

TOWN OF LINCOLN
MINUTES OF COMPREHENSIVE LONG RANGE PLAN COMMITTEE
Subcommittees General Meeting
October 25, 2007, 7:30pm

ATTENDANCE:

Ken Hurd	Chairman and HOBE sub-committee
Peter Sugar	CHuG Sub-committee
Harriet Todd	CHuG Sub-committee
Jack Maclean	CHuG Sub-committee
Susan Brooks	CHuG Sub-committee
Sarah Cannon Holden	CHuG sub-committee/ Board of Selectmen
Jacqueline Apsler	HOBE Sub-committee
Rayna Caplan	HOBE Sub-committee
Ben Horne	HOBE Sub-committee
Ken Bassett	LUED Sub-committee
Anna Hardman	LUED Sub-committee
Chris Klem	LUED sub-committee
Noah Eckhouse	FACTS sub-committee
Angela Seaborg	Conservation Planner
Tim Higgins	Town Administrator
Buzz Constable	LUED sub-committee
Judi Barrett	Community Opportunities Group
Patti Kelleher	Community Opportunities Group
Mark Whitehead	Town Planner
Catherine Perry	Planning Admin.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ken Hurd welcomed the attendees, especially new members. He introduced Judi Barrett and Patti Kelleher from Community Opportunities Group, to those who have not already met them.

Mr. Hurd explained that the main purpose of the meeting is for the sub-committees to share information and begin to be aware of areas of overlapping interest. He stressed the importance of an efficient process, to make good use of volunteers' time. It has been decided to aim for a major public outreach event in February. Mr. Hurd outlined the roles of various components of the CLRP organizational structure, as follows:

- Consultant: help with obtaining data and conducting outreach; distill data; develop balanced plan; develop implementation plan
- Steering Committee: decision making
- Sub-committee Chairs: liaison between the sub-committees and other parts of the structure
- Full CLRP Committee: public outreach.

The format of Lincoln's plan remains to be determined but Mr. Hurd commended Concord's plan as a model.

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT WORK PLANS

Judi Barrett explained that she was asked to do an assessment of the sub-committees' work to date. She has set out her findings in a memorandum. She has also produced a sample of a work plan to help the sub-committees to plan their work. Copies were distributed. Ms. Barrett explained that she sees COG as preparing working papers which will mesh with the more goal and policy oriented work of the sub-committees to produce chapters of the plan.

The sample work table identifies, for each activity: who is responsible; the target start and end dates; and products or outputs. Ms. Barrett suggests that each sub-committee try to break down and plan its work in this way, and check if its workload is realistic. Also the exercise should help sub-committees to flag any information needs at an early stage. COG will be happy to review the plans or provide technical assistance by email. It was agreed to produce the preliminary draft work plans in time for the next Steering Committee meeting on November 13, with copies to Ms. Barrett by November 9 so that she can identify any overlaps, and to produce final drafts by November 20.

COG plans to produce a series of working papers between mid January and the end of February, and expects to take each to the next level with sub-committee input in about 90 days from production.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS: PROGRESS AND ISSUES

a) Housing and Built Environment (HOBE)

Ken Hurd said that the Sub-committee hoped to conduct a visual preferences survey. It is currently revising its approach but intends to present some visual materials for the public to respond to. Affordable housing has not really been addressed as an issue yet but the group has information ready to use.

b) Land Use and Economic Development (LUED)

Chris Klem reported that this group has not met regularly because of scheduling problems. Nevertheless, it has reviewed a wealth of information in past planning documents, and has some ideas about land use issues. It hopes to make use of GIS mapping. On the economic development side, the group is less sure of its approach; this topic is usually seen as primarily a matter of land use but other matters such as the role of non-profit organizations may be relevant.

c) Cultural and Historic Resources and Governance (CHUG)

Peter Sugar reported that the Sub-committee has had regular meetings. It has catalogued and characterized institutions in town, including educational, arts and religious organizations, and selected eight for interviewing. It hopes to complete this stage of work by Thanksgiving, and may add other interviews depending on what the initial results show. Some of this work may cross over into the governance topic, which the group has not yet addressed, and also overlap with other sub-committees' interests.

The group is considering a survey of citizens, which will need careful design. Mr. Sugar asked for other sub-committees to review the draft (available shortly) to see if they have questions to add.

Mr. Sugar mentioned that the group has been diligent in posting its minutes to the website and emailing them to the Chairs of the other groups, and he asked for the favor to be returned.

d) Services, Facilities, Circulation and Transportation (FACTS)

Noah Eckhouse described the group’s work on the two parts of its topic. Under services and facilities, it has drafted a goals statement. It has looked at the past work of service-providing committees and at their current plans or key issues, and it is working on a rationale for future decisions. The public input from the June 19 meeting was useful. The sub-committee sees its role on facilities and services planning as process oriented. It will be posting material on the website for comments.

