

# June 2007 Annual Update

## 18 Communities - Naugatuck Valley Corridor Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)

Presented to  
U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic  
Development Administration



Presented by  
Shelton Economic Development Corporation  
and  
Waterbury Development Corporation



## Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Goals for NVC	2
Work Plan 2006	2
Accomplishments	3
NVC Demographics	3
Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics	3
Changes in Employment Force	4
Brownfields Conference	4
Legislation	4
Lessons Learned	4
Priorities 2006/2007	5
Future Plans	6
CEDS Process	6
Work Plan 2006/2007	7
Demographic Updates 18 Communities	
Charts: Population in NVC 2000 to 2005	
Employment April 2006 to April 2007	
NVC Capital Investment Projects – Ranking and Rating	
Organization and Management	
CEDS Implementation/Coordination of Partners Chart	
Exhibits:	
Committee Meeting Minutes/Agenda	
Foundation Reports	

June 28, 2007

Mr. Stephen P. Grady, P.E.  
US Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration  
Curtis Center  
Independent Square West, Suite 140 South  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Dear Mr. Grady:

The Shelton Economic Development Corporation on behalf of the Shelton Economic Development Corporation and the Waterbury Development Corporation is pleased to submit our June 2007 Annual Report covering the 18 communities included in our Naugatuck Valley Corridor (NVC) Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) area. During the 2006/2007 program year our CEDS Strategy and Governing/Partnering Committee received a request from Newtown, a community contiguous to our CEDS area, to be included in our original 17 communities. Their request was considered and approved.

Our annual report reflects action and progress made during July 2006 and June 2007 plus it reflects our work plan for the 2007/2008 period. Our focus will begin to concentrate on developing a new 5-year CEDS for the NVC. EDA's financial assistance will be necessary if the CEDS process is to be continued. Substantial progress has made been. The planning process is working, communities are involved and expanding.

We request that you review our submission of the 2007 annual report and call us with any comments and/or suggestions. We look forward to working with you during the coming year. Your personal assistance has been very beneficial to the NVC Corridor.

Sincerely,

James E. Ryan, President  
SEDC

C: Michael J. O'Connor, WDC  
18 Communities



## **Introduction – CEDS Annual Update, June 2007**

### **Goals/Work Plan and Accomplishments for 2006/2007**

A major shift in municipal coverage occurred with the Steering and the Governing/Partnering Committees voted to expand the NVC CEDS area to include Newtown as the eighteenth community. The demographic and labor statistics have been upgraded to include Newtown. The US Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA) approved the Naugatuck Valley Corridor Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy's (NVC CEDS) five year plan on February 4, 2005 retroactive to June 2004. The original seventeen town planning area covers the Council of Government of the Central Naugatuck Valley, thirteen towns and the Lower Naugatuck Valley Council of Government area, four towns. The program is supported and administrated by the Shelton Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) and the Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC) with SEDC acting as the lead-administrating agent. The Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce and the Valley Chamber of Commerce further support the CEDS process. See map of the NVC CEDS area attached.

The 2005 update outlined a list of specific activities that would be the focus of the work plan for 2005/2006. These activities are further related to the initial four goals of the NVC CEDS.

The approved CEDS provides for an organization and management structure that includes the following: a Governing/Partnering Committee, which oversees the CEDS, the Steering Committee membership, which meets quarterly and the Strategy Committee membership made up of community and business leaders, which meets quarterly or as needed.

The Shelton Economic Development Corporation acts as the lead administrative element for the monitoring and overseeing of the Naugatuck Valley CEDS. As outlined in the overall administrative section a Steering Committee has been established, which has and will continue to meet at least quarterly (minutes are displayed in the Exhibits section.) The Steering Committee is made up of members from the Shelton Economic Development Corporation, the Waterbury Development Corporation, Valley Council of Governments, Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments, Greater Valley Chamber and Greater Waterbury Chamber.



The Strategy Committee includes representatives from each of the 18 communities plus representatives from banking, business, community organizations, education, finance, government, higher education, industry, labor, minorities, professional, public health, public safety and women. The Strategy Committee also meets on a quarterly basis or as needed and they monitor and revise the CEDS document (minutes are attached in the Exhibits section.)

### Goals for the NVC

**Goal I: Improve overall Transportation and Communications systems.**

**Goal II: Provide opportunities for job growth, advancement and job training, utilizing and identifying Connecticut Industry Clusters as the engine to support and sustain the regional economy, supporting and encouraging private investment in all these areas.**

**Goal III: Continue to develop local infrastructure that supports economic expansion while maintaining and protecting the environment.**

**Goal IV: Sustain economic expansion while reinforcing and complimenting the regional land use and quality of life of the NVC.**

### Work Plan/2006

- Expanded CEDS area to include Newtown to the CEDS area approved by the Strategy and the CEDS Governing/Partnering Committee in the fall of 2006.
- Coordinate and encourage the regional economic development summit outlined in the CEDS document.
- Monitor the regional transportation recommendations – noted in the capital projects.
- Encourage municipalities to submit and/or revise capital projects. Currently 3 communities are receiving EDA funds: Shelton, Ansonia, Waterbury.
- Monitor and notify participating members of any significant changes in the economic conditions of the communities utilizing the evaluation report prepared annual demographics of each community and summary of the NVC.
- Provide information to financial partners i.e. Matthies Foundation, Community Foundation for Greater New Haven, EDA and others regarding progress and accomplishments as required by the individual funding sources.
- Philanthropy – initiated a conference with various economic development partners to explore and evaluate the benefits of a “new” foundation that would assist with the CEDS overall economic development planning.

### Accomplishments

- Economic Development Summit Spring of 2007 with EDA/CT EDR and all communities in the CEDS. The EDA representative encourage Tier I projects that are “ready to go” to



consider filing a pre-application. SEDC/WDC staff and the Strategy Committee will follow up with the Tier I communities.

- Meeting with workforce development organizations to solicit and develop a work plan for 2007/2008 program year.
- Conference on Philanthropy conducted May 2007.
- Coordination with Brownfields officials on priority setting.
- Re-rating and ranking of new and/or revised public infrastructure projects.
- Inclusion of Philanthropy as a priority.
- Inclusion of Heritage Designation as a priority.
- Inclusion of Waterbury Transportation Center as a transportation priority.

