




**CITY OF STAMFORD**  
**OFFICE OF OPERATIONS**  
888 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD  
P.O. BOX 10152  
STAMFORD, CT 06904 - 2152

TO: Board of Finance  
Board of Representatives Fiscal Committee

FROM: Ben Barnes, Director of Operations 

DATE: March 19, 2009

RE: **Budget Presentation for the Office of Operations**

---

Please accept this package in response to the questions posed by your board to City operating departments. It includes, for each component of the Office of Operations, a review of the budget request, information on performance measurement and improvement, budget management and costs analysis and spending priorities, as requested.

During my brief tenure in the Office of Operations, I have sought to reduce costs while preserving or improving public service levels. I welcome the opportunity to do that again through this budget cycle. My approach to this problem has been to look across the entire \$41 million Operations operating budget to identify those areas where significant savings can be accomplished, while challenging all areas of the department to look for savings without reducing the level of service, or even while improving services. This has meant that certain areas have seen dramatic savings, while others have not, based on the nature of their cost structure, their objectives, and the work they do.

If the Office of Operations sustains another significant cut, I would accommodate cuts using this same approach. Information about the impact of the funding scenarios requested by the Board on the entire Office of Operations are provided at the end of this report.

The Mayor's requested budget for FY 09/10 is \$41,017,200, a decrease of almost 1% from the prior year. Four years of Operations budgets are shown below:

	FY 06/07 Actual	FY 07/08 Actual	FY08/09 Budget	FY 09/10 Mayor's Request
Operations	\$ 39,824,394	\$ 40,014,773	\$ 41,391,873	\$ 41,017,200
% change from prior year		0.48%	3.44%	-0.91%

The staff of the Office of Operations is its lifeblood. The Office employs 43 managers at an average, salary cost of \$97,930 and 194 line staff at an average cost of \$52,220 (general fund only.) Benefits add approximately \$20,000 per employee on top of salary costs.

I have always sought to preserve our valued employees as I found ways to reduce the cost of government, because these employees are required to perform each and every service we provide. Moreover, 12 positions have already been left vacant and unfunded in Operations over the course of FY08-09 in order to meet the further budget reductions since the adoption of last years budget. These positions, listed below, will remain unfilled under the Mayor's budget proposal.

4	Heavy Equip Operator	Traffic & Road Maintenance
1	Mt II-Mason/Team	Traffic & Road Maintenance
1	Operations Foreman	Traffic & Road Maintenance
1	Equip Mechanic/UAW	Vehicle Maintenance
1	Equipment Mechanic	Vehicle Maintenance
1	Maintenance Worker	Building Maintenance
1	Tree Climber	Building Maintenance
1	Laborer	Transfer Station
1	Collection Driver	Collections
	<b>Total Vacant Positions,</b>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Unfunded</b>	

Obviously, given the labor-intensive nature of so many Operations functions, significant budget cuts will result in staff reductions beyond these attrition reductions identified above to reach the percentage reductions posed by the boards. Because so many individuals are involved in the provision of multiple services, it may not always be possible to identify specific services to be eliminated. Rather, in many cases, reduced staff will result in longer delays for services, less frequent or deferred maintenance which increases risk and costs at later dates, or reduced productivity in general. For further discussion, please see the "Funding Scenarios" section at the end of this submittal.

## Section 6: Funding Scenarios

In response to the funding scenarios identified, the listing below shows \$877,000 in service reductions within the Office of Operations. Additional cuts required to make the funding scenarios are also identified, with estimated counts of managers and line staff that would need to be laid off to reach the target.

### Mayor's Request

\$ 41,017,200

### 3% option

\$ 1,230,516

18,000	Eliminate Carwin Park Staff and events
40,000	Eliminate Barrett Park Playground Program
50,000	Eliminate Parks Ambassadors, including Tram
25,000	Reduce Parks Maintenance Seasonals by 20%
30,000	Reduce Government Center Security
20,000	Reduce Government Center Maintenance
28,000	Eliminate vacation camps
20,000	Two week closure of ice rink
150,000	Eliminate Holiday solid waste pick-ups
100,000	Increase Recycling diversion by 20%
10,000	Eliminate non-personal expenditures in Land Use Bureau
146,000	Eliminate City Support for all special events
65,000	Eliminate contract for sale of beach permits at beaches
75,000	Eliminate snow contractors
	Replace pro-park in downtown garages with a full time garage
100,000	manager and seasonal staff

