, the cost would increase to \$500,000. She feels concentrating on the duplex area is manageable and will bring more life to the campus and to the community. She said \$350,000 is requested in the CIP to support the infrastructure necessary for KCC to take residence in Duplex 58. The KCC Board will be facing a final commitment to accept the grant (the grant has been awarded but not executed).

Ms. Llodra discussed the Fairfield Hills Authority's work and suggested the committee meet with them to assure there are no conflicting discussions. In relation to the discussion of economic development and the report done by Planimetrics. She said to a great extent, the determiner is the quality of life that the community wants to experience over time. She said the degree to which you have economic development has to be measured against the quality of life. Newtown is often compared to Trumbull as a community, but they differ in that 14% of Trumbull's grand list is commercial/industrial and Newtown's is 8%. It was explained to her that although commercial and industrial do not reduce taxes, it mitigates the impact of the growth in taxes. She then discussed in-kind services provided at FFH. Although they are unable to quantify the work, they began a separate account in December of 2009 to track it. She felt that the campus is treated as any other part of the community and that the Town has a responsibility to care for it as they do for all other parts of the Town.

Mr. Shepard asked if there are any funds dedicated from the sterns and wheler report to upgrade the sewer lines. First Selectman Llodra said no.

Mr. Lundquist asked about the timing of the facilities studies by the Town and BOE. First Selectman Llodra said the school facility study should be done by spring and the Town study would then start and be completed by the Fall of 2011.

Ms. Zukowski asked about other potential options for KCC and if it would make sense to break ground in another part of the campus and use the duplexes for a different scenario. First Selectman Llodra said she was more in favor of reuse and that creating an environment in the duplex area would bring life to the campus.

Mr. Mossbarger discussed the 40 acres in the corner area and if the duplexes were used, it limits the property for another potential use. He wondered whether there was a better location for KCC. Ms Llodra said she's not opposed to other options but strongly believes that part of the campus should serve the community and that critical services like KCC and Newtown Youth and Family Services need the help and support. She said this is an opportunity to address that need and demonstrate community culture by using a very small area of the campus to serve that need.

Ms. Zukowski asked about Newtown Hook and Ladder not wanting to relocate to FFH and asked if there has been any discussion about redistricting the Fire Departments. Ms. Llodra one of the concerns they have for the FFH location is the amount of time it takes for volunteers to get to the fire station to respond to a call. She has not heard any talk about redistricting. She said that all the Fire Departments are volunteer.

#### **Further Discussion and Review of Proposed Process and Public Participation.**

The committee discussed the timeline, stating that it could run into early April. The key component is to get feedback from the community (Process and Public Participation Subcommittee notes are attached). Ms. Zukowski said the 2010 census will have data available in February. It was agreed that giving the committee more time would provide a stronger report. Ms. Zukowski motioned that we recommend as a position of the board to go with the original schedule for April. Mr. Shepard seconded the motion. All in favor.

Mr. Floros will check with First Selectman Llodra about the budget and determine the locations for the public process.

**Education Subcommittee** – Meeting notes attached.

**Public Safety and Municipal Administration Subcommittee** – – No update.

**Resources and Infrastructure Subcommittee** – No update.

**Commercial Subcommittee** – No update.

**Open Space, Recreation, and Social Services Subcommittee** – No update.

**Process and Public Participation Subcommittee** – Meeting notes attached.

**Housing Subcommittee** – No update.

**Demographics Subcommittee** – Meeting notes attached.

**Public Participation** – Ms. Johnson discussed the tax comparison between Trumbull and Newtown. She said someone said during the Fairfield Hills Authority meeting that this committee should complete their work first.

The meeting adjourned at 09:55 p.m. The next meeting will be held in the Council Chambers on Friday, November 12, 2010 at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Tammy Hazen, Clerk.

From Ruby 10-25-10  
Attachment A

## EDITORIAL INK DROPS <sup>11/15/02</sup>

### How Would You Develop Fairfield Hills?

If you care at all about what happens to the 189 acres of property and buildings at Fairfield Hills, now is the time to do something about it.

The selectmen's Fairfield Hills Master Plan Committee is sponsoring two "workshop" sessions this Saturday, November 16, to solicit public comments and direction on three development options for the site. Out of this public discussion will emerge a final draft master plan for Fairfield Hills. That final plan will then be presented to the selectmen and the town for a final vote before submitting it to the Planning and Zoning Commission for its review.