### **Demographics – NVC**

The demographics have been amended to show the inclusion of Newtown into the NVC/CEDS area. The NVC population in 2000 was 357,094 and in 2005 the population increased to 365,776. The Connecticut population in 2000 was 3,405,565 and in 2005 increased to 3,570,297.

The population in the NVC increased by 3.6 percent from 2000 to 2005. Connecticut's population grew by 3.2 percent during the 2000 to 2005 period. Thirteen of the eighteen communities grew at a rate higher than the state (see chart 2).

All of the eighteen communities had an increase in population from 2000 to 2005. Oxford had the largest percentage increase of 19.2%, while Waterbury had the lowest percentage increase of 0.6%.

### **Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics - NVC**

The Connecticut unemployment rate for the year from April of 2006 to April of 2007 increased from 3.8% to 4.1%. The unemployment rate for the eighteen NVC communities remained at 3.85%. Twelve of the eighteen communities were at or below the state average with Woodbury the lowest at 2.6%. The United States adjusted rate for the same period was 4.5%. All but Ansonia, Naugatuck and Waterbury were below the national average. The labor force for the NVC was 202,969 people. Waterbury had the largest workforce with Shelton second. Bethlehem had the smallest work force.



## **Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rate Over Time**

The labor force in the NVC and the State of Connecticut increased by 3,876 and 23,300, respectively. Seventeen of the communities in the NVC had an increase in the labor force with Waterbury showing a change of 655, followed by Shelton having 538, then by Oxford at 466. One community had a decrease in the labor force. See chart for comparison within the district and the state.

During the period of April 2005 to April 2006 Connecticut gained 23,300 jobs while the eighteen NVC communities had an increase of 3,876 jobs.

## **Brownfield Conference**

NVC CEDS Administrative staff did not have the forum on Brownfield Redevelopment because of conflict with Senator Lieberman's schedule. However, all parties are expected to participate in a NVC Brownfields seminar in the fall of 2007. This is a major work plan element for the coming year. In addition the NVC CEDS sponsored a work shop with EDA Regional Office Staff, the CT EDR, state DECD staff and numerous other approved CEDS groups to discuss and consider the benefits of the CEDS program.

## **Legislation**

One of the work elements for the 2007/2008 work plan supported by the Strategy and Steering Committee is to evaluate and considering the formation a district following EDA guidelines for the eighteen communities that currently make up the NVC area. This evaluation would act as the state's model for other areas to consider and follow concerning the formation of an economic development district. EDA financial participation will be encouraged and required in order to have an impact and to show continued support for the CEDS process.

## **Lessons Learned**

The Governing and Partnering Committee under the leadership of its Chairman, Sheila O'Malley of the City of Waterbury/Derby have continued to develop a partnership with government and business leaders through the CEDS Outreach process. The results of the public forums have drawn more than three hundred participants.

SEDC/WDC continue to utilize the CEDS process to develop economic partners with the eighteen communities. The partnering committees continues to oversee the CEDS document, maintain, update and adjustment, prepare and submit reports, monitor significant changes in the economy, coordinate all committees, outsource information by communicating with all the partners, all of which are reported in detail throughout the annual update.

The continued monitoring of the CEDS will have direct impacts on each of the communities with some communities having a greater economic benefit through economic growth, job expansion, new businesses and/or relocation than others, but the entire region will have the benefit because



job opportunities will be available for all residents of the corridor. The demographics show that five communities lost employment opportunities while twelve had job growth during the past year. The CEDS process is also to be used as a measuring stick for improving transportation, which is the bloodline for economic growth since the majority of our residents and/or businesses use our highways to commute and to deliver their products and services. This information will also be shared with state and federal legislatures.

The US Senators and Congressional representatives are aware of the NVC CEDS and have participated in our public forums and assisted with economic development grants for our communities their assistance in procuring additional grants in aid for our individual communities or a regional organization will have an overall economic benefit.

### Priorities – 2007/2008

- Transportation
- Brownfields
- Infrastructure Investments
- Job growth through various approaches
- Philanthropy
  - Current major foundations and current major ED organizations
  - Role that foundations are playing with economic development
  - Role that foundations might play in economic development
  - Role that economic development organizations can play with philanthropic efforts
  - Possible efforts which could accent the potential working relationship between stakeholders
  - Next steps
- District Creation/Use EDA Criteria for the NVC/CEDS District (18 communities)
- New additions expected for inclusion 2007/2008:
  - National Heritage designation
  - Waterbury Transportation Center
  - Work Force development priorities
  - Explore and evaluate the feasibility of NVC/EDA District
- Next Steps
  - Plan additional review of this priority in the 2006/2007 CEDS work plan
  - Evaluate creating a new Foundation similar to the one created by the Cleveland Foundation for the purpose of advocating for these priorities.





## Future Plans

The two corporations based on the approval of the CEDS have continued to monitor, amend and report on the progress of the goals and objectives of the overall plan. Applications will be made to EDA, The Community Foundation for Greater New Haven and the Katharine Matthies Foundation and any other organization in order to support the continuation of the CEDS. The funding from all of the organizations is vital in order to permit successful implementation of the CEDS. Without full financial aid some activities will be reduced or eliminated.

## The CEDS Process

The CEDS process has permitted SEDC/NVDC to reach out to the 18 municipalities, the Councils of government and the private sector through the chambers of commerce to provide them with a framework for a planning process that incorporates all segments for economic development and growth within the region. The towns in the NVC represent the strengths and weaknesses of Connecticut. Some of the municipalities perform quite well either as a place to conduct business, a residential area, or both. By contrast, other cities struggle economically and provide less than optimal living conditions for current and potential residents. The municipalities that thrive maintain a stake in those cities that struggle because their success depends in part on the condition of towns that border them. The CEDS has focused on industry clusters, transportation needs, Brownfields remediation, environmental awareness and community development activities, encouraged information technology zones like the one currently existing in downtown Waterbury. Based on the first Economic Development Summit, the CEDS leaders are planning on a follow-up summit to further explore “new development” through the Brownfields reclamation/remediation process within the NVC CEDS area. The second summit has the support of the councils of government, the regional planning agencies and the two chambers of commerce. Through the ongoing planning process the corporations will identify new funding sources to benefit the continued planning that is necessary for the modification of the CEDS. Support by the continuation and the continued support of local community foundations similar to the excellent support provided by the Community Foundation for Greater New Haven and the Matthies Foundation, which have been instrumental in the approval of the second CEDS for the region and have assisted with the annual reporting criteria.



