

**TOWN OF LINCOLN  
MINUTES OF COMPREHENSIVE LONG RANGE PLAN  
STEERING COMMITTEE**

**Held on June 10, 2009**

**At 2:00 PM in the Donaldson Room, Lincoln Town Offices**

**PRESENT:** Peter Sugar, Ken Bassett, Noah Eckhouse, Tim Higgins, Mark Whitehead, Anita Scheipers, Sara Mattes, Catherine Perry  
Ken Hurd participated via speaker phone.

**DISCUSSION OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Following the Steering Committee meeting the previous Wednesday, comments on the Executive Summary had been relayed to Judi Barrett and she had asked for further guidance on certain questions. A small group consisting of Ken Hurd, Mark Whitehead, Peter Sugar and Tim Higgins had met on Friday to discuss these points and had drafted an email to Ms. Barrett. The current meeting is to confirm or revise the contents of the email.

The questions were discussed as follows:

- 1) Themes or headings  
The previous meeting suggested using headings somewhat similar to the first Implementation Plan to structure the Executive Summary, rather than the three headings used in the draft. The proposed headings are: land use policy, town character, governance and civic responsibility, assets and resources, infrastructure and communications, transportation, and finances and economic sustainability. There was some discussion as to whether it was clear enough where open space fitted. It is covered under assets and resources, and it was agreed that this would become clear to a reader. The headings were therefore agreed upon.
- 2) and 3) Narrative description v. bulleted list, and how to include goals  
The sub-group favored grouping the goals by logical synergies, as suggested by Peter Sugar. An example was given of a statement summarizing what the Plan was trying to achieve in a broad subject area, followed by a list of the relevant goals (as letter and number references). The Steering Committee considered that although the code references do not make for easy reading, they are useful for connecting the concepts to the goals. Therefore this approach was approved.
- 3) Text on balancing preservation with tax base needs  
The language used in discussing economic development/ sustainability issues in both the Executive Summary and the goals and objectives was reviewed. It was agreed that the emphasis should be on the proposal for an economic development committee. The role of the committee will include examining revenue projections, discussing town needs and wants, and examining trade-offs with quantification of the potential for new development to generate revenue and to be accommodated environmentally (including the Lincoln Station area). The Executive Summary should mention the committee and hint at its charge. The wording of the goals and

recommendations should be adjusted to: make Goal ED-2 the broader exercise; include something like “assess different scenarios” as a recommendation; and adjust or remove recommendations ED-2.3 and 2.4. The proposed economic development committee could consider, as part of its work, whether there should be a proactive search for development sites or a reactive approach.

### **OTHER PLAN ISSUES**

Sara Mattes commented that, having looked back at the Elliott-Braun Study, she feels the Plan needs a “50,000 foot view” and a bibliography including references to what has gone before. She noted that a publication titled *Coming Together – Lincoln 250* produced in 2004 included a listing of previous work. Noah Eckhouse also considered that the Plan would benefit from a more forward-looking tone and less external voice.

Ms. Mattes has drafted some introductory paragraphs to set the Plan in context. Mark Whitehead reported that Judi Barrett was intending to write a preface, which might include an acknowledgement of the work done by the committees. It was agreed that the Town will provide wording for the preface. Ms. Mattes suggested that it could mention the state’s requirements, the Town’s process, the balancing of considerations and the continuing or iterative nature of the planning process.

Ms. Mattes noted that she needs to update the sections of the Plan documents on Hanscom.

Ken Bassett pointed out that in the revision of the Implementation Plan, the section which gave guidelines on setting up the Implementation Committee has been lost. He felt this section was useful. Mr. Hurd reported that he included a request to reinstate an introduction about the process, in the draft email to Ms. Barrett. The request was supported.

In line with the discussion at the last Steering Committee meeting, the email also asks COG to group the goals in the Implementation Plan, along similar lines to the Executive Summary, prior to the committee’s task of prioritizing them.

### **FINANCE REPORT**

Mr. Whitehead reported that an invoice has been received from COG for \$ 9,145.00 for the final 15% of work on the chapters. The amount remaining in the budget is \$17,350.00.

A motion was proposed, seconded and passed unanimously, to approve payment of the invoice.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Submitted by Catherine Perry