\$ 877,000 Total service cuts

\$ 353,516 Staff Reduction: 1 manager and 3 line staff

### 6% option

\$ 2,461,032

877,000 Total service cuts

\$ 1,584,032 Staff Reduction: 6 managers and 12 line staff

### 10% option

\$ 4,101,720

877,000 Total service cuts

\$ 3,224,720 Staff Reduction: 10 managers and 28 line staff

Staff reductions will ultimately need to be allocated across the department, and will impact services.

The option of fee increases has been considered as well. Several hundred thousand dollars could be raised through implementation of fee increases, particularly in the areas of parking rates and hours, and fees for land use approvals and reviews. Additionally, the City could pursue new user fees, such as a Pay as You Throw system for garbage collection and disposal, or new laws that would generate revenue for the city, such as flow control. However, I recognize that fee increases are always difficult to accomplish, and are particularly difficult to defend in the current economic environment.

BB/ma

## Appendix

### **Budget Comparison between the City of Stamford Land Use Bureau and Adjacent Municipalities:**

<b>Municipal Land Use Department Budget Comparisons</b>			
<b>Town</b>	<b>Population*</b>	<b>Total Department Budget 2008-09</b>	<b>Budget per Capita</b>
<b>Fairfield</b>	57,548	1,754,068	30.48
<b>Greenwich</b>	61,871	2,025,279	32.73
<b>Westport</b>	26,508	1,035,455	39.06
<b>New Canaan</b>	19,890	401,342	20.18
<b>Stamford</b>	118,475	1,779,706	15.02
<b>Norwalk</b>	83,456	1,053,448	12.62

\* Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007 Population Estimates

## **Performance Measurement and Improvements**

### **Metrics**

After years of planning and engineering, the restoration of the **Mill River**, including dam and wall removal by the Army Corps of Engineers, will finally begin. To reach this milestone DEP and local permits were obtained, federal funding secured and successful bidding within budget occurred.

Over 1200 housing units are under construction including 185 on-site affordable units (Stamford leads the State in both categories).

The 400,000 s.f. Royal Bank of Scotland headquarters is nearing completion. It will be the first large commercial building in Connecticut to obtain LEED Gold Certification.

The Village District zoning regulations for the Springdale neighborhood commercial center were approved (similar regulations for Glenbrook are pending).

Construction is underway at the Harbor Point and Yale-Towne with development totaling 340,000 s.f. of commercial space and 336 housing units. This development will transform the South End. (This development along with Metro Green and RBS are prime examples of Transit Oriented Development on former brownfields sites).

After years of student activism, by Murphy School 3<sup>rd</sup> graders who then graduated to West Hill High, Murphy School has its new playground and green space.

Park improvements were highlighted on the West Side with a completed revitalized Carwin Park and Hatch Field (under construction).

EPB management of FEMA's Floodplain Community Rating System Program has resulted in 15% reduction (the highest in the State) for flood insurance premiums totaling \$239,000 savings for the policy holders.

### **Performance Benchmarks**

In large part our effectiveness and accomplishments are measured by our service to the four land use boards, while meeting the goals and objectives of the Master Plan and mandates required by the Charter and ordinances. In one sense, the number of applications reviewed measures productivity. The budget sheets provide specific benchmarks for processing by both the staff and the boards.

However, what is more difficult to measure than the simple number of application/permit reviews is the complexity of projects, which can vary greatly. For the past two years, the Boards and staff have reviewed projects noteworthy in both scale complexity. The planning/permitting and development of the South End (Harbor Point and Yale-Towne) are unprecedented in complexity and scale. These reviews of both the private developments and public realm (parks, streets and sidewalk amenities) will continue into the next fiscal year. It should be further noted that all of these projects require both by state, local and in some cases federal law, multiple board reviews adding to the complexity and staff time required. In addition, now that development is underway, there are added demands on staff to monitor the projects in order to insure that the conditions of approval are met by the developer (which has already been a significant challenge).

