The January 10, 2024, Hybrid Regular Meeting of the Woodbridge Board of Selectmen was convened at 5:01 p.m. by First Selectman Mica Cardozo in the Town Hall Central Meeting Room.

Present: First Selectman Mica Cardozo, Steven Munno, Maria Madonick, Andrea Urbano, Sheila McCreven, and David Vogel (via WEBEX)

Present for staff: Administrative Officer/Director of Finance Anthony Genovese, Town Counsel Gerald Weiner (via WEBEX); Clerk, Alison Valsamis.

Full Meeting Available for View: https://www.youtube.com/live/ygiC8lj9Zhw?si=GsoPFPLH2CO4gdn

FIRST SELECTMAN’S REMARKS

CCW RFP RESPONSE UPDATE

Discussion can be viewed at 3:25 of the full meeting recording.

WOODBRIDGE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Vonda Tencza

Full report can be viewed at 5:18 of the full meeting recording.

CONSIDERATION OF CSG, LLC PROPOSAL

Vonda Tencza, Donna Coonan

Discussion begins at 9:07 of the full meeting recording.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The clerk reported that there was no correspondence received for public comment and that there was no one attending virtually that wished to provide public comment.

Cathy Wick, 181 Rimmon Road – Statement Attached
Amey Marrella, 184 Rimmon Road – Statement Attached

David Lober, 35 Wepawaug Road – Comment can be viewed at 1:09 of the full meeting recording.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/DIRECTOR OF FINANCE’S REPORT

Anthony Genovese

1. Monthly Report
2. Reported No Funding Requests
3. Fuel Award Update
4. Brush Grinding Bid –

The Board voted UNANIMOUSLY (Cardozo-Munno) to accept Bid #2024-04 for brush grinding and removal services as explained by Tony Genovese.

TOWN COUNSEL REPORT
Gerald Weiner

Mr. Weiner had nothing to report.

MINUTES

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Cardozo) to approve the minutes of December 27, 2023 and voted UNANIMOUSLY (Cardozo-Munno) to approve the minutes of January 8, 2024.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Board voted UNANIMOUSLY (Madonick-McCreven) to approve all items on the Consent Agenda.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY FIRST SELECTMAN

The Board voted UNANIMOUSLY (Cardozo-Madonick) to appoint Board of Selectmen member, Sieve Munno, to serve as Deputy First Selectman, pursuant to Town Charter Section 5-8.

APPOINTMENT OF TOWN OFFICIALS

The Board voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Madonick) to ratify and reappoint the following Town Officials to 2-year terms commencing January 1, 2024:

   a. Enforcement Officer- Kristine Sullivan
   b. Census Taker- Stephanie Ciargleglio
   c. Citation Hearing Officers: Robyn Berke and B. Patrick Madden
   d. Assistant Treasurer- Joseph (Dean) Celotto
   e. Tree Warden- Warren Conners
   f. Deputy Tree Warden – Adam Parsons

And to appoint Richard Blackwell as Treasurer.

The Board voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-McCreven) to ratify and reappoint the following Town Officials to four year terms commencing January 1, 2024:

   g. Tax Collector: Patricia Crisco
   h. Town Clerk- Stephanie Ciargleglio
   i. Deputy Town Clerk – Karen Berchem
   j. Assistant Town Clerk- Susan Castelot
   k. Assistant Town Clerk- Kim Rioux
BOARD AND COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Cardozo-Munno) to appoint Mica Cardozo, Sheila McCreven, and Andrea Urbano to serve on the BOS Personnel Subcommittee.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Cardozo-Urbano) to appoint David Vogel, Steve Munno, and Maria Madonick to serve on the BOS Ordinance Subcommittee.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Madonick) to appoint Lauren Francese to the Woodbridge Board of Education for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2025.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Cardozo) to appoint Robyn Stewart to the Agriculture Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2025.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Urbano) to appoint Rachel Holden to the Agriculture Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2025.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Madonick) to appoint Javier Aviles to the Board of Finance for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (McCreven-Cardozo) to appoint Beth Heller to the Board of Finance for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2025.

The Board of Selectmen VOTED (Munno-Cardozo) to appoint Kris Wuestefeld to the Board of Police Commissioners for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending December 31, 2027.