### Work Plan 2006-2007 Outcomes

1. Continue to implement the CEDS.
2. Improve overall transportation infrastructure.
3. Improve local infrastructure through capital projects.
4. Brownfield's land/building reclamation/remediation.
5. Increase philanthropic activities and efforts.
6. Increase awareness of National Heritage Corridor.

Following this section is an Attachment A that outlines the NVC CEDS action plan for the coming year.

The SEDC/WDC will with the assistance of its financial partner continue the involvement of the eighteen communities and all its leaders to monitor, amend and strengthen the overall CEDS process. Encourage all the economic development partners to actively participate in the planning, process, seminars and various capital projects, monitor the current jobs/employment status, assist businesses with visions of expansion into the CEDS market area with:

- Site selection
- Job training, retraining efforts
- Philanthropic investment
- Brownfield reclamation
- Improved transportation networks via highway and rail
- Expand and improve public infrastructure
- Maintain and improve quality of life



# Ansonia's Demographics

## Population

Ansonia's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 18,881 a difference of 327 additional people from the 2000 population of 18,554. Ansonia's population, the seventh largest population in the NVC, grew by 1.7 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Ansonia's rate was lower than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Ansonia

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 4.5 in Ansonia, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Ansonia possessed the second highest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Ansonia possessed 5.2 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 9,788 was the sixth largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem only possessed about one percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Despite its small labor force, Ansonia had more than 443 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in April of 2006. Ansonia maintained the fourth largest number of the NVC's total number of unemployed in April of 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in April of 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rate Over Time

Ansonia's employment force decreased by 265 people from April 2005 to April of 2006. The employment in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 and 23,500, respectively. In total, Ansonia lost 265 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Beacon Falls' Demographics

## **Population**

Beacon Falls' population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 5,553 a difference of 307 additional people from the 2000 population of 5,246. Beacon Falls' population, the second smallest population in the NVC, grew by 5.5 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Beacon Falls' rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## **Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Beacon Falls**

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 4.0 in Beacon Falls, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Beacon Falls possessed the sixth highest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Beacon Falls possessed 1.7 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 3,188 was the second smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem only about more than one percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Beacon Falls had 128 unemployed in the labor force in the NVC in 2006. Beacon Falls maintained the third smallest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,047) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## **Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time**

Beacon Falls' employment force increased by 71 jobs from April of 2005 to April of 2006 whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 and 23,500, respectively. In total, Beacon Falls gained 71 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Bethlehem's Demographics

## Population

Bethlehem's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 3,598 a difference of 176 additional people from the 2000 population of 3,422. Bethlehem's population, the smallest in the NVC, grew by 4.9 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Bethlehem's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Bethlehem

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 2.9 in Bethlehem, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Bethlehem possessed one of the lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 2,024 was the smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem only possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Bethlehem maintained less than 1 percent of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Bethlehem maintained the smallest number of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Bethlehem's employment force increased by 254 people from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 1,988 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Bethlehem gained 254 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Cheshire's Demographics

## Population

Cheshire's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 29,303 a difference of 760 additional people from the 2000 population of 28,543. Cheshire's population, the fourth largest in the NVC, grew by 2.6 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Cheshire's rate was lower than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Cheshire

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 2.8 in Cheshire, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Cheshire possessed the third lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Cheshire possessed nearly 7.7 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 14,549 was the fourth largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed only about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Cheshire had 405 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Cheshire had the largest number of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Cheshire's employment force increased by 625 people from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people at 23,500, respectively. In total, Cheshire gained 625 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Derby's Demographics

## **Population**

Derby's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 12,620 a difference of 229 additional people from the 2000 population of 12,391. Derby's population, the eighth smallest in the NVC, grew by 1.8 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Derby's rate was lower than the State and NVC average.

## **Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Derby**

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 4.1 in Derby, 4.3 in the NVC, and 4.9 in Connecticut. Derby possessed the fifth highest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Derby possessed 3.57 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 6,751 was the tenth largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem only possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Derby had more than 277 unemployed in the labor force in the NVC in 2006. Derby had the fifth largest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest share of number on unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## **Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rate Over Time**

Derby's employment force decreased by 192 people from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Derby lost 192 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.





# Middlebury's Demographics

## Population

Middlebury's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 6,846 a difference of 395 additional people from the 2000 population of 6,451. Middlebury's population, the third smallest in the NVC, grew by 5.8 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Middlebury's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Derby

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 2.8 in Middlebury, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Middlebury possessed the fourth lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Middlebury possessed 1.94 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 3,672 was the third smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 2.62 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Middlebury had 102 of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Middlebury had the second smallest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074), whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest share (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Middlebury's employment force increased by more than 99 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Middlebury gained 99 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.





# Naugatuck's Demographics

## Population

Naugatuck's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 31,802 a difference of 813 additional people from the 2000 population of 30,989. Naugatuck's population, the third largest in the NVC, grew by 2.6 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Naugatuck's rate was lower than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Naugatuck

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 4.3 in Naugatuck, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Naugatuck possessed the third highest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Naugatuck possessed 8.95 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 16,918 was the third largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Naugatuck has 735 people of the unemployed in the labor force in the NVC in 2006. Naugatuck had the second largest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074), whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Labor Force Over Time

Naugatuck's employment force increased by 304 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Naugatuck gained 304 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Oxford's Demographics

## Population

Oxford's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 11,112 a difference of 1,291 additional people from the 2000 population of 9,821. Oxford's population, the eleventh largest in the NVC, grew by 11.6 percent from 2000 to 2004, the largest percent of growth in the NVC. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Oxford's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Oxford

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 3.1 in Oxford, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Oxford possessed the lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Oxford possessed 3.41 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 6,443 was the eleventh smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem only possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Oxford has 198 persons of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Oxford had the seventh smallest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Oxford's employment force increased by 94 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Oxford gained 94 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Prospect's Demographics

## Population

Prospect's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 9,205 a difference of 498 additional people from the 2000 population of 8,707. Prospect's population, the fifth smallest in the NVC, grew by 5.4 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Prospect's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Prospect

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 3.2 in Prospect, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Prospect possessed the eighth lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Prospect possessed 2.75 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 5,201 was the fifth smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Prospect had 168 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Prospect had the eighth smallest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Prospect's employment force increased by 128 jobs from April 2004 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Prospect gained 128 workers from April 2004 to April 2006.



