

Minutes
Culture, History and Governance (CHuG)
Sub-Committee
November 18, 2008

Present: Sarah Cannon Holden, Paul Giese, Mark Hochman, Karen Keane, Jack MacLean, Harriet Todd, Peter Sugar; also Mark Whitehead

The meeting was in the context of a follow up to SoTT. Re: the latter, we only had one visitor: Marcus Gleysteen (architect, 39 Sandy Pond Road). He expressed his general frustration with SoTT: too much time spent in describing process and who the members of the committees were and not enough time on issues and ideas. He also noted the general age of the attendees – considering himself one of the youngest there (he is 53)!

He stated that most people do not know enough about what is being planned (there are too many assumptions made, and not enough of the town understands what is going on). Then, when going to the website, they cannot find the information. As an example, he tried to find the date and time of the SoTT follow-up and could not, finally having to call Town Hall.

Just showing up at TM is not enough. If one is interested in getting buy-in, one needs to organize neighborhood meetings in various locations to inform the public.

Karen observed, that what he was saying is exactly what we – ChuG – have been acknowledging in the formulation of our goals and recommendations, many of which are also reinforced by what we have culled from the survey.

He also brought up the point about an individual's right and the ability to promote diversity, while, on the other side, understanding a town's desire to maintain its general character.

Marcus expressed a willingness to volunteer and work with one of the town committees as he feels very strongly about these issues.

Re: CHuG's specific agenda, we discussed the following:

- PS reviewed the recent telephone conversation he had with Judi Barrett about what the remaining tasks are and the overall schedule which is getting very tight:
 - Any final comments on our goals are due by the end of this week
 - The revised drafts of the working papers are being issued on 26 November
 - Comments are due back, at the latest, by 19 December
 - COG will be working on the implementation plan between 26 November and 19 December
 - In light of the above, she felt that we really do not have time for interviews or any other additional work, and specifically because anything which may emerge between now and the end of the year could no longer get into Master Plan
- We then turned to a discussion about Bill's proposal to conduct a series of interviews with various staff members, and Harriet's response to Bill, that we should restrict such interviews to a very few.
- Also indicated was the need, if we were to conduct such interviews, for our questions to be properly defined, and the results of the interview carefully analyzed and summarized to draw appropriate conclusions to incorporate into the document. This is not a process which we could rush through without an adequate time-frame.
- Mark H. supported the notion of additional interviews, and commented that the consultants would simply have to live with this. It was pointed out, however, that COG's schedule was known for a long time, and if there was to be a party to be blamed for not having carried out adequate outreach – vis-a-vis the staff – the culprit was CHuG and not COG.
- In the end the majority of us agreed that we were in no position to do any further interviews. Rather, we must ensure that the interviews of the staff become part of the implementation plan.

Any resultant modification of our goals would be part of the development of the MP down the line.

- Sarah felt that our goals were fine, with one very minor amendment (“Explore *additional* opportunities for regionalization of services”). She was also going to check with Tim as to any other issues he may have had with our goals (Tim has since called me and agreed that what we had produced was very much in line with his thinking)
- We also discussed implementation – it is important for the various boards and committees to buy into the goals and the overall MP, and for TM to accept it in order for the document not to end up on the shelf. COG must lay out and define the process. It is likely that the Planning Board will be the body eventually assigning the various parts to the different committees. We also posed the question as to whether there should be a small implementation committee to oversee the process.
- The essence among other things will be flexibility. The recommendations are not cast in stone and modifications will occur during the plan’s evolution

Next meeting: **7:30 AM on Thursday (note: not Wednesday) at the Library on 4 December** (the idea being that by then we will have read the revised draft paper from COG and will be able to discuss it in detail)