

Minutes  
Culture, History and Governance (CHuG)  
Sub-Committee  
May 16, 2007

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

We discussed the following:

- We reviewed the recent Steering Committee notes. The big CLRPC meeting will be held on 19 June at 7:30 PM to review the work of the subcommittees. There probably will not be another CLRPC meeting until just before the State of the Town
- We discussed our general perception of the work of the CLRCP. It was considered that the meetings in their previous form were not very productive which possibly could be a reflection on their focus and the natural confusion of the process at the time. It was felt that they should really become a forum for the subcommittees where the latter could exchange their views and interact with each other about the overall agenda.
- We then reviewed the town 'interviews' to date (see also the particular notes about the interviews)
- Concord:
  - Its work is contained in two binders – one, the MP and the other, the appendix with the supporting documentation
  - There were 12 people on the committee who did all the work, with each taking one important topic, and also acting in support on other topics
  - The committee was composed of a large percentage of senior volunteers, since they were more likely to have the time available. The work became well-nigh full time – there were over 100 meetings! (Can a MP effort really be done with only volunteers?)
  - The consultants: they received mixed reviews. They helped primarily by injecting general ideas into the process and, in summarizing, editing and writing.
  - They had one major public meeting, attended by about 70 people.
  - The eventual product was kept out of the lime-light: the committee felt they had sufficient buy-in. It should be noted that the CLRPC was a creation of the Selectmen: who provided an elaborate and detailed charge, which the committee followed. Both the Planning Board and the Selectmen were represented on the committee. The end product was checked against the charge. (Note also that the schools did not wish to take part and were not part of the MP work.)
  - The Culture and History Element received little priority and was eventually left to one person to complete (with help from the Town Clerk). There was great reliance placed on past efforts to inventory and describe the resources. Recommendations in the final plan were general. Consulting help in this Element was minimal and of marginal use.

- Governance – and also Finance – were a late addition to the MP work, and were only tackled in a general sense. On governance there were a number of internal issues and thus the work was not greatly satisfactory
- The greatest driver in the MP effort was land use
- Concord is now proceeding with some of the recommendations: e.g. their program of ‘village overlay’, treating various parts of Concord as self-contained ‘villages’
- The MP has become a reference point/background to Concord’s planning actions.
- Wayland:
  - The MP committee consisted of 11 members – though, as they represented the major boards/committees, they could draw upon the members of these groups for assistance
  - The consultants were not considered particularly satisfactory (maybe because of numerous personnel changes – project managers kept leaving the firm and had to be replaced – which added considerably to the time-table). The committee did most of the research and used the consultants mainly to write the report.
  - The process started with a visioning process and a preparation of a Precursor Plan
  - The main driver was land-use.
  - On Cultural-Historic resources there was little work done other than a cursory reference to a few
  - There is a separate Preservation Plan. Governance was also handled separately
  - The public outreach was confined to three focus group meetings – attended by about 40 people each.
  - There was no update of an existing traffic study
  - There was no charge from the Selectmen and at the end no real buy-in – the MP was not approved by the Selectmen and was not taken to Town Meeting (considered too difficult). Thus the report sits on the shelf
  - There was an intent to prepare an Implementation Plan, which would have helped but which never happened. (Note that in ’98-99 there was a smaller mini MP, which was adopted by the Selectmen at the time and which was implemented.)
  - The current MP is considered to cover a period for the next 7-10 years
- Bolton:
  - The Selectmen called for volunteers and eventually named a committee of eight (four of whom were former selectmen)
  - They had a consultant but it was considered that this was inadequately funded (45K rather than what might have been a better figure of 100K)
  - Again, land-use was a driving force and Bolton had begun to implement some of the land-use recommendations
  - Lincoln is often held up as a model town to follow.
  - A few years previously there had been a historic preservation plan which was considered useful
  - Bolton has now passed an Agricultural By-law, and they are also in the process of becoming a CPA town
- Bill is attempting to follow up with Harvard and has made numerous telephone calls – but so far to little effect; he will continue to persevere

- Having reviewed our work to date, what are our conclusions? What have we learned? Paul will attempt to summarize and will circulate a memo for our review and commentary
- In dealing with Governance, we need to look at our support staff and assess their adequacy – what are their job-descriptions? This is a heads-up from Concord, where the majority of the MP budget was spent on the town clerk and his staff
- From Lincoln’s perspective we reiterated that we value our historic antecedents and intend to preserve them. The issue to examine: how should this be integrated into our overall perspective and how are we going to move into our current and future times. (It was suggested that we have a conversation with Bob Lemire and see how his ideas of some time ago have played out since)
- Our next meeting will focus on our Mission Statement using Jack’s last draft as the basis
- Also, as Susan will be away, she will put down her ideas in a memo
- We also need to think about how Finance impacts our Mission Statement
- As an administrative aside, our meeting minutes will be posted by Chuck Miller in a separate CHuG box on the CLRPC site (PS to e-mail to Chuck)

Next meetings:

- May 23 at **7:00** AM
- May 30 at 7:30 AM (need to nominate a temporary scribe – PS will be away)