The sessions on Saturday will present an opportunity for townspeople to discuss with the committee and its planning consultant the various components of the three plans. (Details on the three options and cost estimates for each appear this week on pages A8&9.) In particular, there are two important questions that need to be answered by the committee.

First, why do two of the three options presented for public consideration include significant housing development? One option calls for 44 units of housing in a "cluster village" and the another proposes up to 64 units. Housing is also proposed in a third option, but on a far smaller scale. These housing proposals suggest that the committee members were not listening the last time the public was asked about its preferences at Fairfield Hills. At a public planning "charette" sponsored by the Fairfield Hills Master Plan Committee last June, townspeople agreed on many priorities for Fairfield Hills, including ballfields, open space, municipal buildings, and space for cultural arts and recreation. There was little or no support for housing on the campus. Yet when it comes time for the committee to come up with alternatives, all three options include housing. Why?

Second, what impact will significant economic development at Fairfield Hills have on future annual tax rate increases? Again, two of the three proposed options reserve large areas of the campus for economic development, which also was listed as a low priority at the public planning session in June. The call for new and large buildings for office and commercial development is presumably to "make Fairfield Hills pay" thereby lessening the tax burdens for Newtowners in the future. But when it takes \$80 million worth of development to yield just one mill in tax revenue, isn't it a little disingenuous to suggest that Fairfield Hills offers meaningful tax relief to local property owners well into the future? Have other costs associated with a massive influx of people and traffic to support such development been calculated? Can the proponents of economic development at Fairfield Hills truthfully say these plans will spare local taxpayers their customary one and two mill tax annual increases for any more than a year or two? The town needs more answers on the actual economics of economic development before committing large portions of Fairfield Hills to this cause.

These are just two questions we have about the development of Fairfield Hills. We are sure there are many others that linger in the minds of townspeople. Make sure that all the important questions get asked. Attend one of the two workshop sessions on Saturday. They will take place from 9:30 to 11:30 am and from 11:30 am to 1:30 pm in Canaan House on the Fairfield Hills campus. And be sure to fill out the survey form that appears in The Bee this week on your preferences for the 189 campus. Invest two hours of your time now in the decades to come at Fairfield Hills.

## EDITORIAL INK DROPS

### The Tax Benefits Of Economic Development, Real And Imagined

Of all the daunting tasks faced by the Fairfield Hills Master Plan Advisory Committee, the trickiest has to do with economic development. Not whether there should be some at Fairfield Hills — most realistic visions for the future of the 189-acre campus include a mix of uses, including commercial uses. The real task will be to reconcile with reality the widespread public perception that economic development, particularly at Fairfield Hills, will offer some meaningful tax relief to Newtowners for generations to come.

Let us ignore reality for a moment as we try to understand the issue. Imagine that the town hits the economic development equivalent of a grand slam home run next year and attracts to Fairfield Hills commercial enterprises equivalent to Newtown's top ten taxpayers — Connecticut Light & Power, Sand Hill Plaza, The Homesteads of Newtown, Sorvall Products, Harvey Hubbell, Inc, Taunton Press, Curtis Packaging, Rand-Whitney, Barnabas Realty Group, and the Newtown Shopping Center. That would be quite a bonanza for the taxpayers for years to come, right?

Well, not exactly. The tax revenue that would accrue to the town as a result of this fantasy would be less than two mills. That is less than the tax rate increase to be paid by Newtowners for the 2002-2003 budget, which barely passed in a second vote after an initial referendum defeat. While the tax revenue to be paid by all these new businesses would come to the town year after year, annual inflation in so-called "fixed" costs in the town and school budgets, along with capital projects addressing future needs, will always ensure more tax rate increases on top of the established tax base of the preceding year. So the relief from tax rate increases would show up for one year and disappear the next — unless, of course, another fantasy grand slam comes along every year. And while we are imagining things, imagine what the town would look like if we added \$160 million worth of commercial development every year to wipe out our two mill tax increases.

Fortunately, the culprit driving the local tax rate ever higher — residential development — will not be a part of the Fairfield Hills Master Plan. That is the best news the master plan advisory committee can offer the town about Fairfield Hills and tax relief. In this summer's discussions about economic development at Fairfield Hills, we hope the advisory committee will take pains to differentiate, for itself and for the public, between the real and imagined tax benefits of commercial development on the campus.

The real benefits of economic development for Newtown will come in the form of jobs, the creation of new products and services needed here in town, and an infusion of creativity and enterprise that the best businesses bring to a town. With these benefits and a sense of proportion in mind, the town should find some place at Fairfield Hills for economic opportunity to hang its hat.

