



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC+)

Thursday, January 13, 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: Councilor Faith Varney

Sandra started the meeting around 7:02 PM.

1. Review of Draft Minutes of December 9, 2010

The draft minutes of December 9, 2010 were upon a motion by Bud, which was seconded by Becca, unanimously approved. Sandra turned the meeting over to Sam.

2. Review of Draft Survey

Sandra mentioned that not too much time should be spent by the committee on reviewing the draft 1 survey, as the subcommittee wanted to do some exercises with the whole group. Before doing that she was interested to hear any comments on the draft 1 survey.

Kurt asked how comments and suggestions from others outside LPAC+ were being handled. Sandra said that Theo is the central source for that and that he will make sure those comments are not forgotten in the final draft.

Claudia had several comments. On the regional approaches, she felt that the answer would depend on the service under consideration. On the housing question, she also felt that the answer “would depend” on location. She felt the question on traffic and speeding could be reworded. Claudia suggested to add a question if agriculturally-valuable land should be protected.

Becca had the same idea on agriculture and mentioned it was also referenced in the open space section of the draft survey.

Kurt noted that the survey presupposes a knowledge on issues that is currently missing from the draft. He gave as an example natural resources, where the questions need further clarification.

Becca felt that in the themes document there were also parts missing and that she had other notes. Sandra asked Becca to save those notes and the group would focus on themes shortly.

3. Other Business

Sandra distributed a proposed template to be used by the subcommittees for each of the subject areas. She reviewed each section.

Steve asked what was meant by “opinions” in the third section. Sandra gave as an example the “ultimate” question that Paul had suggested and which was used in the June survey: would you recommend Falmouth on a scale of ... etc. There may be two or three of such opinion questions which could provide good qualitative information.

The subcommittees are asked to develop fact, opinion, and risk questions for their subject areas. An example of a risk question is: If I can only do one of three things, which one is most urgent to do.

A lot of the work on the templates has already been done by the subcommittees in their first round of work.

Next, Sandra handed out a proposed schedule which Sam reviewed with the group. The morning of January 24th is the proposed deadline for submission of the completed templates for all subject areas. The survey subcommittee will meet on January 25th to review these and distribute its work to the full committee prior to the January 27th meeting. On the 27th there will be good understanding what the subcommittees want for their subject areas.

Steve W. agreed to take the lead for group 3, and Becca will do so for group 2. Sam will contact Rachel as there was no one present for group 1.

Next, Sandra passed around the subject categories handout. She reviewed each of the columns. The first one represents the subject areas. The second represents the subjects the consultant included in draft 1. The third column represents the themes that LPAC+ identified on December 9th and the last column lists the themes the survey subcommittee discussed afterwards. The last set is further explained in the memo that starts with Paul’s “five top themes.” These were considered “hot topics” and the survey subcommittee felt that the draft 1 misses the mark in reflecting these themes.

There was a discussion that the committee should go into the direction of themes, instead of the conventional subject areas. There was a question whether addressing only the core themes would meet the requirements of the State Planning Office. Sandra stated that the

survey does not have to address all subject areas. Theo stated that the State's expectations for comprehensive plans are very extensive and that if Falmouth produces a concise to the point plan that meets local needs, the State may come back with more work to be done for the town. This is what happened with the 2000 Plan, which is why there are two versions of the plan. Kurt felt that the proposed direction was OK, as long as the group realizes that more work may be needed from it.

The sense of the group was that organizing the survey by themes would speak better to Falmouth and result in more engagement by the public.

As the next step, Sandra proposed to revisit the themes to make sure they were captured well. She went to the whiteboard to take down notes on what themes or hot topics people felt existed in Falmouth.

Bud listed a series of issues and others added some. Sandra reviewed each one of them and asked the group to add other elements that they were thinking of and clarify "where the fire is" was with that issue, so a theme could be articulated. A listing of the ideas follows.

Workability

Business development

Big box

Route 1

Route 100

Home businesses

Farms

Agricultural

Work force housing?

Is Falmouth a great residential community?

The group felt it is still a great bedroom community.

Perhaps the theme is what kind of business activity people like to see in Falmouth.

The character of the businesses here.

If business activity was unregulated, would that affect Falmouth's identity?

Do businesses serve Falmouth's population?

They also draw people in from the region. Who does what work in Falmouth?

What is needed to support them?

Kurt noted the seismic shift in uses along and appearance of Route One.

Sandra summed up that the theme may be the marriage of the residential aspect of Falmouth with Falmouth as a place where proactive entrepreneurs can thrive.

This may involve a change in reputation or a change in behavior.

Sustainability

The transformation from fossil fuels.

Alternative energy

Efficiency

Waste reduction

Transportation

Critical global issue, but do people in Falmouth care?

Addressing it may require financial investment and/or more regulation – these are tension points as not all people will embrace that.

There could be a wind farm proposed in West Falmouth. Town should be proactive and have a windmill ordinance.

What do I think of a windmill on my neighbor's property?

Regional coordination may save money and may save resources.

Sustainability deals with cost, personal convenience, and regulation.

Affordability

Workforce housing

Services versus taxes

Mill rate in Falmouth is low, but its real estate is valued high.

Encourage diverse housing options vs. developers deciding what to do

Livability?

Livability

How people relate to the built environment

Attractive character of roads

Things close by

What does it look like?

Do areas look different? In what way?

Plans since 2000 have encouraged open space preservation, which meant more compact development

Conservation of natural resources

People also want town center and small town feeling

Balance between development and conservation

Have convenience of a corner store and town center

Connectivity of neighborhoods

Encourage

Identity

The way it was vs. ways in which it can change or improve

Who are we? Identify identity

Open space

Sense of place, sense of community.

Need for community dialogue, cooperation. Better decisions.

Example: Town center

Mobility

Transportation

Connectivity of roads

Side roads

Increase of cars on arterials

“Complete streets” (addressing multiple modes of transportation)

Compatibility

Business vs. livability

Interconnectivity with neighborhoods

This theme may go away.

Sandra closed the discussion on possible themes and handed out two examples of introductions to possible themes that could be part of the survey. In order to bring the reader of the survey into the reality of the theme, an introduction to each is essential.

Sandra asked if Faith had any comments. Faith said she thought the meeting was very interesting and that she was glad she came as she had no idea of all that the committee was working on. She promised to come again.

4. Next Meeting

The next LPAC+ meeting will be on **Thursday January 27th at 7 PM.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

The subcommittees proceeded to schedule their subcommittee meetings. Sandra offered to meet separately with group 1.

Draft Meeting Notes by Theo Holtwijk, January 14, 2011