### **Programs designed to increase revenues and meet changing demands**

Last year we proposed a graduated zoning fee schedule based on the size of both commercial and residential projects. The fee schedule was adopted by the Board of Representatives and will allow us to better define this benchmark as well as add additional revenues. To-date, since the new fee schedule went into effect, revenues have increased by 31% as compared to those under the old fee schedule.

One of our busiest areas relates to zoning permitting and enforcement. Although the number of zoning permits processed was down compared to last year, we increased the number of zoning complaints resolved by one-third. This is an example of management utilizing flexibility to meet changing demands on staff. And despite the loss of a zoning inspector two years ago, we were able to answer an increased number of information requests from the public compared to last year.

Service outputs for the current year are somewhat lower than in the previous year for some but not all categories. For example, while Planning Board and Zoning Board applications are down, large complex projects, as noted previously, continue to occupy considerable staff and board time. In addition, the two boards completed action on a comprehensive up-date of regulations for the Springdale neighborhood center (action for Glenbrook is pending). The unanimous approval by both boards was the result of several years of continuous interaction with the Springdale Neighborhood Association. Starting later this year and continuing into 2010, we will be going through the same intensive community interaction with the Downtown and West Side neighborhoods.

It should be noted that between mid-October and mid-February of each fiscal year that the Planning Board and staff are heavily engaged in the review of capital budget requests and in the preparation of the Planning Board's

recommended capital budget and plan. These deliberations are consistent from year to year.

With the elimination of a Land Use Inspector position two years ago, we were forced to reduce our involvement in the joint Housing/Zoning Enforcement Task Force. However, this past year's decline in permit applications has enabled us to increase our role in that important endeavor.

### **Comparison with other municipalities**

The attached table in the appendix provides a comparison of land use expenditures by municipalities within Fairfield County. Of these municipalities, only Norwalk spends less per-capita than Stamford and none of these communities share Stamford's complexity and magnitude of development.

### **Programs added or eliminated/operational improvements**

As noted in prior reports, over the years the Land Use Bureau has been asked to assume additional responsibilities without the addition of staff resources. Past and continuing examples include park planning and implementation, with improvements and community based stewardship highlighted in Mianus River Park, Scalzi Park, Cove Island, Hatch Field, Carwin Park and of course Mill River Park. This year, staff has taken on added responsibilities in the area of sustainability/energy efficiency. We staff the Sustainable Stamford Task Force, have successfully applied for grants and work closely with other Operations staff in developing energy saving and improved recycling programs.

Operational improvements include increased use of GIS capabilities for project analysis and presentation services. In development is a program to display the quarterly capital budget reports graphically, on a project-by-project basis, which will provide a geographic context for capital budget planning and monitoring. We plan to demonstrate this to you at your earliest convenience. After a few initial problems, the utilization of the Citizen Services System has greatly helped to streamline the complaint resolution service. The Land Use Bureau continues to utilize volunteer interns with on-going projects to implement a bicycle use survey, and provide research for an amendment to the Master Plan on sustainability.

In the future we hope to prepare a "citizen-centric" annual report as recommended by the Association of Government Accountants to better inform the citizens as to our performance results, priorities and future challenges.

### **Budget Management**

The Land Use Bureau serves four (4) land use boards—Planning Board, Zoning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals and Environmental Protection Board. Historically, our workload is dependent on applications filed before these boards.

Over the years, as a result of amendments to the Charter, new city ordinances, State mandates and changing administration priorities, new duties have been assigned to the Land Use Bureau. These include zoning permitting and enforcement, transportation planning, park planning, participation in the housing/zoning enforcement task force and sustainability/energy efficiency. Land Use staff is also involved in the implementation of specific capital projects, particularly in the areas of parks and open space.

For the purposes of the budget, the Land Use Bureau is divided into six (6) cost centers: Administration, Planning, Zoning, Zoning Board of Appeals, Environmental Protection and Technology. The overall budget objective of the Land Use Bureau is to stay within our approved budget, keep cost increases to a minimum and enhance city revenues where possible. As you are aware, this Bureau has almost never come before you requesting a supplemental appropriation for operating expenses.