# Seymour's Demographics

## Population

Seymour's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 16,133 a difference of 679 additional people from the 2000 population of 15,454. Seymour's population, the ninth largest in the NVC, grew by 4.2 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Seymour's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Seymour

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 4.0 in Seymour, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Seymour possessed the sixth lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.02) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Seymour possessed 4.76 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 8,911 was the seventh largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Seymour had 358 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Seymour had the seventh highest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Seymour's employment force decreased by 120 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Seymour lost 120 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Shelton's Demographics

## **Population**

Shelton's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 39,254 a difference of 931 additional people from the 2000 population of 38,101. Shelton's population, the second largest in the NVC, grew by 2.9 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Shelton's rate was lower than the state and NVC average.

## **Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Shelton**

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 3.2 in Shelton, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Shelton possessed the fifth lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Shelton possessed 11.64 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 22,013 was the second largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Shelton had 702 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Shelton had the third highest of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## **Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time**

Shelton's employment force decreased by 474 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Shelton lost 474 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Southbury's Demographics

## Population

Southbury's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 19,498 a difference of 931 additional people from the 2000 population of 18,567. Southbury's population, the sixth largest in the NVC, grew by 4.8 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Southbury's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Southbury

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 2.9 in Southbury, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Southbury possessed the third lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.02) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Southbury possessed nearly 4.67 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 8,821 was the ninth largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent, whereas Bethlehem only possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Southbury had 259 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Southbury had the eighth lowest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rate Over Time

Southbury's employment force decreased by 114 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Southbury lost 114 jobs from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Thomaston's Demographics

## Population

Thomaston's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 7,901 a difference of 398 additional people from the 2000 population of 7,503. Thomaston's population, the fourth smallest in the NVC, grew by 5.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Thomaston's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Thomaston

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 4.2 in Thomaston, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Thomaston possessed the third highest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.02) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Thomaston possessed 2.52 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 4,707 was the fourth smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Thomaston had 192 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Thomaston had the sixth highest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Thomaston's employment force increased by 156 people from April of 2005 to April of 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Thomaston gained 156 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.





# Waterbury's Demographics

## Population

Waterbury's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 108,487 a difference of 1,216 additional people from the 2000 population of 107,271. Waterbury's population, the largest in the NVC, grew by 1.1 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Waterbury's rate was lower than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Waterbury

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 6.2 in Waterbury, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Waterbury possessed the highest unemployment rate ( 6.2 )among NVC towns. Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5) of the NVC.

In April of 2006, Waterbury possessed 26.22 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 49,569 was the largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Waterbury had the highest number of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006 whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (1%) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Waterbury's employment force increased by 385 jobs from April of 2005 to April of 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Waterbury gained 385 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.





# Watertown's Demographics

## Population

Watertown's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 22,268 a difference of 607 additional people from the 2000 population of 21,661. Watertown's population, the fifth largest in the NVC, grew by 2.7 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Watertown's rate was lower than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Watertown

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 3.6 in Watertown, 4.2 in the NVC, and 2.9 in Connecticut. Watertown possessed the sixth highest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.02) whereas Oxford possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Watertown possessed 6.47 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 12,226 was the fifth largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Watertown had 436 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Watertown had the fifth highest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Watertown's employment force increased by 226 jobs from April of 2005 to April of 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Watertown gained 226 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Wolcott's Demographics

## Population

Wolcott's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 16,149 a difference of 934 additional people from the 2000 population of 15,215. Wolcott's population, the eighth largest in the NVC, grew by 5.8 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Wolcott's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Wolcott

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 3.6 in Wolcott, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Wolcott possessed the eighth lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.2) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Wolcott possessed 4.7 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 8,862 was the eighth largest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem only possessed 1.0 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Wolcott had 321 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Wolcott had the eighth highest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed 3,074 whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number 58 of the NVC's unemployed in April 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Wolcott's employment force increased by 276 people from April 2005 to April of 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Wolcott increased by 276 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.



# Woodbury's Demographics

## Population

Woodbury's population based on State of Connecticut Department of Health projections for 2004 was 9,679 a difference of 481 additional people from the 2000 population of 9,198. Woodbury's population, the eighth smallest in the NVC, grew by 5.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. The population in the NVC increased by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2004. Connecticut's population grew by 2.9 percent during the 2000 to 2004 period. Ten of the seventeen communities grew at a rate higher than the state. Woodbury's rate was higher than the State and NVC average.

## Unemployment and Labor Force Characteristics in Woodbury

In April of 2006, the unemployment rate was 2.5 in Woodbury, 4.2 in the NVC, and 3.9 in Connecticut. Woodbury possessed the seventh lowest unemployment rate among NVC towns. Waterbury had the highest unemployment rate (6.02) whereas Woodbury possessed the lowest unemployment rate (2.5).

In April of 2006, Woodbury possessed 2.9 percent of the labor force in the NVC. Its total labor force of 5,446 was the sixth smallest in the NVC in 2006. Waterbury maintained the highest share of the NVC's labor force at 26.2 percent whereas Bethlehem possessed about 1 percent of the NVC's labor force in 2006.

Woodbury had 134 people of the unemployed labor force in the NVC in 2006. Woodbury had the second smallest share of the NVC's total number of unemployed in 2006. Waterbury possessed the largest number of unemployed (3,074) whereas Bethlehem possessed the smallest number (58) of the NVC's unemployed in 2006.