VOTE: Aye: Munno, Cardozo, Madonick, McCreven
Nay: Urbano, Vogel

Kris Wuestefeld is appointed to the Board of Police Commissioners for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Cardozo) to reappoint Bruce Schaefer and Joseph Palumbo to the Building Board of Appeals for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Madonick) to appoint Ben Carlson to the Conservation Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Urbano-Madonick) to appoint Rachel Guerra to the Conservation Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.
The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Cardozo) to appoint Brian Bodt to CUPOP for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Urbano-Vogel) to appoint David Conelius to CUPOP for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2025.

The Board of Selectmen VOTED (Munno-Cardozo) to appoint Erin Scanlon to the Human Services Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending December 31, 2027.

  VOTE:  Aye: Munno, Cardozo, Madonick, McCreven
         Nay: Urbano, Vogel

Erin Scanlon is appointed to the Human Services Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Cardozo-McCreven) to appoint Steven Munno to the Investment Committee for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2025.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Urbano-Munno) to appoint Diane Lenskold to the Recreation Commission for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.

The Board of Selectmen voted UNANIMOUSLY (Munno-Urbano) to appoint Cynthia Gibbons to the Town Planning and Zoning Commission (ALT) for a term commencing on January 1, 2024, and ending on December 31, 2027.

**BOARD AND COMMISSION PLANNING**
The Board took no action.
Discussion starts at 1:58:31 of the full meeting recording.

**ADJOURNMENT**
On a non-debatable motion by Mr. Munno, seconded by Ms. McCreven, the meeting adjourned at 7:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Alison Valsamis, Clerk
To: Housing Committee

From Cathy Wick and Amey Marrella

Date: 1/3/2024

A few months ago, at the September 2023 Housing Committee meeting, we presented detailed comments on the town’s Housing Plan, including the identification of factual errors, misstatements, and erroneous conclusions that resulted from reliance on outdated and generic data. In the four months since, we have seen no effort by the committee to address any of the substantive problems we identified in the report. Instead, recent posts on Facebook by a committee member repeated errors that we had identified.

The committee’s follow up response to our comments focused on expressing disappointment that we did not offer “new suggestions for addressing the problem.” While we recall offering several suggestions in our oral presentation to the committee, we are here to make sure our suggestions are clear to the committee and to interested residents. To make these suggestions, however, we need to first critique the committee’s current approach.

To begin, the housing committee’s discussion of housing is inappropriately siloed, meaning housing is being discussed simplistically, in isolation from other state policy and from the potential impact said housing will have on the town as a whole. Instead, this committee should be discussing housing as it fits in with other equally important state policy, such as the Green Plan, Smart Growth, transit-oriented development, watershed protection, and sewer avoidance. Housing, land conservation, and the protection of clean water are not mutually exclusive: housing goals can and should be accomplished without sacrificing public open space land or endangering public water supply watershed.

In addition, the housing committee must acknowledge that when it comes to school enrollment, Woodbridge is not average, it is extreme: it is one of the only towns in Connecticut that continues to experience substantial growth in its school population as existing housing stock changes hands. The Woodbridge Board of Education completed a thorough study last year predicting a 15% increase in our school enrollment over the next eight years, assuming no change in the number of housing units in the town. In the first year since the study, the actual enrollment increase of 30 students was DOUBLE the prediction. Yet the Housing Committee continues to rely on outdated pre-covid state averages of student enrollment while ignoring the actual data generated by our own Board of Education. The Housing Committee loses credibility when it promotes predictions that contradict known reality.

The Housing Committee also seems to be placing far too much emphasis on private development that includes some element of affordable housing. But given the housing market reality in Woodbridge, the Housing Committee should be focused on ways to increase affordable housing WITHOUT increasing the amount of market rate housing in the town. This is the most direct way to increase the ratio of affordable to market rate housing.
The committee also needs to understand, through a buildout analysis, what is the currently existing housing opportunity in Woodbridge as allowed under the new zoning regulations enacted in summer of 2021. As a reminder, those regulations include:

- Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted “by right” in every zone;
- Duplexes are permitted “by right” everywhere except in the public water supply watershed, which safeguards drinking water for New Haven area customers;
- Duplexes are permitted in the watershed with TPZ commission review;
- Multifamily housing of up to 15 units per acre is permitted in every zone if the parcel has public sewer and water.

Dominic Thomas, the original Chair of the Housing Opportunity Study Committee, praised these changes to zoning, saying they make Woodbridge “a leader” in the state. Working within these zoning changes the housing committee has ample opportunity to encourage private property owners to increase the percentage of legally affordable housing within the Town.

