



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC+)

Thursday, April 28, 2011 Minutes

Attendance:

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Rebecca Casey	√	Bud French	√	Hugh Coxe	√
Paul Bergkamp	√	Kurt Klebe	√	Jim Thibodeau	√
Steve Hendry	√	Sandra Lipsey	√	Julie Motherwell	√
Rachel Reed	-	Sam Rudman	√	Steve Walker	-
Claudia King	-				

Council Liaison: -
Staff present: Theo Holtwijk
Others present: -

Sam started the meeting at 7:06 PM.

1. Review of Draft Minutes

The draft minutes of April 14, 2011 were approved without any changes.

2. Discussion of Draft Survey Instrument

Theo gave an introduction to the survey draft he handed out. It is the same draft 6 that was distributed earlier, but has comments and suggestions noted from LPAC+ members and department heads, plus Bill Lunt. These are listed in their respective sections. Draft 6 was developed by Sam, Sandra and Theo incorporating the comments made at the last meeting. Nathan Poore also weighed in on this draft. In addition, Market Decisions (MD) reviewed the draft and MD's positive comments were distributed to the committee.

The Committee proceeded to review draft 6 of the survey.

Table of Contents

Sandra suggested a reordering of the sections. The group was OK with that.

Intro Statement

The group agreed to add that its work was done "at the request of the Town Council."

Introductory Question

There were no changes to this section.

Driving, Bicycling, and Walking

The group agreed to add “among others” at the end of the second introduction. The group agreed to add “where” in Q15. The group discussed the comment from Jay Reynolds. Some felt it was more a policy question for Public Works to the Council and that it was not a concept that the group had been after. Others felt that the suggestion raised other questions, such as what other State roads this may apply to. Sandra felt that it was a question that could help to educate the public and many people had an expectation that their roads would be fixed. It was clarified that there was no prohibition for towns to fix State roads, but just a matter of availability of financial resources. Theo believed the typical State-Town cost share is 80%-20%, and that Jay was asking how people felt about a 0%-100% split between State and Town. The group agreed to add a new intro and the requested question. Theo will review it with Nathan and Jay.

The group agreed to add “currently” to Q22.

The group discussed the Police Chief’s comments. It felt that Q24 afforded people an opportunity to comment on the bicycle issue raised (without being prompted about it). In response to the personal safety/crime response issue, the group agreed to add “crime prevention” to the Town services list on page 21.

Public Wastewater Disposal

Jim explained his suggested edits. He felt that some of that had been lost in the proposed language. The group felt that the intro needed to be fleshed out to explain things better and that some of Jim’s language could be included there. It liked the simplicity of the questions that were proposed to be used. It agreed to use some of Jim’s language in his Q5c with Q6, and incorporate language from Jim’s Q5e into Q7. It agreed to add “water and other utilities” to the text as suggested by Jim and Bill Lunt and change the heading. Some edits were proposed to the intro. The group agreed to add “where feasible” to Q5. Becca noted that the Town has more control over sewer as it has its own department than water, which is controlled regionally.

Alternative Energy

The group agreed with Bill Lunt to expand the list of possible alternative energy sources. This mentioned once in the intro and “such as wind and solar” will be deleted from the questions.

Residential Development

The group brainstormed a list of compact housing examples in Falmouth to add to the intro. Some asked if a definition of compact housing or example lot sizes should be added to the introduction. The group made an effort to revise the questions to test various types of compact housing in various settings, but in the end agreed through a straw vote to ask higher level questions. These questions would address if compact housing should be optional or mandatory, if compact housing should be in existing or in new neighborhoods, and if it should be single family housing or multi-family housing. Hugh commented that the past compact housing study had resolved several issues, but not necessarily where geographically compact housing should be built. The group agreed to collapse Q7-9 and Q10-14 into two questions. The group with Julie’s suggestion to make Q15 more broad and speak to “residential development” and not just compact housing.

On the master planning section, Jim felt that if people were not familiar with past master planning efforts, they should not answer Q2, Q3, Q5 or Q6. The group agreed with that. Becca suggested that alternative collaborative efforts should be added, besides neighborhood master planning. Jim suggested to add contract zoning. Jim also suggested to add a new question to ask if the zoning ordinance should be treated as a guideline and not a requirement. The group did not agree with that suggestion. The group agreed to make Q9 more broad.

Commercial Development

The group agreed to leave this section as is.

Open Space Preservation

The group agreed to add an intro to Q10 that reflect the recent ordinance change the Council made and what the current requirements were. The group agreed with the proposed edits in Q11-Q30.

Town Center

The group agreed with the proposed edit in this section.

Town Services

The group agreed with proposed edits in Q1. It also added “crime prevention” to “police protection.” It agreed with Ethan’s suggestion to add a question to learn more if people are not satisfied with Town services. It agreed with the edits in Q2. The group did not delete the library. The group acknowledged the comment from Barbara Powers.

Conclusion

The group agreed to add “roads” to “driving,” add a “public water” listing, and keep the “school services” listing even though there are no school questions. There was a suggestion to add walking and bicycling together, but the group did not go along with that. The group also did not add the library as these were intended to be a prioritization of the section headings only.

Demographics

The group agreed to state “public” instead of “Town” with the water and sewer questions.

The next step is for Theo to make the required changes, send those to LPAC+, the CDC as well as Market Decisions. LPAC+ members can make any proposed edits until early afternoon Monday May 2nd. Sandra, Sam, and Theo will meet with CDC on Monday at 6:30 PM in the library room. Other LPAC+ members are invited to attend. Any changes by CDC will be made on May 3-4. The final proposed survey will be posted to the Council agenda for May 9th meeting on May 5th. The Council meeting is May 9th at 7:00 PM. LPAC+ members are invited to attend. Any changes from that will be made on May 10th. The hope is to launch the survey on May 16th.

3. Survey Marketing Update

Julie presented the updated marketing materials. The group made some suggested edits to the letter, poster, e-mail message and Forecaster ad. Julie will make changes and will give the group one more opportunity for feedback before finalizing things.

Theo will get exact survey dates from Market Decisions, so the ad dates and promotion can be planned accordingly. The survey will be up for one month.

4. Next Meeting

The next LPAC+ meeting will be on **Thursday May 12th at 7 PM.**

The group will at that time discuss its schedule and next steps as well as its plan for public meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 PM.

Draft Meeting Notes by Theo Holtwijk, April 29, 2011 rev. May 20, 2011