## Changes in Employment Force and Unemployment Rates Over Time

Woodbury's employment force increased by 703 jobs from April of 2005 to April of 2006, whereas the employment force in the NVC and the state increased by 2,157 people and 23,500, respectively. In total, Woodbury gained 703 workers from April 2005 to April 2006.

CHART 2

POPULATION				
	2000	2004	DIFFERENCE	
Connecticut	3,405,565	3,503,604	98,039	2.9%
U.S. (Adjusted)				
NVC Towns				
Ansonia	18,554	18,881	327	1.7%
Beacon Falls	5,246	5,553	307	5.5%
Bethlehem	3,422	3,598	176	4.9%
Cheshire	28,543	29,303	760	2.6%
Derby	12,391	12,620	229	1.8%
Middlebury	6,451	6,846	395	5.8%
Naugatuck	30,989	31,802	813	2.6%
Oxford	9,821	11,112	1,291	11.6%
Prospect	8,707	9,205	498	5.4%
Seymour	15,454	16,133	679	4.2%
Shelton	38,101	39,254	1,153	2.9%
Southbury	18,567	19,498	931	4.8%
Thomaston	7,503	7,901	398	5.0%
Waterbury	107,271	108,487	1,216	1.1%
Watertown	21,661	22,268	607	2.7%
Wolcott	15,215	16,149	934	5.8%
Woodbury	9,198	9,679	481	5.0%
Totals	357,094	368,289	11,195	3.0%
				3.0%

**EMPLOYMENT**  
**APRIL 2005 TO APRIL 2006**

CHART 2

	Apr-06			Apr-05			Change in Employment 2005-2006
	Employed	Unemployed		Employed	Unemployed		
Employment in Connecticut, the NVC and the NVC Towns, 2005-2006							
Connecticut	1,752,400	69,600	3.8%	1,711,500	87,000	5.1%	23,500
U.S. (Adjusted)						5.2%	
NVC Towns							
Ansonia	9,345	443	4.7%	9,502	551	5.8%	-265
Beacon Falls	3,060	128	4.2%	2,962	155	5.2%	71
Bethlehem	1,966	58	3.0%	1,693	77	4.5%	254
Cheshire	14,144	405	2.9%	13,380	544	4.1%	625
Derby	6,474	277	4.3%	6,584	359	5.5%	-192
Middlebury	3,570	102	2.9%	3,424	149	4.4%	99
Naugatuck	16,183	735	4.5%	15,702	912	5.8%	304
Oxford	6,245	198	3.2%	6,128	221	3.6%	94
Prospect	5,033	168	3.3%	4,868	205	4.2%	128
Seymour	8,633	358	4.1%	8,740	371	4.2%	-120
Shelton	21,311	702	3.3%	21,591	895	4.1%	-473
Southbury	8,562	259	3.0%	8,598	337	3.9%	-114
Thomaston	4,368	192	4.4%	4,172	232	5.6%	156
Waterbury	46,495	3,074	6.6%	45,137	4,047	9.0%	385
Watertown	11,790	436	3.7%	11,429	571	5.0%	226
Wolcott	8,541	321	3.8%	8,241	345	4.2%	276
Woodbury	5,312	134	2.5%	4,535	208	5%	703
Totals	181,032	7,990	4.4%	176,686	10,179	6%	2,157

Matrix – NVC Capital Investment Projects

<b>Municipality/Project Name</b>	<b>R &amp; S 2/20/03</b>	<b>R / S 11/10/04</b>	<b>R / S 5/11/06</b>	<b>R / S 6/5/07</b>	<b>Tiers I, II, III</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Related Goal</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Partner</b>	<b>Jobs Const.</b>	<b>Jobs Created/ Retained</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
<b>Ansonia</b>												
Riverwalk & Park: Trails Downtown	Tier I			Tier I X	Tier I	2,400,000	2-3-4	Ansonia Development Corporation	City, State, EDA/Federal, Private	50	N/A	Consultant selection design 2007
Fountain Lake Commerce Center Access Ro			Tier I	Tier I X	Tier I	2,500,000	1-2-3-4	Ansonia Development Corporation	Private/City/ EDA	100	1000	Private Developer selected. P&Z approval Summer 07, Construction Fall 07.
<b>Beacon Falls</b>												
Commerce Center	Tier II				Tier II	1,500,000	1-2-3	Beacon Falls EDC	Town, State, DECD, Federal	75	750	Planning in process at local level. Future 2009.
Transportation Center	Tier I				Tier I	2,850,000	1-3	Beacon Falls EDC	Town, State, DOT, FHWA	35	10	Conceptual design in process. Negotiate with CDOT for land swap 2007.
Depot Street Bridge	Tier I				Tier I	2,500,000	1-3	Beacon Falls EDC	State, DOT, Town, FHWA	50	N/A	Preliminary design in process. Bridge has reduced traffic due to structural deficiencies. Immediate 2007.
Riverwalk: South Main Street	Tier I			Tier I X	Tier I	1,300,000	1-3	Beacon Falls EDC	Town, DOT, DEP, FHWA	50	N/A	Town selecting consultant, design Fall 07 construction 08.
Roadway Improvements	Tier III				Tier III	8,400,000	1-3-4	Beacon Falls EDC	Town, State, Federal	100	N/A	Long term projects – subject to additional funding to support the downtown plan.