The following are four specific suggestions on how the town can increase housing affordability:

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs): The committee should undertake an effort to educate the public about ADUs. Ways to do this include articles in the local paper, information via email newsletter, and workshops for realtors and for the public. Recently, we were shocked to hear from a prominent local realtor that she was unaware that ADUs were legal in Woodbridge. A realtor!

The state of California has experienced a nearly 20-fold increase in ADUs in the last seven years, since it began promoting their use. Any number of Woodbridge residents might be interested in constructing an ADU for a variety of reasons – out of a commitment to legally affordable housing, as a means to expand the feasibility of childcare or eldercare assistance, or as an opportunity for someone they care about at whatever age. Or they might just want to increase their own net worth: according to Desegregate Connecticut, a housing advocacy group that promotes the construction of accessory apartments, ADUs can boost property value by as much as 50%.

Incentive program for qualified elderly: The committee, like the State, is too focused on new construction as a way to create affordability, and is too focused on bringing new residents into the town. We have many current town residents who are burdened by housing costs, particularly our elderly who may be in danger of losing their homes. These residents should be a top priority of the committee, but they are being ignored. We suggest that qualified elders be offered a tax incentive in exchange for deed restricting their homes as affordable. A bill proposed in the last legislative session in Hartford (HB6777, summarized below) proposed such a program – it did not end up passing, but can serve as a model for towns. The list of seniors
who might be interested is readily available from an existing taxation program that allows
deferral of tax payment.

**Infill development in the Business District:** The committee should analyze the opportunity to
make specific suggestions for zoning changes that could allow more density in our business
district (for instance, expanding the areas where residential units can be built above retail
establishments). Focus on this area is warranted because it enjoys access to public water and
sewer service.

**State owned land:** The State owns several parcels totaling about 50 acres on Litchfield Turnpike,
which either contain or are very close to sewer and water infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1811</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1857</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1871</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1970</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2075</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee should reach out to state representatives to explore the feasibility of state-
sponsored construction of legally affordable housing on one or more of these parcels.
Summary of HB6777:

HB6777 Would require municipalities to adopt ordinances to abate the property tax on single-family homes, where
- the owner is 65+,
- earns no more than the regional median income
- and places an affordable housing deed restriction on the property such that
- the property may only be sold at a price affordable to households making no more than 80% of the regional median income.
- Such homes would count toward the 10% threshold under §8-30g, as well as 2 points each towards a moratorium;
- the abatement would continue for as long as the restriction is in effect.
- The restriction may be revoked only with significant penalty to the municipality;
- such penalties shall be used to build or improve affordable housing owned by the municipality.
- The ordinance may be suspended during when a moratorium is granted on the 10% threshold is met.

Comments on the bill:
1. This bill is a win/win, helping elderly that are financially challenged, frees up existing affordable housing for other needy residents and helps towns get to 10% relief from 8-30g and moratoriums
2. Incentivizes elderly to stay put in CT when they are the largest demographic leaving our state.
3. The tax abatements would help those elderly that financially struggle to remain in CT due to the lack of overall affordability and high taxes in our state.
4. This bill would expand what counts towards 8-30g as "Affordable Housing" helping municipalities to get to their 10% to have relief from predatory developers overriding local zoning code with 8-30g. This would be helpful since most towns cannot use the 4 criteria to get to 10% per 8-30g standards.
5. Helps towns get to a moratorium. Only 4 towns currently have a moratorium and since 1990 enactment of 8-30g, only 13 municipalities have ever been able to achieve a moratorium because the cost of development of affordable housing is very high – approximately $250K -$500K per unit and as just stated, many of the 4 categories which count towards 8-30g are not available to all municipalities.
To: Woodbridge Housing Committee

From: Cathy Wick and Amey Marrella

Date: September 5, 2023

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Town of Woodbridge Affordable Housing Plan, adopted by the Board of Selectmen on May 25, 2022. We offer these comments with the understanding that we may have further specific observations and suggestions to make at another time.

As you know, the consultant was very late in delivering the draft report. This delay forced the ad hoc volunteer committee to rush its review before delivering the draft to the Selectmen. The Town leadership then adopted the plan without any opportunity for public review and comment, despite resident pleas that the BOS take the time to present the draft to their constituents and invite comments and questions.

As a result of this history and inadequate vetting, the report is substantially flawed. In this memo, we point to some of the overarching problems, give specific examples of some of the misstatements and errors, and offer recommendations for moving forward.

