

**Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting
March 19, 2012 - Old Library**

Present: Tim Clark, Joe Hutchinson, Michelle Cataina, Lucy Wallace, Ron Ostberg, Jim Breslauer, Rich Marcello

Meeting opened 9:36am

Meeting called to order at 9:36 AM.

Motion by Catalina, seconded by Breslauer to “postpone consideration of the minutes until the next meeting” . Motion was approved unanimously.

Review of BW draft report - Open comments by MPSC

RO – the fonts are too small, this is important as it should be easily read and also to give the document more heft. Also the section on Devens is totally inadequate and incomplete.

LW – I thought we had agreed to not include all of this town center stuff.

JB – we need an advocacy piece to sell the town on phase 2. This document is too dry, it may serve as an appendix.

JH – we need an executive summary. We should ask the consultants to draft executive summary and a one page summary.

TC arrived at 9:45

Executive summary to incorporate top 3 points that will be the message that we move forward to town meeting with. JB suggested developing 3 narratives of what a 20 year output might be...Perhaps we have affirmed a vision, and there are three avenues we can choose, in particular about Devens. Determining the town’s Stability, mitigation of detrimental development, its impact on housing & schools etc.

LW format and presentation needs to be polished. Some terms need to be redefined. Town Center - Chart of items to be revised especially Town Hall and Hildreth table to be corrected. Bullets need to be prioritized.

JB on survey reports, place “no opinion” at end of chart consistently.

LW some focal points have that arisen in the forums have to be incorporated into the report.

RO - scenarios are preferred paths that give guidance and from which we can design regulations. Give trajectory and give a direction and it gives us control. Something to work towards or make adjustments to as we go down the road.

RO need to stay true to our conviction that we don’t know the end state.

RM - Process or funnel approach suggested: You stage the decision making process to arrive at a preferred scenario. It will likely be an iterative process - perhaps first define 3 avenues, gain acceptance of these paths and then refine the pathway.

RO - Series of impacts that need to be determined - look at impacts on these items - because they profoundly impact the community. Can we really look at the total number of hours by volunteers committed to running.

LW - do we want to continue this form of a very expensive community to maintain and remain dependent upon volunteers? We continue to constrain ourselves and fewer and fewer people are able to share the load.

RO - LW's issue is a really big deal. Impact of education vs. housing? Is revenue a big deal? We have to choose a path which we move down from which policies flow. Communicating what we need to do to move forward is critical, but we also need to articulate why we are not moving forward. "Why is it not happening?" Education and Labor has been the limiting factor. Why aren't we succeeding and are we learning anything. We should state our message that the process has moved forward.

RM - perhaps we should list the "non-discussables".

LW - "if you don't know where you are going, you will end up someplace else."

Editing Process

LW will do corrections to the BW report for errors and omissions. Suggested we divide report by working group leaders - give comments to Bres and Joe.

RO - the report will be fine, what is most important is what sits on top. The one piece of paper is what this product is all about.

RM - Executive Summary - will BW be writing? Can MPSC outline? Key issues, bullets for each section need to be wrapped up by BW.

Final work product

JH will distribute draft RFP from BW

RM - perhaps we all write our own exec summary for each subsection and Joe will compile into the executive summary. Then we take the BW summary and combine them together.

LW - MPSC will develop the voice of the project for ATM - The One pager for ATM, Exec summary for the Report are different.

LW - Organization of content within each section should be adjusted with Goals at front with mini executive summary and conclude with and strategies should be redefined as "techniques or next steps" for phase 2.

RO - goals are an affirmation process - confirmed and identified the following goals, identify next steps (strategies) and the follow up with supporting data.

Education/Publicity for ATM

TC to help draw up calendar with JH and approach.

Meeting Adjourned 11:30am Minutes drafted by TC