[illegible]

<b>Municipality/Project Name</b>	<b>R &amp; S 2/20/03</b>	<b>R / S 11/10/04</b>	<b>R / S 5/11/06</b>	<b>R / S 6/5/07</b>	<b>Tiers I, II, III</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Related Goal</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Partner</b>	<b>Jobs Const.</b>	<b>Jobs Created/ Retained</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
Andrews Mountain Road	Not ranked				Tier III	2,833,000	1	EDC	Borough	N/A	N/A	Concept plan being generated 2006. More details required.
*Naugatuck/ Waterbury Industrial Park – Listed under Waterbury. WITHDREW				Tier I	Tier I					100	400	Withdrawn – land sold to permit development.
Industrial Park Site Work					Tier III	1,500,000		Town	Borough, State, EDA	N/A	N/A	
Downtown Mixed-Use Development					Tier III	250,000,000		Town, NEDC & Conroy Dev. Co.	Borough, State, EDA, Private	N/A	N/A	
Uniroyal Site Cleanup & Demolition					Tier III	15,000,000		Town, NEDC	State, EDA, Private & Town	N/A	N/A	
<b>Newtown</b>												
*Fairfield Hills Campus, Town Hall, Parks-Recreation, Commerce Park, Underground Electrical Distribution				Tier I	Tier III	3,606,155	1-2-3-4	First Selectman	Town, State, DECD, EDA, Other Federal, Private	250	900	Local overall investment will exceed \$23.4M project will have 5 phases.
<b>Oxford</b>												
X Route 67 Highway Improvements and Storm Water Management	Tier II			Tier I	Tier I	2,575,000	1-3	Oxford EDC	Town, Regional Planning, State DOT	50	TBD	Conceptual design underway – no funding source
X Water Lift @ Woodruff Hill Road				Tier I	Tier I	100,000	1-2-3-4	Oxford EDC	Town, State, DECD	25	TBD	Design in process.



[illegible]

[illegible]

Municipality/ <b>Project Name</b>	R & S 2/20/03	R / S 11/10/04	R / S 5/11/06	R / S 6/5/07	Tiers I, II, III	Cost	Related Goal	Responsibility	Funding Partner	Jobs Const.	Jobs Created/ Retained	Time Frame
Bethlehem Middlebury Watertown Woodbury	Submitted with no projects.						N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A

X = Revised 6/5/07    \* = New project

## Naugatuck Valley Corridor Capital Project Tier Ranking

**NOT USED IN 2007 SUBMITTAL!!!!**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Employment Relationship Max 20 pts.</b>	<b>Economic Development Max 30 pts.</b>	<b>Adequacy Infrastructure Max 10 pts.</b>	<b>Planning/ Engineering Max 20 pts.</b>	<b>Local/State Regional Compliance Max 35 pts.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Tier Ranking</b>
Ansonia	Business & Commerce Park Downtown	2,201,600	18	25.4	9.4	17	28.8	98.6	Tier I
	Fountain Lake Commerce Center	4,500,000	17.6	23.4	9.8	10.2	18	79	Tier I
Beacon Falls	Commerce Center	1,500,000	14.2	12.8	10.4	8.8	21.6	67.8	Tier I
	Transportation Center	2,850,000	8.4	21	10.6	14.2	23.2	77.4	Tier I
	Depot Street Bridge	2,500,000	9.8	21.4	10.8	15	25.8	82.8	Tier I
	Riverwalk	1,300,000	9.6	22.8	10.6	15.4	18.4	76.8	Tier I
	Roadway Improvements	8,400,000	8.2	19.2	10.4	13.4	22.4	73.6	Tier III
Bethlehem	Fire Station	620,000	5.6	9.4	3.4	9.6	13	40.8	Tier III
Cheshire	Town Industrial Park	3,800,000	15.2	14.6	9.8	13.8	25.8	79.2	Tier II
Derby	Division St. Commerce Park	3,500,000	14.4	18.2	8.8	7.4	20.2	69	Tier I
	Division St. Improvements Exit 19/Rt 8	1,800,000	13	28	10	16	25	92	Tier I
	Fountain Lake Commerce Center	4,200,000	12.4	16.2	8	10.8	21.6	69	Tier II
	Sterling Opera House	9,000,000	5.6	10.4	9.4	12	18.4	55.8	Tier I
	Downtown Revitalization Program	300,000,000	15.8	21	10	15	21.2	83.4	Tier I
Naugatuck	Andrews Mountain Road	2,833,000							
**	Industrial Park Site	1,500,000							
**	Downtown Mixed-use development	250,000							
**	Uniroyal Site Cleanup& Demolition	15,000,000							
Newtown	Fairfield Hills Campus	23,000,000	20	16	10	16	23	85	Tier I
Oxford	“Loop Road” Upper Christian Street	1,940,000	20	18	9	12	23	82	Tier I
	Route 67 Improvements	2,500,000	11	10	9	8	23	61	Tier I
	Business Incubator	4,200,000	9.2	12	8.6	13.6	20	63.4	Tier III
**	Foreign Trade Zone	150,000							
Prospect	US Cap	1,000,000	10.2	11.4	9	10.6	24	65.2	Tier III

Naugatuck Valley Corridor Capital Project Tier Ranking

Municipality	Project	Cost	Employment Relationship Max 20 pts.	Economic Development Max 30 pts.	Adequacy Infrastructure Max 10 pts.	Planning/ Engineering Max 20 pts.	Local/State Regional Compliance Max 35 pts.	Score	Tier Ranking
Shelton	Commerce & Business Park Phase III	12,000,000	19.2	22	10	19	27.2	97.4	Tier I
Southbury	Commerce & Business Park	TBD	11.4	9	6.2	6.2	15.2	47.6	Tier III
Thomaston	Plume & Atwood Business Park	1,000,000	12.8	15.6	10	17	25.2	80.6	Tier I
Waterbury	Waterbury/Naugatuck Industrial Park	10,000,000	20.	28.8	10	16.4	22.8	98	Tier I
Waterbury	Multi-Modal Transportation Facility	TBD	12.6	15.2	11	8	23.4	70.2	Tier I
	Jackson St, Thomaston Ave. Connector	TBD	11.4	13.4	10.4	5.4	22.4	63	Tier II
	Naugatuck River Walkway	TBD	5.6	15.8	8.8	6	22.4	58.6	Tier II
	Redevelopment North End	TBD	5.4	10	9	4.6	19	48	Tier III
	Willow Street Redev. Ph II & III	TBD	11.2	22.6	10.4	14.6	24.4	83.2	Tier I
	Comprehensive Brownfields Multiple Sites	TBD	Not Ranked						Tier I
Bethlehem	No Projects								
Middlebury	No Projects								
Watertown	No Projects								
Woodbury	No Projects								

\*\* Not Rated



# Organization And Management

## Management/Leadership Continues

The same two Economic Development Corporations have been involved in the CEDS process since 1999. The Shelton Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) and the Naugatuck Valley Development Corporation now the Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC) accepted the management of the planning process for the eighteen-town area designated as the Naugatuck Valley Corridor (NVC). The Strategy was the initiation of the planning process for the NVC. The two corporations (SEDC/WDC) created the original Steering Committee consisting of the two regional planning agencies/councils of government and the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce and the Lower Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce.