Overarching flaws: First, as noted above, the draft was never presented to Woodbridge residents in a public forum with adequate opportunity for follow-up questions and comments. As a result, this is not a report supported by or endorsed by the townspeople but merely a record of the thoughts of an unelected consultant with hurried input by a well-meaning but rushed ad hoc town committee.

Second, the ad hoc committee’s charge (as described on page 5 of the report) includes ensuring compliance with Federal and State law, yet the report fails to describe the relevant law and whether Woodbridge is in compliance. Instead, the report contains basic errors about State law’s requirements.

Third, the report assumes that Woodbridge’s population, including its school population, is in decline. In fact, Beecher Road School’s current projections and data, as well as recent house sales, demonstrate that the opposite is the case.

Fourth, the report falls victim to an “apples and oranges” problem, in that it often cites Woodbridge-specific housing data but draws conclusions based on national or state averages of other measures (such as the income data enumerated in #13 below).

Fifth, the report fails to fully acknowledge and analyze the sweeping zoning changes adopted by the Town Plan & Zoning Commission in summer of 2021 that vastly increase housing opportunity throughout the Town.

Sixth, the report ignores other state policies such as the Green Plan and the sewer avoidance policy within which housing policy must fit.

Seventh, the report repeatedly makes broad reference to data (“current demographic models,” “many studies and empirical evidence show”) to support its assumptions without actual citations. References should be supplied for all cited data so that the reader knows the basis for the assumptions made.
Our close reading of the report has identified many sloppy statements and specific errors. Here are some examples:

1. Page 5: The Committee states that diversified housing will bring economic advantages to the town by creating a “stabilized and diversified population.” Please explain what economic advantages will be created, what is meant by “stabilized and diversified,” and how a stabilized and diversified population creates the promised economic advantages.

2. Page 6: The top box states that “current demographic models” project 20% decline in Woodbridge’s population over the next 20 years. What models are the basis for this statement? At best, this projection seems to be based on outdated, pre-covid information. In contrast, we have observed a large influx of young families to town since March 2020. Further, the continued opportunity post-covid for remote work has increased Woodbridge’s desirability, given its proximity to New York City. This report’s relevance is diminished by its reliance on outdated, inaccurate information. For comparison, see the Woodbridge BOE July 2023 report to the Selectmen for projected enrollment increases at Beecher Road School: https://resources.finalsites.net/images/v1689783640/woodbridge/iteg5uyfxxhx94uid5/AdHocEnrollmentSpacePlanningCommitteeWBOE2023.pdf

According to the Beecher report, enrollment is projected to increase by 125 students over the next eight years. It is notable that these increases are based on a constant number of housing units in the Town. Just last month the Superintendent reported to the Woodbridge Board of Education that total student enrollment is 875 as of 8/21/23 compared to 845 as of 10/1/22.

3. Page 6: The bottom box makes sweeping statements about the potential impact of higher density housing with affordable set-asides. On what “studies and empirical evidence” are these statements based? In contrast, the financial analysis done by our town’s Finance Director for all previous CCW development proposals shows that residential growth produces a net loss for towns largely driven by school costs. Tax revenue cannot compensate. This report’s analysis should not rely on statewide or nationwide averages in making Woodbridge-specific enrollment projections. Moreover, given that the Amity district is regionalized, there is no such thing as marginal cost in that system – every additional student in the Amity system costs the town some $20,000 more per year.

4. Page 6: In the second bullet regarding the use of town owned properties, the report fails to acknowledge that State law does not require, it does not even suggest, that towns should sacrifice undeveloped potential open space for housing. Rather, rival State policy such as the Green Plan promotes the opposite action – the preservation of undeveloped land as permanent open space to address various environmental concerns including the climate crisis. The report fails to explore ways to promote housing opportunity that do not conflict with other State policy such as the Green Plan. Some towns, such as Essex, specifically exclude town owned land from consideration for affordable housing.
5. Page 6: In the third bullet, the report generally supports sewer expansion without recognizing that existing homes in the Highlands area (behind Brookside Market) should receive sewer service first due to recurring septic problems. Further, the avoidance of sewer expansion has been the official policy of the State due to the ongoing challenges of existing systems in meeting Federal Clean Water Act requirements. The report should be grounded in the reality of the current Greater New Haven sewage treatment system.

6. Page 6: The fourth bullet gives scant acknowledgement of the town’s sweeping, radical changes to its zoning in 2021 and fails to identify specific “additional opportunities” for zoning changes.