In order to meet our budget goals while providing the expanding services, we strive to do more with our limited staff resources. Over the past ten years our staff has been reduced by three (3) positions, while our work load and responsibilities have increased (see above). This has been achieved, due to the quality of our staff, the sharing of staff (e.g. one secretary serves both the zoning division and EPB) and the utilization of technology.

Total cost reductions made in 2008/09 total \$44,426. The bulk of these reductions were in salary accounts, the result of a vacancy for part of the year of a part-time zoning position, and family medical leave for the GIS Technician. In addition attendance at conferences/training was severely curtailed, also resulting in a reduction.

### **Cost Management Actions**

Last year we successfully reduced overtime costs to under \$2,000. This was achieved by adjustments of several job categories, which allowed us to greatly reduce overtime while increasing productivity and our ability to better serve the Land Use Boards.

In 2009/10, we have made one significant cost reduction by eliminating contract services. We expect that the monies spent in this fiscal year, 2008/09 will allow the City to develop a more efficient recycling program while reducing haul away costs. Process improvements to be implemented in 2009/10 include more efficient use electronic databases and the Citizen Services System.

In 2008/09 we proposed and the Board of Representatives adopted a new fee schedule for Zoning Board amendment and site plan reviews. This not only better equates these fees to the staff time involved but increases City revenues. This year we will send to the Board of Representatives additional fee modifications—revision to excavation fees (which date from 1951), the addition of

fees for the preparation of zoning compliance reports and revisions to coastal site plan review fees. Once adopted, these fees will result in increased revenues to Stamford.

### **Cost Analysis and Spending Priorities**

#### **Priorities—Mandated functions**

As noted previously, provisions in the Charter, ordinances, and State statutes mandate most of functions of the Land Use Bureau. Others, while not mandated, are directly related to securing funds and resources from outside sources such as the state, federal government and community groups.

All four Land Use Boards and their responsibilities are mandated and could not be eliminated without changes in the Charter and State statutes. The charter also mandates the responsibility for zoning permitting and enforcement within the Land Use Bureau. Last year, the State DEP promulgated regulations requiring that zoning boards prepared and adopt aquifer protection regulations and that zoning staff enforce these regulations. This is an example of an “unfunded State mandate” but one that will add to the staff workload.

Activities in the area of sustainability/energy efficiency have recently joined the mandated list, in this case, due to new Federal Government policies. Up until now this program has served to coordinate sustainability and energy efficiencies policies, obtain state grants and draft ordinances to support these citywide initiatives (e.g. LEED silver certification for municipal building projects). Recently, the Federal Government has not only initiated funding for these programs but is requiring recipients of such funding to develop Energy Management Plans. Since the Land Use staff was involved in the initial preparation of a “Local Action Plan” to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we will continue to work and support this now mandated activity.

Most of the Bureau’s funding and staff resources are directly related to the above mandated functions.

#### **Non-mandated functions**

There are three areas, while not specifically mandated, are important functions of our Bureau.

Some fifteen years ago, among the Charter amendments that were adopted was the elimination of the Parks Department, which led to the parceling out of various park functions to Bureaus within Operations. Land Use was assigned the responsibility of park planning, starting with the Parks Master Plan and subsequently with planning and design for specific park projects. In addition staff has been instrumental in obtaining state grants and developing “friends of parks”

groups, who augment limited city park crews in maintenance and programming. Examples range from the Mill River Park Collaborative to Take Back Carwin Park, Cove Island Wildlife Sanctuary Stewardship Committee and Friends of Mianus Park. Providing staff support to these groups is a cost effective means to maintaining and improving our parks.

The second area relates to neighborhood planning/zoning initiatives as follow up to the 2002 Master Plan. These follow up initiatives started with Springdale and Glenbrook. After a lengthy and continuing dialogue with the two neighborhood associations, master plan and zoning amendments for Springdale were approved and hearings scheduled for Glenbrook later this spring. Slated to begin later this year and continuing into next are similar initiatives for the West Side and Downtown. While these planning/zoning projects could be delayed, there are pressures—Stamford Health Systems/Housing Authority initiatives impacting the West Side, and the DSSD jointly with the URC moving ahead in the Downtown—to involve both staff and the boards sooner rather than later.