The 1999 and 2004 CEDS approved documents continue today June 2007 as our guide for the future. For the purpose of this annual report we have chosen not to duplicate the history, but choose to have a vision for continued success.

The NVC has distinct strengths, which include but are not limited to local governments that care for business, a committed workforce and a pre-existing infrastructure that is conducive for business. The prime location of this district, including its transportation network Interstate I-84 on the North running East to West and CT Rt. 8 running North to South in the center of the Valley Corridor connects to the Merritt Parkway CT Rt. 15 and Interstate I-95.

The NVC also has serious problems. Initial survey respondents were generally concerned with a number of business-related expenses, such as tax rates and rising utility costs. They are particularly disturbed by Connecticut's high worker's compensation rates. In addition, even though the work force has its attributes, the bifurcation of the labor force between the older, skilled, reliable workers and the unskilled, younger, less reliable workers is a problem that needs to be addressed through increased training in high schools and community colleges.

The original Strategy indicated that the NVC needed to build upon past success and develop new strategies. For example, abandoned industrial sites, which contribute to the image that the NVC is a depressed area, should be inventoried, targeted and prioritized for clean-up because they are excellent locations for new business development. The Brownfields initiatives for the NVC have started to inventory properties and in some cases "clean up" is already in process. This will remain a priority for 2007/2008 of the CEDS.

As the two lead corporations determined in 1999 more time is needed to educate the district's business, civic, community, and political leaders. Example, projects that look town specific have a far-reaching regional effect. The individual strength of each town is not nearly as powerful and productive as the strength of the entire district.

## CEDS Process 2006/2007 - Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy



The two corporations acting as the parents and/or governing bodies accepted the responsibility of building on the original Strategy and the 2004 approved CEDS document and began the process to convert to the CEDS program. EDA recognized their leadership and overall community acceptance of the two corporations and commissioned SEDC and WDC to continue with the CEDS in 2007/2008.

### CEDS Governing/Parenting Committee

#### SEDC Executive Committee

Kenneth E. Schaible, Chairman	David M. Grant, 1 <sup>st</sup> Vice Chairman	Norman Santa 2 <sup>nd</sup> Vice Chairman	Ralph Matto, Secretary	William C. Partington, Treasurer
Tony Pogoda, Planning & Zoning	Mark A. Lauretti, Mayor	Fred Musante, Chairman, EDC	At Large: Fred Ruggio, Martin Coughlin, Michelle Kawalautzki, Patrick Carey	

#### WDC Executive Committee

William Morris, Chairman	John T. Daddona, Treasurer	Dr. Jon Jay De Temple, At Large	James Gatling, PhD, At Large
Sandra Vigliotti, Secretary	Joe Geary, Mayor's Office	Steve Sasala, Vice Chairman	J. Paul Vance, Jr., At Large

All the partners outlined below accepted the responsibility of building on the Strategy. Based on the effort, experience and general acceptance of previous efforts the following organization and management team are in place for the implementation of the CEDS.

### Steering Committee

The Steering Committee was expanded in 2003 to include a chairman. The chairman was familiar with the CEDS process based on her previous government relationships. The chairman accepted the responsibility of running the Steering Committee and the Strategy Committee. The Chairman is Sheila O'Malley. Currently she is the Economic Development Director for the City of Derby.



Members of the Steering Committee supported that the SEDC act as the lead administrative role for the implementation of the CEDS with assistance from the WDC. Both of these corporations have been recognized as leading regional economic development and community development, planning and implementation oriented agencies.

**Steering Committee Calendar for 2007/2008:**

The Steering Committee will meet quarterly in September, November, January, and June.

The Calendar for 2007/2008 for the Steering Committee is as follows:

September 25, 2007  
November 20, 2007

January 22, 2008  
June 17, 2008

**NVC Steering Committee**

Name & Title	Association	Represents
James E. Ryan, Chief Executive Officer	SEDC	Community Organizations, Municipalities & Regional Government
Sheila O'Malley, Chairman	City of Waterbury	Government and Municipal
Michael O'Connor, Chief Operating Officer	NVDC	Community Organizations, Municipalities & Regional Government
Richard Dunne, Executive Director	VCOG	Regional Governments
Peter Dorpalen, Executive Director	CNV/COG	Regional Governments
William E. Purcell, President and Chief Executive Officer	Greater Valley Chamber of Commerce	Business Community
Stephen R. Sasala, II, President & Chief Executive Officer	Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce	Commerce Business and Retail





### Strategy Committee

The SEDC and the WDC administrative staff have the responsibility, experience and knowledge to prepare the technical and administrative components of the overall CEDS implementation. Based on the initial experience of preparing the Economic Development Strategy for the 17 towns an initial framework was created to establish the foundation for a Strategy Committee. Building on the initial experience and working with EDA's Philadelphia Regional Office staff, the two corporations have during the annual process expanded their window of opportunity to include additional participation in the review and implementation of the Strategy, the capital project investment survey and development process, but more importantly a framework for ongoing assistance and participation. Organizations being represented include local governments, businesses, industry, finance, the professionals, labor, utilities, community organizations, public service agencies, racial or ethnic minorities, and women.

### Strategy Committee Calendar for 2007/2008:

The Strategy Committee will meet quarterly in September, November, January and June of every year or as needed.

