



# Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC+)

## Thursday, May 10, 2012 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:** -

The meeting was called to order by Sam Rudman at 7:03 PM.

**1. Minutes**

The minutes of April 26, 2012 were approved with the addition to the first sentence of the fourth paragraph of page 2 that reads “Becca noted that data on the age of housing stock should be added” to the following: “as well as a note referencing the archaeological, historic, and cultural resources chapter for older homes.”

**2. Draft Chapter Review**

Sam mentioned his recent e-mail in which he encouraged the committee members to also offer solutions to issues or problems they may see with draft chapters. Members were in general agreement, but some also felt that they had been operating in that manner already.

There was also a discussion on the formatting change that had been suggested. The idea is to put the State goal and the conclusions at the beginning of each chapter, so the reader can decide if he/she wants to read more. The group felt that this was a good change.

Archaeological, historic and cultural resources

- It was noted that action #6 regarding a Veterans Memorial was already under way.
- Becca stated that the action priorities apply to this chapter only and would not necessarily be priorities for the overall plan.

- There was a discussion if the policies stated were actually actions or not and what the difference between “policies” and “actions” were. Sam consulted Wikipedia for the group. From the Merriam Webster dictionary, one definition of the word policy is “a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions”.
- Bud suggested that the historical narrative be shortened. Others felt that it was informative.
- Sam wondered if action #1 was already addressed in the current Conservation Overlay District. To some extent this is the case, but it does not apply anywhere else.
- Steve W. suggested adding “islands” to “The Brothers” as not everyone may know them. He asked what the criteria for National Register sites are.
- Jim felt that the first action did not provide enough direction. He also suggested that any regulations should not come with excessive financial burdens for the property owner. Becca will reword this action.
- Sandra wondered if action #1 meant that the Town does not have sufficient data to know if a site is significant or not. The reply was that this is indeed the case as evidenced by action #3 which recommended that several inventories be completed. Theo suggested reordering the actions to make them flow better. Sandra suggested that action #1 could be revised to say “As a result of the surveys conducted...”
- Jim talked about a headstone he had discovered in his basement, the history associated with that headstone, and that there were no policies in place to deal with discoveries like that.
- The subcommittee will edit this chapter in next two weeks.

#### Marine resources

- Julie stated that it was the Casco Bay Estuary “Partnership,” not “Project.”
- It was asked what the source was for the detail provided in this chapter. Sources included the Harbormaster, several studies, comments from Casco Bay Estuary Partnership, and Maine Department of Environmental Protection and review by the Harbor Committee.
- Sam felt that the marine resources appeared to be in pretty good shape.
- There was again a discussion that the policies read like actions.
- There was a discussion on action #4 and how it should be worded. Theo recommended checking with the Harbor Committee to make sure they were aware and supportive of this recommendation. Julie suggested changing “coastal waters” with “Town Landing” to be more specific. The group was OK with that.
- Regarding action #2 Jim suggested that instead a point source pollution study be conducted. Theo commented that a lot of information is already known about pollution sources and that he learned that some areas may be very costly to get reopened. He stated that it was not yet known which areas have the greatest potential to be reopened and that that was why the action was worded that way.
- Jim suggested adding an action to state that opportunities should be investigated to improve access to coastal waters, rivers, and Town Landing. He noted that in the past some access points were lost and are now posted. The group was OK with that.
- Julie suggested that in action #2 the Town should “investigate” the potential for remedial action. The group was OK with that.

### Fiscal capacity

- It was noted that the data on page 1 should be updated.
- There was a discussion on issue #1. Sandra felt that the survey showed that there were lifestyle pressures that will have budget implications. Becca mentioned the reduced funding of state and federal governments for municipalities. This issue will be reworded.
- Julie asked if “intergovernmental aid” meant state revenue sharing and state school aid and suggested saying so if that was the case.
- Julie suggested adding dates where other numbers are mentioned.
- She also wondered why the elementary school did not get any mention, even if it is covered elsewhere.
- There was a discussion to include a mention of impact fees. The Town did study school impact fees in the past.
- Sandra felt that an emerging issue was the fact that 78% of the assessed value in the community is residential. She felt that the committee should recommend an aggressive effort to attain a greater commercial tax base. She felt that the survey stated no great desire by residents for new businesses. If there was no change in the commercial base, then residents would end up paying more taxes.
- There was a discussion what a “healthy” commercial sector meant. Sandra felt that it meant that this was not a depressed area with lots of vacant stores. This was followed by a discussion of Falmouth had a diverse economy or not.
- Jim stated that he felt that respondents of the survey were supportive of development along Route 1 and 100.
- Rachel added that the survey also stated that people did not want to see their taxes go up.
- Sandra stated that this chapter was a place to educate people on these budget concerns.
- Theo and Paul will add some new data. There has been a new budget posted that may have some good information. The group also felt that adding a tax rate comparison with area communities was useful.

### **3. Schedule**

The group reviewed the meeting and task schedule for the project. Julie wondered when the CDC would be asked for input. Sandra thought that that would be in September. There was a sense to at least brief the CDC as to what the general schedule and plans were.

A question was asked how committee members can comment on revised chapters. The lead editor for each chapter will send it out, and people who have comments will send them back to the lead editor and Theo. It was suggested that committee members identify those people and groups that would have a special interest in specific chapters and invite them to go to the website and comment. Sandra noted that there would not a forum for every chapter.

Claudia wondered if a general overarching vision could be crafted to show people what the big picture of these chapters is. An introduction to the project will be provided on the website. There was a request made that if only a selection of chapters were to be posted on the website, while others are being finished, any related chapters be posted as well. The goal

is to have all chapters posted, perhaps all at once, by the end of June. Upon Sandra's questioning, the group stated it was in support of the schedule as outlined.

#### **4. Next meeting**

LPAC+ will meet again on May 24 at 7:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, May 17, 2012