



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

**TESTIMONY SUBMITTED TO THE
PLANNING and DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MARCH 17, 2010**

**W. David LeVasseur, Undersecretary
Office of Policy and Management (OPM)**

**Concerning Proposed Substitute Bill No. 199 (LCO No. 1991)
AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

Senator Coleman, Representative Sharkey and distinguished members of the Planning and Development Committee, I thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony concerning Proposed Substitute Bill 199, the intent of which is to support increased consistency amongst state, regional, and local plans of conservation and development.

Section 1 of the proposed bill seeks to implement a "cross acceptance" process which would be utilized during the drafting of the next State Plan. This process would provide municipalities and Regional Planning Organizations with an enhanced role in working with OPM to identify areas of agreement and disagreement between those plans and the proposed State Plan. The proposed language would further clarify the role of municipalities and Regional Planning Organizations and would expand the current adoption process to provide an opportunity to achieve and document concurrence with the plan at the various levels of government. Generally, OPM is supportive of this concept and concurs with the language in this section of the bill.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the bill further extend the various deadlines associated with the adoption of the State Plan of Conservation and Development for an additional year, beyond those recently adopted in Public Act 09-230, to allow OPM time to develop a process for "cross-acceptance." OPM agrees that this additional time is clearly needed to develop and implement a new process for the adoption of the State Plan.

Section 5 of the bill would provide municipalities a temporary reprieve from the mandate that requires their plans of conservation and development to be updated at least once every ten years. OPM supports this temporary mandate relief; however, the committee should be aware that without updated municipal plans of conservation and development, the overall quality of any State plan may be compromised. This may become particularly apparent when attempting to identify discrepancies between the proposed State Plan and a municipal plan which may be more than ten years old.

Thank you for the opportunity to share the thoughts that OPM has on Substitute Bill No. 199. As always, my staff and I are available meet with you to discuss any questions you may have regarding the State Plan.