

Minutes  
Culture, History and Governance (CHuG)  
Sub-Committee  
May 2, 2007

Present: Susan Brooks, Paul Giese, Nancy Henderson, Mark Hochman, Sarah Cannon-Holden, Karen Keane, Jack MacLean, Bill Stason, Harriet Todd, Peter Sugar

We discussed the following:

- We reviewed some of the major points we discussed during Paul's absence. These included:
  - Steering Committee meetings: the next one is scheduled for this Friday
  - The upcoming meeting with CLRPC, where all subcommittees will make their progress reports: the intent is to set up a meeting before the summer
- Team reports:
  - Team 1: Mark Hochman reported on his efforts to speak with the Concord people. He was largely stone-walled by the town planner (whose only suggestion was that we should look at the ongoing 'Concord Villages' initiative). Mark then pursued some of his other possible contacts, including Tim Blancke who is the chair of the comprehensive long range plan effort and who is eager to talk with us. One of his recommendations was that we do not go through Town Meeting (too long) – though we do not believe that this would be the case in Lincoln. He also recommended that we look at the Appendix in the Concord Master Plan. They received some monies from the state for the planning effort (\$30,000) – and we could investigate under what heading these funds were obtained. Mark also reiterated the recommendations he received from Larry Vail and Terry Szold of MIT, that we take a look at the American Planning Association (APA) website and publications.
  - Team 2: PS explained the frustrations he faced in trying to get information and the name of the contact person from Dover – the Planning Board assistant essentially refused to give us the information (an issue of the volunteer's privacy). Thus we need to find another town to talk with. Speaking with Team 3, we agreed that Team 2 will look at Wayland and Team 3 will follow-up with Harvard. (Note, that Karen has a long-time business association with Bolton, and she will look into whether Bolton may be a good town to investigate.)
  - In any event we will make every effort to have these interviews completed by our next meeting.
- In conducting our interviews, it was emphasized that we should follow the guidelines we established in drawing up our questionnaires: the aim is to discover what was learnt in the process for us to be able to model our own efforts on.
- Another important point is that we focus specifically on the task our subcommittee has been charged with and not expand the enquiry into the larger picture of how the overall Mater Plan effort was conducted, except in so far as to note such points as they may come into the conversation.

- Also: what thought was given by these towns to the continuing effort of updating their MP: every five years? (E.g.: Wayland has included in their MP the intent of systematically updating their MP in five year's time – 2009)
- We agreed that the meeting with CLRPC will include not just a rep from each subcommittee but all members of the subcommittee
- We discussed Governance. We agreed that we will have a lunch meeting, where we can get together and have a more focused discussion. Bullet points will be sent via e-mail for us to think about for the meeting (Sarah and Susan to meet to talk about topics, which could include such things as:
  - Complexity of issues
  - How to deal with these as well as how to involve/reach out to newer/younger members of our population
  - The impact of what surrounding towns are doing – (specific reference to Waltham)
  - Comments made by some (Verizon) that small towns are obstructionist!
  - The culture of governance
  - The role of the Moderator
- Mission Statement: we are almost there: it sets the purpose, it details the various sub-tasks, it enumerates the elements under CHuG, it covers the coordination with others/other subcommittees, it lays out the process for action (Jack will finalize)
- Communication: At the last meeting with Chuck Miller, it was suggested that we in fact establish a blog and then place all our information on the blog (each subcommittee can have its own blog). The blogs would be password protected but otherwise accessible. We would deposit all minutes and critical documents and reports but not all our e-mail traffic. The essence is to be succinct and to the point.
- We returned to some of the topics which have been assigned – perhaps incorrectly – to various subcommittees: e.g. finance assigned to CHuG, evaluation of buildings to Housing/Built Environment. Sarah will take this up with the Steering Committee.
- Also: point 1 in the State's charge: should not be a bi-product of the MP but rather a departure point permeating the whole effort.

Next meetings:

- CHuG: May 16 at 7:30 AM
- Governance lunch (all invited): May 11 at noon – Donaldson Room – brown bag