7. Page 7: Here the report states that Woodbridge has “over 1/3 open space.” This is incorrect. As stated in our Plan of Conservation and Development (page 91) legally protected open space is at most 25% of the town. The percentage goes down to just 17% if Regional Water Authority (RWA) Class II lands, which can be sold, are removed from the tally. More broadly, this report should have recognized the distinction between legally-protected “Open Space” and undeveloped land, and the town’s vital role in supplying public drinking water supply watershed for the Greater New Haven area.

8. Page 9: Income levels are determined by number of occupants. The report cites Woodbridge’s 80% AMI at $67,950 for an individual. But the limit for a family of four is much higher. The report should have looked at income level for an individual next to housing cost for a one-bedroom unit, and income level for a family of four next to housing cost for a three-bedroom unit, recognizing that income thresholds vary with household size.

9. Page 12: Again, the report is inaccurate. Woodbridge has not had a population decrease. According to the U.S. Census Bureau website, the population of Woodbridge in 2010 was 8,990 and in 2020 was 9,089.

10. Page 12: There is no “state mandated 10% requirement.” It is surprising and very disturbing that this report misrepresents the law on which it is grounded.

11. Page 13: Housing goals should include acknowledgement of Woodbridge’s large amount (more than 300 homes) of “naturally affordable” housing and identify ways to convert some of this housing into legally affordable housing. An added benefit of this approach is that it serves Woodbridge’s current elderly residents, many of whom would like to age in place but may be struggling to afford to stay in their homes. There was a bill proposed in the last legislative session that addresses this issue.

12. Page 14: Given that experts agree that dense housing is best located in walkable neighborhoods served by public transportation, the areas of focus for development of large-scale affordable housing should be concentrated in a town’s business district which contains shops, banks, doctor’s offices, and a bus line. Orange, for example, identifies the Route 1 corridor as its exclusive focus for affordable housing.
13. Page 28: The income figures cited are national averages and thus much too low for our area. Here are some current state averages published by the Connecticut State Department of Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Days of work annually</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$78K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Tax Preparer</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$60K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Community Health</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$67K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$56K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>Graphic Designer</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$53K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>Registered Nurse</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$85K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Web Developer</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$86K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Page 45: Here is another inaccurate reference to the “10% state requirement.” We also question the accuracy of this sentence: “The aim of this law is to commit each municipality to provide no less than 10% of total housing stock as affordable housing.” This article by housing advocate Bill Cibes asserts that the purpose of 8-30g is not and never has been to get all towns to the 10% exemption level: [https://ctmirror.org/2022/02/14/connecticut-needs-more-affordable-housing-8-30g-is-a-law-that-works/](https://ctmirror.org/2022/02/14/connecticut-needs-more-affordable-housing-8-30g-is-a-law-that-works/)

Recommendations:

Given all of the problems that we have identified, we offer the following recommendations. First, the committee should begin now the process of overhauling this flawed report so that a well-researched, well-drafted, and thoroughly reviewed report can be submitted to the State on or before the next deadline.

Second, the committee should update the population projections on which the report relies, after analyzing Beecher’s report (and subsequent school projections) and the actual changes to the town’s populations in the last few years. To assist this latter effort, the committee should seek data on the household population changes in every dwelling that has changed ownership or been built recently, as well as the ones that are now under construction.

Third, the committee needs to prepare a section of the report that describes the zoning changes made in 2021 and provides a build-out analysis showing the difference in housing opportunity afforded by these changes over time.
Fourth, the committee should make sure that the revised report accurately describes the laws and state policies that are relevant to housing opportunity in Woodbridge – including such competing policies as the Green Plan, the protection of public water supply watershed, and the limitations on sewer expansion.

Fifth, the committee should explore specific ways to promote smaller-scale affordable housing instead of making the implicit assumption that a large-scale affordable housing development on town-owned land should be the Town’s and the committee’s focus.

Sixth, the revised report needs to be refocused so as to be grounded in the specific characteristics of Woodbridge. At 96 pages, the current report is much too long, mostly because it is filled with irrelevant boilerplate info from the consultant. The sample reports from other towns that you include on your webpage have the following page counts:

a. Essex 19 pages  
b. Fairfield 58 pages  
c. Ridgefield 35 pages  
d. Stratford 26 pages  
e. Salisbury 16 pages

These reports are much more focused and specific to each town. We would suggest a target of about 25 pages. And lastly, the committee must insure that Woodbridge residents receive ample opportunity to learn about and comment upon the revisions at every stage of their development.