Master JOHNSON

# Stearns & Wheler, LLC

Environmental Engineers and Scientists

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Newtown Water and Sewer Authority

**From:** Sarah E. Cwikla, P.E.

**Date:** January 10, 2007

**Re:** Fairfield Hills Utilities

Stearns & Wheler retained New England Pipe Cleaning Company (NEPCCO) to further document the location and condition of the sanitary and storm sewer lines surrounding Bridgeport Hall by television inspection. Mr. Hurley asked us to focus in this area because it will be the first building on the campus that is put into use and the data would give us a snapshot look at the condition of the utilities on the campus.

NEPCCO began their investigation on January 4<sup>th</sup> and completed the work on January 8<sup>th</sup>. They will be providing us with a map of the system and video tapes of the television inspection, which I will forward to the WSA upon receipt. Based on verbal communication with NEPCCO, we have gathered the following information regarding the condition of the pipes around Bridgeport Hall:

### Sanitary Sewer


The pipes were half full of water, the joints are leaking, there are several areas of the pipe that are cracked and portions of the pipe are underwater. One can conclude that groundwater is infiltrating into the sanitary system and making its way to the wastewater treatment plant, consuming part of the capacity, causing the high peaking events, and possibly impacting treatment efficiency.

According to today's standards, sanitary sewer lines should have manholes every 300 feet and at all bends. In Fairfield Hills, there are sections where the pipe is slightly curved to make a turn but there is no structure. In other areas there are, what NEPCCO described as, brick boxes which act as drop manholes to change the elevation of the pipe but the structure is buried and therefore, there is no access from the street level for maintenance.

On the portion of the sanitary system that was inspected, NEPCCO did not find any connections, indicating that direct inflow from drainage systems or roof leaders does not appear to be a concern in this section.

### Storm Sewer

The majority of the storm sewer pipe is reinforced concrete and it is in good condition, with the exception of a few areas. NEPCCO was on site during a dry day and a rainy day. The pipes had a couple inches of water running on the dry day and they were flowing on the rainy day but not close to capacity. There is a 36-inch pipe that runs on the west side of Bridgeport Hall which had approximately



10 inches of water during the rain storm. This indicates that the existing system has capacity for a large storm event.

Joe, from NEPCCO, had a difficult time tracking the storm system and stated, "so many things didn't make sense and there were times when we had no idea where we were going". There are lengths of pipe over 800 feet long that have no structures and the pipe makes gentle curves to move around the buildings. They found many connections on the 36-inch line that are not shown on the utility maps. There were also many underground structures and pipes that dropped straight down and they found a "wall of brick" in one area.

### Conclusions

The sanitary sewer line around Bridgeport Hall, and possibly throughout the campus, should not be used in its current condition. We can review pipe bursting options however, this is usually recommended when road repair and traffic control costs outweigh the benefits of installing a new system and where existing slopes are adequate. Considering that all the roads will be repaved on this project, installing a new PVC sanitary system may be the better option.

The storm system will need lining or repair in a few sections but the majority of the pipe can be maintained. We recommend dye and smoke testing to better locate the system and the connections.



**The education committee goals**

- Review education allotment in current master plan
- Listen to what the BOE says they need in the 2020-2050 timeframe.
  - Investigate alternates to a FFH solution
- Determine if FFH is a reasonable solution and if so, how

**Process**

- Attend the BOE coffee on Tues, 10/26 at 7PM (Middle School) to hear the conversation the board members have with the public
- Prepare a set of questions re: potential needs for banking land on Fairfield Hills property
  - Forward questions to the full BOE membership by Thursday Nov 4.
- Attend the BOE Facilities Subcommittee meeting on Thurs, Nov 11, to engage in conversation, re: questions

**Expected Deliverables**

- Summary of the expected facility needs of the BOE from 2020-2050, as articulated by the BOE.
  - Includes expected amount of space, both for buildings and surrounding property
  - Describes potential options both within FFH and more broadly in the Newtown community.
- Shooting for read out at full committee meeting on Tuesday, Nov 23.