The third area relates to the 2010 Census. I don't need to stress the importance of a complete count of Stamford residents as it will impact funding, representation, reapportionment and demographic information for the next decade. Since the 1980 Census, our staff has led the City's outreach effort to help the Census Bureau achieve the complete count. In prior Census, 1990 & 2000, approximately \$50,000 was appropriated to fund outreach workers, information centers and promotional materials. Unfortunately, the proposed budget for Census outreach has been eliminated. Existing staff would be utilized to help with the Census effort, although on a reduced level. Note that this effort usually lasts for a period of six months every ten years.

### **Cost drivers**

Personnel costs are the most significant cost drivers. Other costs are incidental to personnel costs. As previously mentioned overtime costs have been controlled and greatly reduced.

Given the small size of the staff of the Land Use Bureau and the multiple boards we service, most of our existing staff are involved in multiple tasks. Therefore, the elimination of one "non-mandated" function—say Census outreach—will not result in the elimination of a staff position because no one person is assigned solely to that function. Many years ago we had a statistical planner position, which worked primarily on census analysis and outreach. That position was eliminated years ago and the Bureau Chief, among my many other responsibilities, has coordinated Census outreach in 1990 and 2000. It has been a long time since we had the resources to designate employees solely in these non-mandated areas.

In order to respond to your question as to how priorities would impact spending, my response is that we could reduce staff costs by moving some positions to part-time, which would allow our core functions to continue but at reduced levels of service and reduced effort in the non-mandated areas.

## Performance Measurement and Improvement

**Performance benchmarks**, and comparison with other programs, are difficult when evaluating the EPB program due to the unique circumstances pertaining to organization and responsibilities. The EPB was established by ordinance as a multi-purpose agency combining mandated functions that are undertaken by separate agencies/departments in other municipalities. In addition, through regulations (Planning, Zoning, and Zoning Board of Appeals), ordinance(s), and Charter revision, the role and responsibilities of the EPB have been broadened to become integral components of the function of other land-use agencies.

It is interesting to note that in depth discussions have taken place between the director and representatives of other municipalities, including most recently the towns of Greenwich and Fairfield, that are considering some manner of an integrated (similar) approach to land use.

Even comparison of what could be perceived as a common activity – number of applications for permits pursuant to Inland Wetland and Watercourses regulations – is difficult due to differences in the definition of what constitutes regulated areas within which projects require a permit. In Greenwich, for example, a permit is required if a property contains wetland areas even if the proposed activities are not within or proximate to these wetlands thus increasing the number of permits required; an “Agent Approval” provision further clouds comparison.

The above observations notwithstanding, however, the EPB is mindful of the need to be accountable for performance. In lieu of benchmarks cited by the Board and Finance that are not easily applied, EPB staff both keep daily work logs, and maintain detailed written records of all activities, providing a means of documenting work completed, type of activities undertaken, interactions with the public and others, and timeframes for task completion. In addition, intradepartmental comparisons may be made from year-to-year. This comparison is reported, in part, in the “Department Summary – Activity/Service Output/Service Quality” section of the budget package for the department.

It is interesting, and perhaps encouraging, to note that EPB applications for permit for the current year-to-date total 13 more than the comparable period for the prior year and revenue is on target.\*

$(56 (2008) + 5 (March 2009) = 61 \text{ compared with } 43 (2007) + 5 (March 2008) = 48).$

**\*The “annual Compliance Fee provides a revenue cushion since these annual fee payments, equal to the original application fee, are made on the anniversary date for approved but not completed projects.**

**Operational improvements** implemented during 2008 and ongoing through 2009 include increased use of electronic capabilities for project analysis such as receiving maps and technical information from consultants as data files (ArcView/ArcMAP) rather than paper copies, greater use of e-mail for communications, record keeping through creation and maintenance of electronic databases (Microsoft Access), and

use of computerized mapping and graphics programs for presentation purposes; coordination of inspections with Engineering Bureau staff; direct access to the Citizen Services System (QAlert) and City web publications (QScend); and use of interns and volunteers for special projects.

#### Cost Analysis and Spending Priorities

The EPB budget is both modest and uncomplicated. The **spending priority/cost driver** is the salary account. Other costs are incidental to the primary need to provide staff services in response to mandated and other service responsibilities.

