

**Community Development Committee and Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee  
Thursday, November 12, 2009, Large Conference Room**

Attendees: Lissa, Bonnie, Amanda, Hugh S, Karen, Teresa, Kurt, Will, Hugh C

Bonny Rodden opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting is to review questions, concerns, and issues around the LPAC presentation to the Town Council.

Hugh Smith and Kurt Klebe did a run through of the presentation. CDC comments were:

Will: will presentation go faster? Cut narrative, eliminate history. Is this all? This feels like 10min. here's what we've done, you've got report.

Teresa: expecting more detail of report, e.g. x% doesn't deviate from state, y% does. How bullet substantive items? If you go directly to Q&A people will be all over the map. Sounds like easier to use, show how much of the project is this.

Will: You have an opportunity to diffuse debate by itemizing what is equal to state, need to answer the question "why not just state standards", need to show where deviate and itemize.

Bonnie: What should be done with the maps showing vernal pool boundaries? There is a concern that it doesn't show wetlands or steep slopes.

Hugh S: If the analysis was simple, it would have been quicker. He wonders if they have addressed the key things.

Bonnie: Exemptions should be ordered by what has the biggest impact.

Will: If you state all legal existing lots built or not are exempt. If so, some people will say "that's not true" as the state can regulate them so that's a detail that needs explanation.

The length of the presentation was discussed and agreed to be kept around 15 minutes.

Hugh C: Perhaps a solution is to address certain aspects, how do we differ from state and how are we the same. Most questions will be around dimensional standards. This is the place for detail.

Will/Teresa: The presentation should address why we are different than state, not in narrative but in the bullet points.

Lissa: If we pick the top 3 things, talk about progression; how we moved from the science to the recommendations as a logical choice for Falmouth, this will add time.

Kurt: Perhaps the framework is a 10m intro with 3 slides on the substantive piece.

Teresa: Perhaps you could add where the numbers come from.

Will: A ½ hour presentation is fine if it includes the details, helping understand where the deviations are and why certain choices were made.

Bonnie: The debate has gotten to this point, can assume there's background.

Bonnie: The presentation does not reflect the variety of people on LPAC and therefore the compromises are not reflected.

Kurt/Lissa: Big things should be pulled out, buffers, design process, setbacks, area of concern, compensation tools.

Amanda: There are specific reasons why we don't mirror the state, for example the state has a large number of permits by rule. The approach here is much simpler.

All agreed that we need to emphasize that the town and state processes address the same resource but handle the permitting differently. The landowner must comply with both as they do now.

It was reiterated that the vote from the committee was unanimous on moving this forward.

It was agreed that Jeff Simmons would not be present at the meeting, but if detailed questions were asked, he could be made available to answer them.

It was agreed that the difference between the area of concern and a buffer should be made clear.

The group discussed at length the use of the vernal pool maps and it was decided that they do not provide enough information in enough detail to be useful. It would most likely cause confusion rather than clarify.

The areas of compromise were discussed, including exemption of lots, exemption of certain projects such as stormwater facilities, utilities, road crossings and use for agriculture and forestry. It was agreed that the top 3 should be represented. It was emphasized that the thought process and consideration in the process should be conveyed.

Kurt recapped the request – a slide on deviations from policy, a slide on compromises by committee, a slide or example on the buffer and areas of concern for VPs and a little more specificity on wetlands, shortened history, difference and similarities from state and why chose, dimensional standards what choices were and why they were selected.

Will: not have Jeff there, open door to science debate

Some discussion around Hugh Smith's and Lissa Robinson's terms being up on LPAC was had. It was agreed that this would not be an issue.

It was agreed that Amanda will redraft the slides and email them to LPAC to respond to and then finalize the presentation for Hugh Smith and Kurt Klebe. There will be no need for an additional meeting before the Council hearing on January 25<sup>th</sup>.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.