The Calendar for 2007/2008 for the Strategy Committee is as follows:

September 25, 2007	January 22, 2008
November 20, 2007	June 17, 2008

Members of our Strategy Committee (names, occupations and areas they are representing are on file with both corporations. The Committee members broadly represent all interests of the 17 communities beginning with public leadership commencing with the two (2) Councils of Government that represent the 17 communities in the NVC area. These elected officials that form the Valley Council of Government and the Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Government are provided information regarding the preparation and content for the CEDS. Other members include the Executive Committee of SEDC and WDC Board of Directors, representatives of the Lower Naugatuck Valley Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce, local Planning and Zoning Commissions, Economic Development Commissions, Insurance Agency, Social Services Agency, Boards of Education, Community Organizations, Women and Minorities, and the Regional Planning Agencies that govern the 17 communities including the Valley Council of Governments and the Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Government.



### Working Relationships

The Strategy Committee at its quarterly meetings will monitor and review economic development trends (i.e. employment numbers) , the status of capital projects, and other economic conditions, i.e. the closing of manufacturing or businesses that impact a community of the corridor. Review recommendations from the support staff of SEDC and WDC, and recommend as appropriate amendments to the implementation plans/CEDS document. Also, assist communities with economic development grants to both federal and state agencies as our budget permits. Continue to work with community foundations that are located within the jurisdictional area of the 18 communities that have supported and continue to support the CEDS process.

Where appropriate the Strategy Committee, because of its community involvement, may be asked to contact local, state and federal legislators, either regarding implementation and/or legislation that will be beneficial to the corridor area.

### Staff Support

SEDC/WDC will continue to provide the day-to-day administrative functions and responsibilities for the overall strategy, working with chief elected officials of each municipality and/or their economic development agents. Their involvement will include collecting and disseminating information, assist with establishing implementation priorities, and monitoring existing programs to aid the region. The staff of the corporations and the consultant will provide both demographic and technical information regarding the ever changing population, out migrations from our major cities, and increased population in the rural communities within the NVC, economic and tax information provided as part of the overall planning and technical assistance aspect to the various committees.

The two corporations will annually submit to EDA requests for financial assistance to continue the CEDS process. Requests will also be made annually to other corporations in the NVC area to assist with the implementation and updating process required by the CEDS guidelines. The success of our funding partners will determine the levels of service the Corporations can provide.

### **The Capital Needs Evaluation Assessment Team**

The NVC CEDS area was expanded to include Newtown in the 2007 CEDS reporting area. The CEDS area will now have 18 communities.

The Committee during the past year encouraged all 18 communities to submit as available any type of capital improvement program for the Committee to review and include in the CEDS document. The Strategy Committee at its various public forums and at all of its quarterly report meetings advised the participating communities of the “open enrollment” opportunity for submission of projects. During the year new or revised projects were received from 9 communities (Ansonia, Beacon Falls, Derby, Naugatuck, Newtown, Prospect, Shelton, Oxford and Waterbury).



In addition, the Strategy Committee at its June 5, 2007 meeting reviewed the matrix for NVC capital improvement projects. The modified ranking system will better reflect projects that are “ready to go” as Tier I. Projects that are in final planning or design referred to as “mid-point” or Tier II. Projects that are not ready for implementation with planning and design in conceptual or early phases will be considered Tier III. Therefore, the Strategy Committee has revised the projects into these three categories:

- Tier I – ready for implementation 0-35 months
- Tier II – Mid-point 36/59 months
- Tier III – Long Term 60 months and beyond

The Committee is not ranking the projects beyond placing them in a tier category as defined above. See the overall matrix, which covers all projects received, ranked and rated to date. As of the June 5, 2007 meeting of the CEDS Strategy Committee, 13 municipalities out of 18 have submitted a project(s) for inclusion in the CEDS. A total of 35 capital investment projects will be included in the 2007 CEDS Annual Report.

The Committee at the June 5, 2007 meeting reviewed capital project responses from 7 communities (Ansonia, Beacon Falls, Oxford (2), Newtown, Shelton, Derby and Bethlehem).

Bethlehem acknowledges receipt of questionnaires and returned it without a project.

One community (Beacon Falls) provided a revision/modification for the four projects previously ranked and rated covering the timeframe for implementation.

Ansonia submitted a revision to its Fountain Lake Commerce Center, which was previously ranked and rated. Ansonia, also revised its downtown riverwalk and park program to reflect the most current schedules using FHWA funds as coordinated by DOT. Design will commence in June 2007 with potential for some phasing of the planned improvements.

Derby provided updates for its major downtown revitalization project and announced the hiring of a new Economic Development Director Ms. Sheilla O'Malley who began her new position on May 26, 2007.

Derby and Ansonia as part of the Rt. 8 Corridor study support the reconstruction of Division Street at Exit 19 off of Rt. 8. This is the planned first project for the upgrading and improvements to Rt. 8 that will improve the flow of traffic through the area. These improvements will further aid the Griffin Hospital Cancer Center that has been started on the corner of Division and Seymour Avenue in Derby.

Newtown, the newest community in the expanded CEDS area provided details for the Fairfield Hills Municipal Complex. The initial cost estimate is \$23,400,000 for the first five phases covering utilities, road design and construction infrastructure, loop systems, improved street lighting, some demolition of existing buildings will also take place and several municipal offices will be relocated to the new complex.



Oxford provided two new projects for incorporation into the CEDS. Rt. 67 improvements including a storm management plan and the “loop road” for upper Christian Street were ranked as Tier I projects.

Shelton submitted a plan for Phase III of the Commerce & Business Park. Design is in process and private developer has started on the first phase of renovating the old manufacturing building into residential with some commerce and office space planned for other structures, other projects were adjusted or modified to better reflect current timetables for the individual project.

### **Committee Work Program**

The staff received the demographic and economic background information from the consultant. The information was reviewed and analyzed by the staff and presented to the Strategy Committee and other regional organizations that have an interest in the economic viability of the region.

The Committees have accepted this information including transportation, housing and economic development initiatives of the various communities and began to analyze how the implementation plan would be phased over a period of time, and established a three tiered implementation designation:

Tier I – ready for implementation 0-35 months

Tier II – Mid-point 36/59 months

Tier III – Long Term 60 months and beyond

The background information that was presented to the Strategy Committee (attached to this submission) allowed for review, discussion and decision making predicated on local jurisdictional matters and/or regional concepts that have been considered and voted upon by the appropriate agencies.

# CEDS Implementation/Coordination of Partners