It is asserted that no mandated function can be responsibly or legally abandoned, although adherence to proscribed timeframes might be extended where penalties for exact conformance are ambiguous. The use of staff resources may be re-prioritized based upon circumstances at any given time. For example, an increase in reported violations would become a higher priority for deployment of staff than would a timely response to a land-use referral for advisory comments, or completion of Minutes of meetings.

Spending priorities/cost drivers are driven by specific mandated responsibilities. Each mandated responsibility is subject to re-prioritization based upon circumstances, and may be neither entirely predictable nor controllable. These mandated responsibilities are summarized as follows:

#### MANDATED REGULATORY SERVICES

Mandated Regulatory Services are governed by legally required time tables for decision and other administrative tasks such as the publication of legal notices, notification of parties, record keeping, and other tasks. The failure to adhere to these administrative requirements would invalidate any action and subject the City to potential legal actions/court appeals.

#### **Inland Wetland and Watercourses Agency**

Inland Wetland and Watercourses Permits  
Enforcement/Administration of Regulations, Project Monitoring, State Reporting; Recording and publication of Minutes; Publication of Legal Notices

The Environmental Protection Board (EPB) was established by Ordinance No. 286 Supplemental, effective June 30, 1974, and codified Chapter 6 Article V et seq. of the Stamford Code. The EPB is authorized therein to exercise the powers and perform the duties of a municipal Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency pursuant to Chapter 440 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Sec. 22a-36 et seq; Chapter 126 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 8-26 et seq; and Chapter 124 of the Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-7 et seq. as may be amended from time to time.

## Considerations

When there is no local Inland Wetland and Watercourses Agency, applications for permits must be made to the Commissioner of Environmental Protection. The municipality is obligated to reimburse the DEP for all costs of application review and processing. State permitting is lengthy (three-plus times local permitting review and decision), provides reduced opportunity for public participation and input (limited public notice requirements; no public participation absent a formal public hearing allowed); limited jurisdiction (upland review areas not recognized); little to no project monitoring and enforcement (staff and distance limitations).

### **Inland Wetland and Watercourses Agency/Flood and Erosion Control Board**

Flood Hazard Permits

Enforcement of Regulations; Project Monitoring; Federal/State Record Keeping

The Environmental Protection Board (EPB) was established by Ordinance No. 286 Supplemental, effective June 30, 1974, and codified Chapter 6 Article V et seq. of the Stamford Code. The EPB is authorized therein to exercise the powers and perform the duties of: a municipal Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency pursuant to Chapter 440 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Sec. 22a-36 et seq as may be amended from time to time; and a municipal Flood and Erosion Control Board pursuant to Chapter 25 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Sec. 24-84 et seq. as may be amended from time to time. Also pertinent are Title 44 Section 60.3 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and Section 7.1 of the Stamford Zoning Regulations.

## Considerations

When a municipality fails to comply with the Federal regulatory, record keeping, and reporting requirements pertaining to properties within the designated Special Flood Hazard Boundary (100-year floodplain), the municipality is not eligible for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program. Suspension from the NFIP results in the owners of properties and businesses within the Special Flood Hazard Boundary being unable to purchase flood insurance thus preventing the obtaining of financing/mortgages and loans (if FDIC insured); ineligibility of the municipality to receive Federal grants for projects within the Special Flood Hazard Boundary; and ineligibility of the municipality for Federal disaster relief for flood damages. Program implementation and conformance is audited by the State DEP and FEMA at intervals no greater than three years.

### **MANDATED ADVISORY SERVICES**

Mandated Advisory Services are governed by legally required time tables for decision

and other administrative tasks, but the failure to adhere would not always result in the invalidation of any action. Failure may result in a legal appeal.

### **Conservation Commission**

- Review of Subdivision Applications
- Inventory and inspection of Open Space/Conservation Areas

The Environmental Protection Board (EPB) was established by Ordinance No. 286 Supplemental, effective June 30, 1974, and codified Chapter 6 Article V et seq. of the Stamford Code. The EPB is authorized therein to exercise the powers and perform the duties of: a municipal Conservation Commission pursuant to Chapter 97 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Sec. 17-131(a) et seq.; and Chapter 126 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 8-26 et seq. as may be amended from time to time. Also pertinent are Sections 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2 of the Stamford Subdivision Regulations.