Under the traffic and circulation element, the group has looked at past reports and Journal articles. It notes that traffic conditions are worsening, and hopes to make use of discussion at the State of the Town Meeting. It also hopes to interact with the other sub-committees.

e) Open Space, Recreation and Natural Resources (OSNR)

Angela Seaborg spoke in place of Jim Meadors. She explained that this component of the plan is on a different timetable because the Open Space and Recreation Plan has already been drafted and will stand alone as well as forming part of the CLRP. She expressed the view that the OSRP did a good job in being aware of potential interactions with other topics. The detailed mapping carried out may be useful to other sub-committees. State feedback on the plan has recently been received, and there is still the opportunity for comment; the plan is on the website.

Mrs. Seaborg reported that the group that prepared the plan has currently disbanded but hopes to conduct interchange via the Conservation Commission as work on the CLRP progresses. Mr. Higgins commented that the OSRP proposes a shift in emphasis towards land stewardship rather than acquisition, which may affect the nature of future interactions.

In conclusion, Mr. Hurd expressed a hope for the Steering Committee to be kept informed of future progress by each of the sub-committees and an intention on its part to help with coordination.

WEBSITE

Mr. Higgins outlined the new organization of the website. From the main page of the Town website (www.lincolntown.org), the CLRP page can be accessed via the compass symbol. On the CLRP page, there are now icons for each of the sub-committees. Materials for posting should be emailed to Chuck Miller (millercc@lincolntown.org). Mr. Higgins urged the sub-committee Chairs (or nominated representatives) to keep the site up to date.

DISCUSSION: OVERLAPS, CONCERNS AND PROCESS

Judi Barrett led a discussion. She said that in her meetings with the sub-committees she has listened for areas of overlapping subject matter and opportunities to coordinate work. Teardowns may be an example of something that is of interest to more than one group. In such cases, it can be decided either that one group will take the lead or that the topic will be split into aspects for each group to address.

Sarah Cannon Holden suggested that it will be most important to identify overlaps and to coordinate efforts before approaching the public. Noah Eckhouse suggested keeping a spreadsheet showing which sub-committees have interviewed or consulted

which staff or outside organizations. Mrs. Cannon Holden proposed that sub-committee Chairs email the others before starting a consultation exercise.

Bryce Wolf said that she was concerned about the potential for omissions; sub-committees may wrongly assume that another group is addressing something. Ms. Barrett suggested that work plans, and published minutes, will be helpful here. She urged greater evenness in maintaining a documented record. Both COG and the Steering Committee will try to look out for obvious gaps.

In terms of liaison with staff, it was agreed to schedule a session of the Department Heads' monthly meeting for an interactive discussion on the CLRP. Individual members of staff can be invited to add comments afterwards if they wish. Ms. Barrett asked if there were ever joint meetings of town committees; a recent special joint meeting of the land use-related committees was mentioned.

There was a discussion on the best balance between 'silos' and an 'umbrella' as organizational approaches to developing understanding of issues. It was agreed that there is merit in allowing creative thinking to develop in small groups, and resolving conflicts at a later stage.

Noah Eckhouse raised a question about how far the sub-committees should go in trying to solve issues; his own preference was for the plan to set a process rather than specify the answers, and he felt there was a risk of unevenness. Ms. Barrett commented that communication and work plans will help with examining this and working it out over time. She suggested that the answer may vary between issues; for some it may be possible to develop a prioritized list of projects with timelines, while for others it may be more realistic for the plan to set out a process for decision making. Some participants wondered whether the level of detail achieved in the OSRP is realistic for the rest of the CLRP. Mrs. Seaborg suggested that some issues may need to be addressed at a site-specific level, particularly where needs for new sites for particular facilities are identified.

Mr. Hurd said that the HOBE sub-committee would find it useful to have some ideas on issues from COG at an early stage. It was agreed that COG will provide some suggestions across all topics after seeing the initial work plans.

NEXT STEPS

Copies of a timeline were distributed. February 2 is the proposed date for the public forum, and a number of intermediate deadlines have been laid out. Additional points are:

- Draft work plans to Judi Barrett by November 9
- Start thinking about and organizing sub-committee outreach scheduled for November-February
- Preliminary goals and objectives for December 18: the emphasis is on preliminary
- The public forum on February 2 will need careful planning. Mark Whitehead, Tim Higgins and Anita Scheipers will give it some initial consideration; ideas by November 13
- January may be a good time for any small scale neighborhood or focus group meetings

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10pm.

Submitted by Catherine Perry