**Next Steps**

- Finish phrasing questions for the BOE
- Attend identified meetings
- Prepare document that conveys information gathered

**Proposed Processes**

- Public Hearings – held on selected nights of full FFHMPR Committee meetings
  - Publicize via The Bee/Newtown Patch – public notice to encourage people to come to our committee meeting and offer their thoughts/suggestions on what should be done with FFH
- Qualitative Discussion Groups
  - Structured focus group discussion(s) with the general public and/or town organizations (i.e., Lions Club, Rotary Club, Newtown Youth & Family Services, Newtown Senior Center, etc.)
    - Structured to explore detailed thoughts and visions regarding different aspects of potential FFH uses
      - e.g., desires for residential development (apartments, incentive housing, subdivision, residential-over-retail), for commercial development (goal or purpose of commercial development, what would it look like – corporate, small biz, retail, restaurant, main street/town center, etc.), recreation (trails, rec center, senior center, sports fields, passive, band shell, etc.), municipal needs (fire, police, emergency svcs, etc.), land banking for future use (schools, tbd, etc.)
  - Online sites such as Facebook, NewtownPatch, etc. can be used to educate the public and spur an organized and moderated discussion of related topics as appropriate
    - Structured to explore specific question on a weekly basis (or more), borrowing specific question topics from qualitative line of questioning.
    - Can be used to allow a moderated, free-flowing community discussion
  - World Café discussion session(s) – a facilitation method that promotes collective ideation and opinion through iterative group conversations
- Quantitative Survey – likely a combination of online and paper survey methodologies. Recruitment via publicity campaigns utilizing local news websites, public library, other town organizations.
  - Can integrate any key learning already available from the FFHMRC, but not wait for all subcommittees to complete their work
- *Next step prior to committing to quant survey is to determine budget requirements, and assess availability of funds... estimated at \$5,000*

**PLAN B – A REVISED APPROACH**

**Hypothetical Timing for Community Feedback – PLAN B:**

	<u>Week of:</u>	
• Public Hearing 1	11/12	<i>During FFHMPR Cmte. meeting</i>
• World Café Session 1	11/15	
• Focus Group Discussions 1 (4:00 & 7:00)	12/6	
• Public Hearing 2	11/23	<i>During FFHMPR Cmte. meeting</i>
• World Café Session 2	1/10	
• Focus Group Discussions 2 (4:00 & 7:00)	1/24	
• Public Hearing 3	Jan 2011	<i>During FFHMPR Cmte. meeting</i>
• Quantitative, town-wide survey	11/29-2/1	
• Public presentation of community opinion results from qualitative and quantitative research efforts	2/8	

### The role of demographics for our committee

- We need metrics for ensuring that our survey(s) and other forms of public input appropriately represent the town (i.e., respondent data will be weighted to reflect the real-world demographics of our community)
  - Assumptions behind survey:
    - The survey will be town-wide
    - The survey is intended to reflect views of the citizenry within today's current social and economic climate.
- We also need an estimate of the overall, long-term population of the town. Such information provides a context for vetting alternatives when the subcommittee talk with resources. For example, it provides grounding to better understand the needs for fields, schools, emergency services, etc., to enhance strategy, long-term planning for the use of the Fairfield Hills property.
- Sources
  - US Census, both 2000 and 3-Year estimates [2006-2008], see: <http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?lang=en>
  - Reconcile with US Census 2010 when available (expected February, 2011 - as noted on above landing page).
  - Connecticut Economic Resource Center (CERC) Town Profile, see: <http://www.cerc.com/TownProfiles/Custom-Images/newtown2010.pdf>

### Metrics for ensuring reasonable representation of community

- Age [*We should, if possible, add information about the distributions to this and the following metrics*]
- Gender
- Employment
- Ethnicity
- Marital status
- household income
- households with children under 18 at home
- households with children in the Newtown Public Schools
- People who voted in the last budget referendum

### Working assumptions re: overall, long-term town population for better strategic planning

- **Our Position:** To better understand the long-term strategic uses for the Fairfield Hills property, we believe that an estimate of population based on the build-out of the town, as modeled in the Planimetrics document, tempered with more recent information from other population sources (see above), provide a reasonable set of assumptions for us to proceed with<sup>1</sup>.
  - Our POV regarding the two population projections: The two highly different views provided in the documents strongly suggest that the underlying models are extremely sensitive to recent historic trends. The first, the "Population Projections for 2000-2030" document essentially views the future through the lens of the tail end of a time period rife with housing speculation. The "School Enrollment Dynamics & Projections 2010-2019" document extends the economic realities seen during an unprecedented recession through to 2020. Both population studies show example routes to eventual build-out. In our opinions, an estimate of the final population at build-out, not the actual route to build-out, is pertinent to the work of the committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that this coarser level of granularity removes reliance on highly random variables seen in the nearer-term population studies. Such variables can and do change dramatically over time. Trying to account for them long-term is beyond the scope of the FFH Master Plan Review Committee's objective and would not add any new insight for our purposes, in our opinions.