#### Considerations

When a property to be subdivided contains inland wetlands and/or watercourses, the Planning Board cannot complete action on the subdivision application until the Environmental Protection Board has issued a report or permit (Chapter 126 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 8-26 et seq. as may be amended from time to time). Similar requirements pertain to certain applications to the Zoning Board, and Zoning Board of Appeals.

### **Flood and Erosion Control Board**

- Excavation and Erosion Control Permits
- Review of Applications and Project Monitoring
- Eligibility for Federal Flood Control Projects/Grants
- EPB director is Stamford's designated Floodplain Management Administrator

Connecticut General Statutes The Environmental Protection Board (EPB) was established by Ordinance No. 286 Supplemental, effective June 30, 1974, and codified Chapter 6 Article V et seq. of the Stamford Code. The EPB is authorized therein to exercise the powers and perform the duties of: a municipal Flood and Erosion Control Board pursuant to Chapter 25 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Sec. 24-84 et seq as may be amended from time to time. Also pertinent are Title 44 Section 60.3 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and Section 15 of the Stamford Zoning Regulations.

#### Considerations

Federal and/or State sponsored flood control projects, including land acquisition, grants, and construction require the establishment of a local Flood and Erosion

Control Board.

#### ADVISORY SERVICES (Not Mandated)

Advisory Services are not legally required, and would of necessity be subject to reduction or elimination as the consequence of loss of staff resources.

#### **Coastal Management**

Review of Applications for Coastal Site Plan Approval and Project Monitoring  
EPB director is Stamford's designated liaison with the Connecticut Office of Long Island Sound Programs

Chapter 444 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 22a-101 et seq. as may be amended from time to time; and Section T of the Stamford Zoning Regulations.

#### Considerations

Any change in regulations affecting land use activities within the coastal boundary must be submitted to the Commissioner of Environmental Protection for a consistency determination. Elimination of Coastal Site Plan Review requirements would not be approved, and would be subject to the initiation of legal action by the State DEP. The City would be ineligible to receive coastal area permits (structures, dredging, other) or grants.

#### **Review of City capital projects for consistency with regulatory requirements and environmental standards.**

#### Considerations

EPB staff acts as in-house experts for environmental issues associated with City sponsored projects. Engineering, parks planning, and facilities departments are primary recipients. Alternatives include greater use of private consultants under contract to the sponsoring department.

#### **Community Rating System – Floodplain Management**

Participation and eligibility in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Community Rating System Program with record keeping, program implementation, and annual re-certification requirements.

#### Considerations

Participation results in 15 percent reduction in flood insurance premiums for policy holders.

Estimated aggregate savings for 2008 was \$239,000.00. This is an ongoing program

with annual review and biennial audits. The CRS program has significant record keeping and other requirements that are time consuming to fulfill. Re-certification enabling continued eligibility is an annual requirement for participating communities. Failure to obtain re-certification would result in the restoration of full premiums to policy holders.

#### OTHER SERVICES (Not Mandated)

- Accounting for, and maintaining of databases for the submittal of bonds and sureties required as condition(s) of land use approvals.
- Review of all proposed activities, and maintaining of records for building permit and zoning applications.
- Data collection and mapping of wetland and conservation areas using GIS capability and filed surveys and other sources.
- Local oversight and coordination of Federal Emergency Management Agency's implementation of new floodplain mapping affecting Stamford. Part of the Federal Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map – Map Modernization initiative.
- Coordination of ad hoc study group to establish criteria for submitted surveys and transition to new City datum.
- Public Information – Creation and publication of Fact Sheets on environmental topics.
- Creation and maintaining of content on the City web site.
- Participation in the Sustainable Stamford initiative.
- Advice to property owners and departments on tree-care as a Connecticut Certified Tree Warden
- Investigation and response to non-regulatory citizen service requests.
- Advisor to Mill River Collaborative, Cove Island Wildlife Area Committee, Mianus River Park Friends Group; Holly Pond Study Committee, and Rippowam/Mill River Watershed Study.