

**Joint Meeting of the Subcommittees
Cultural and Historic Resources, and Governance (CHuG), and
Land Use and Economic Development (LUED)**

Town Hall Lower Conference Room

3 November 2008, 7:30 PM

Attendees:

LUED: Ken Bassett, Sarah Guerrero, Buzz Constable, Bob Domnitz, Anna Hardman,
Bryce Wolf

CHuG: Sarah Canon Holden, Paul Giese, Karen Keane, Jack MacLean, Harriet Todd,
Bill Stason, Peter Sugar

Others: Noah Eckhouse, Neil Feinberg

We discussed the following:

- The meeting was called at the request of Ken Hurd, chair of the Steering Committee of CLRPC, in order that the two subcoms iron out any remaining differences related to the topic of commercial development and tax revenues
- PS opened the proceedings by explaining CHuG's chronology of its work regarding the draft goal of 'targeted commercial development':
 - The confusion arose out of not having a definition of what each word – such as 'targeted' – really meant
 - The phrase occurred initially in CLRPC's Proposed Committee Structure (1/29/07) under CHuG's purpose: "Consideration should be given to alternatives to the property tax to expansion of the tax base through targeted commercial development ..."
 - It was reiterated in a CHuG memo on its Mission, Goals and Objectives (11/28/07), under looking at Financial Management of the Town: "Examine alternatives to the current tax base, such as property tax alternatives and targeted commercial development"
 - We spoke about it again under CHuG's draft goals of 9/10/08: "Explore opportunities for a commercial component to assist the town in its financial well-being"
 - We used 'targeted commercial development' in our first draft for the presentation bullets (for SoTT) – distributed around the beginning of October
 - Since that time we revised the bullet which now reads: "Explore opportunities for increasing the tax base through revenues such as service fees, and existing or new commercial sources" and which will be a part of our SoTT presentation
- PS concluded that CHuG never expected to work through the bullet in detail – leaving this task to LUED – and any refinement would be left either to the implementation plan - still to be defined - or to work by others after the production of the final MP
- In response to a question as what we meant by 'service fees' we indicated that, as an example, these could be fees charged for the ability to park at the commuter station, while using the train to go into town
- Buzz suggested that the revised CHuG language reflects the intent of the LUED premise that any new development should be considered in the context of assessment criteria such as those described in the LUED report. Potential development around Lincoln Station is cited as meeting many of those assessment criteria.
- The aims of CHuG and LUED may be considered as complimentary, CHuG touching on policy goals and LUED dealing with criteria for development: see LUED's draft assessment criteria for development and in particular:

“Enhances the long-term financial stability of town government:

- Seeks to offset its direct and indirect costs to the town
 - To that end, the town may pursue conventional tax revenues, developer contributions to finance needed expansion of public facilities or use of resources, and Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILOTS) from not-for-profit activities
- Provides additional net revenue to the town to fulfill public goals and objectives”
- It was generally agreed that we cannot avoid having some overlaps as each subcom develops its final goals and objectives – these are bound to bring differing perspectives to the fore, to be ironed out by COG in the final MP document.

The meeting was adjourned.