



**Start with Planning Outreach Summary
 March 20, 2018**

Over the course of the past six months, CCAPA initiated conversations with our members, peer organizations and political leaders to better understand the various perspectives that will likely take center stage during Connecticut’s upcoming elections. In lending our voice to this important statewide dialogue, CCAPA first used a traditional planning process and organized teams to research current practice in resiliency, economic development, transportation, conservation and housing. There is an extensive amount of work being done across Connecticut, including work by our own members. Rather than initiate new primary research, the work teams instead synthesized existing material and then developed insights on the current setting and potential next steps for Connecticut, all from a planner’s point of view. These insights were shared with the membership via email and in person at the SNEAPA chapter meeting in October, 2017 (see feedback and comments below). Final work products were developed earlier this year, taking the form of a presentation document for stakeholder conversations, policy papers for each of the focus areas and this special edition of the magazine. All told, CCAPA reached nearly 500 people through the process with all of the Start with Planning backup material now posted on our website at ccapa.org.

**SNEAPA Roundtable Exercise Comments
 October 27, 2017**

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Overall SNEAPA Comments</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be sure to re-prioritize. Ex – move up economy. • Build in a graphic to show the interrelatedness of topics (2) • Important to have a combined document – all related. • Add in equity • There is a revenue component across the board. • Work on predictability and efficiency – automatic approvals for certain (?) • There needs to be a statewide planning voice, coordinator between departments – implementation of interdisciplinary plans. • Add in Health (crime, longevity, etc) • Drive home the value and opportunity that comes from planning. • (Justify with) data before recommending implementation. |
| <p>Resiliency</p> | <p>Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regionalize Disaster and Mitigation Planning ▪ Prioritize Infrastructure Investment ▪ Include Habitat Protection and Regional Fisheries in Resiliency Planning ▪ Protect Tax Revenue by Promoting Expanded Private Investment out of Future Flood Risk Areas ▪ Buffer High Risk Areas with Green Spaces and Greenway Amenities <p>SNEAPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Missing – public finance question on how to deal w/resiliency. Integrate city/state/FEMA, other ▪ Change “habitat” to “resource” ▪ Disconnected with many organizations, needs to be a more cohesive |



| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| | <p>approach. For instance, there is no clearinghouse or database, although CIRCA made an effort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain a local focus on disaster/mitigation planning for local buy-in. ▪ Interdisciplinary – how to capture and convey importance to citizens at local level. Also explain beyond the town line – nature has no boundary. Also not only, shore flooding (there are other impacts statewide) |
| <p>Housing</p> | <p>Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Link planning activities with real data on housing conditions and future needs ▪ Connect state & local programs with federal fair housing requirements ▪ Enforce existing laws requiring planning and zoning for housing ▪ Begin assessing alternatives to 8-30g ▪ Promote investment in urban communities by reducing unequal property tax rates <p>SNEAPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More data is critical; statewide GIS for example on affordability ▪ Econometrics – data sets with address features. ▪ Does the economy drive housing, or the other way around? ▪ Zoning – important but start w/infrastructure and data. ▪ Regionalize the issue or “stealth” regionalize in order to leverage for local (action). ▪ A more effective 8-30g need to address the ‘one size fits all’ issue ▪ Support the core cities (amazon promotion model?) ▪ Other states seem to focus more funding and attention. ▪ Regional issues – including resources – who actually needs it ▪ Towns view all of this as punitive – can we incentivize and restructure from the state down to local level. Funding is not trickling down. ▪ Too cumbersome for smaller communities to reach % goals. ▪ #1 issue – ties to economy, quality of life, etc. ▪ People remain hung up on the past – need to update for future needs (1) housing; (2) options, better than advocacy; (3) stabilize process for planning. Can we promote regionalism. ▪ Don’t like the “fair share” idea – allow towns to plan bottom up rather than top down-might be ok if it was ‘research’ (?) rather than policy. ▪ Need to increase the benefits for certain types of housing (TIF?) ▪ Educate the commissioners ▪ Promote all types of housing, private and affordable ▪ (You can use) TIF – and like products to get the right type such as enterprise zone (might need to be created) ▪ Improve process across the spectrum ▪ CEDAS-best management practice (a good model) ▪ (More) administrative approvals and review boards. |



| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <p>Economy</p> | <p>Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align statewide priorities with custom place-based implementation, including core infrastructure (eg-broadband, Main St. etc). ▪ Focus on talent workforce attraction – Two pronged approach between workforce development and business engagement ▪ Support deeper and aggressive sector-based strategies by region as well as statewide. ▪ Deepen brand-attachment through local supply and economic development services. <p>SNEAPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eliminate sector strategy (how can we know/keep pace w/industry?) ▪ Focus on K-12 education and tech/trade (SE CT as example). ▪ School population shrinking ▪ Debt forgiveness for in-state tuition (college) ▪ Connecting to other markets – Amtrak vision to NY-Boston ▪ NYC expanding into region; economic region for supporting ▪ Reliance on taxes that creates battles b/w communities ▪ Branding the state/region as “sustainable CT” or similar ▪ #2 issue need to address tax/spend issues ▪ *need to relate to special places to attract people* |
| <p>Transportation</p> | <p>Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retrofit roadways for multi-modal transportation ▪ Embrace power of technology/data-sharing to integrate modes ▪ Proactively prepare for autonomous vehicles/transit/freight ▪ Harden transportation network against risks (storms, SLR, cyber security) <p>SNEAPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proactively seek new technologies/approaches to plan expensive methods. ▪ Be careful w/acronyms (eg-SLR) ▪ Parking/ policy reform needed ▪ Sell it, but realize that cars are a part of life and will remain. ▪ FRA – state guidance (needed) ▪ Stronger state planning department / leadership ▪ State mobilize with guidance (policy tree) ▪ DOT/OSTA (improve) permit process ▪ LEAN-training and process – RI example. ▪ Central office for all permit review, to shorten time frame |



| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Conservation</p> | <p>Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turn over conservation land database to single entity like CTECO and fund or incentivize universal participation in database maintenance; ▪ Vigilantly maintain funding for current preservation programs; ▪ Encourage multi-partner conservation projects that leverage local, state, and federal funding; ▪ Empower top-level coordination of conservation efforts to facilitate resource sharing and cooperative planning; ▪ Promote Connecticut’s successes in land conservation and agricultural viability as a value proposition to CT’s quality of life. <p>SNEAPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Read/consider State Water Plan, Open Space, Rural/Urban scale, Preservation of diversity (place uniqueness), maintenance of existing open space. ▪ Key concerns should also note invasive species. ▪ Regionalization of recreation facilities (opportunity). ▪ Database needed ▪ Entire topic plays into economy, agriculture, water quality, education and tax structure. |
| <p>Other SNEAPA Comments</p> | <p>Quality of Life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move Quality of Life to the top. • Add in funding for parks and recreation at local area level. • Address blight and household hazard mitigation. <p>Governance</p> <p>Equity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recidivism <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tie-in to other key efforts such as Sustainable CT, |