



Granite State Future
Executive Committee Meeting
May 9, 2013 | 12:30-2:30 PM
NH Local Government Center
25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Agenda

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. UNH Survey**
Final review
- 3. NH Listens**
Next steps following conclusion of the Communities of Place sessions
- 4. Coordinated Metrics**
Next steps and housing the final data sets
- 5. Statewide Coordination and Project Updates:**
 - a. Chapter Outlines
 - b. TASCs – Next Steps, Comments on Existing Conditions
 - c. Coordinated points of contact
 - d. NRPC meetings with DES staff and Dr. Cameron Wake, UNH
 - e. HEAL and HNH*foundation*
- 6. Other Business**
 - a. Public Comments and Questions (10 min. time permitting)





Granite State Future
Executive Committee Meeting
May 9, 2013 | 12:30-2:30 PM
NH Local Government Center
25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Meeting Notes – Draft

Members Present:

Mike Tardiff, Central NH Planning Commission
Kimon Koulet, Lakes Region Planning Commission
Cliff Sinnott, Rockingham Planning Commission
Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Comm.
Jeff Hayes, North Country Council
David Preece, Southern NH Planning Commission
Tim Murphy, Southwest Region Planning Comm.
Cynthia Copeland, Strafford RPC
Christine Walker, Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC

Staff Present:

Jennifer Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Comm.

K. Koulet called the meeting to order at 12:35.

1. Introductions

As there were no guests, introductions were not necessary.

2. UNH Survey

C. Sinnott noted the survey drafting is now completed distributed the final budget for the survey. J. Czysz noted that the final draft has been reviewed by HUD who had no comments. NRPC will directly submit the total invoice amount to HUD and then deduct the total amount from each RPC's individual grant balance. For many this will require a budget change to add funds into the consultant or subcontract line. J. Czysz will review each RPCs budget status and resend individual RPC updates with instructions on how to make budget modifications.

Each director will send an email to J. Czysz and S. Bogle confirming the amount of their share of the oversampling to be charged to GSF. Once the invoice has been received from UNH, J. Czysz will send a

final memo to all RPCs outlining how much was deducted from each RPCs grant amount to cover their individual share of the oversampling.

C. Copeland addressed concerns with one of the questions and the director's discussed the validity of the question and whether it is useful, adequately provides for alternative responses. J. Czysz shared the survey status update from UNH. The final version was placed in the field yesterday for pre-testing – this involved getting 4 – 5 completed interviews and determining if any of the questions were confusing or difficult for respondents. Based on the results of this they will make any final changes today during the day and expect to go into the field tonight (5/9). K. Diers asked J. Czysz to follow up with UNH to see if there were any issues identified during pre-testing.

3. NH Listens

The Communities of Interest are complete, we are still waiting for the final report out on those focus group sessions. There is only one Community of Place left to be held. The Committee discussed next steps for the contract with NH Listens that includes a third phase of listening sessions to be conducted in the fall. Given the added cost of having police present at each CoP session, the listening sessions are projected to be over budget. During the final phase, they are to conduct 3 additional, larger scale regional forums in September 2014. NH Listens is concerned that September would be too late to provide meaningful input into plan development. Question to the RPC director's is what should that final role be at this point and should it be revised? J. Czysz needs to get a budget status update from UNH. The last invoice period had yet to include the majority of the time or expense to run the communities of Place sessions.

C. Copeland suggested that phase three could be focused on collaboration with the fall Local Government Center conference and/or the OEP Fall Planning and Zoning Conference that would be a direct conduit to local boards.

K. Koulet stated we should still hold the forums. C. Sinnot noted that we should find out what remains in the budget and make sure we can find a solution. T. Murphy stated the contract is deliverables should be adhered too. K. Diers said that while the contract could be amended, she suggested we modify the format to still have an opportunity to report out on what was heard and allow another opportunity to participate, but rather than hold sessions in person, do so online. There was concern with only holding 3 larger forums as groupings of regions, only people from the local area will attend if in person, leaving some regions without participants or representation. C. Sinnot and J. Hayes felt this was a good solution. K. Koulet felt it is most important that there is a report out as promised in the scope of work. An alternative method for people to comment on the results is through the online forum.

Regarding the Communities of Place report outs, concern was raised that the summary reports from the CoP were deficient. All RPC directors would like full transcript of the flip chart notes. Additionally, it was requested that J. Czysz make sure that the statewide report highlights both regional commonalities and differences.

4. Coordinated Metrics

J. Czysz reported that all RPCs have uploaded data to the FTP site. Next question to address is how should the data be housed in the future. It was recommended that the data files posted online be locked to prevent edits being made to the versions stored online. At this time all RPCs can download the data sets from the FTP site to use. Additionally, the most recent version of the methodologies are posted online. There are some methodologies posted to the FTP site, J. Czysz will follow up with individual RPCs to find out if those contain edits that need to be incorporated into the final version of the compiled methodologies.

J. Czysz asked RPC directors, to ask their data team members to identify and change the file names of any sensitive data that is not to be distributed as a condition of its being made available to the RPCs for use. In such cases the file name should be clearly labeled as “do not distribute”. If there is sensitive data within a larger file set, such as an Excel file, it should be separated out and marked as such.

5. Statewide Coordination and Project Updates

Chapter Outlines

The committee discussed the status of the chapter outline development. J. Czysz noted that staff will have an opportunity to discuss and compare outline at the next staff meeting. All RPCs should share their chapter outlines as a Google Doc so that other RPCs may in turn share additional ideas within the document. CNHRPC and UVLSRPC selected components to work on as they previously did not have an assignment. Current assignments and status of work are as follows:

Plan Component	Outline Available	RPC
1: Vision	N	UVLSRPC & SRPC
2: Telling the Story	N	UVLSRPC & SRPC
3: Implementation	N	CNHRPC
4A: Housing Needs Assessment	N	SWRPC
4B: Fair Housing Equity Assessment	N	NRPC
4C: Transportation	Y	SNHPC
4D: Water Infrastructure	Y	SRPC
4E: Environmental Plan	Y	LRPC
4F: Economic Development	Y	NCC
4G: Climate Change Impacts	N	RPC
4H: Energy Eff & Green Bldg	N	RPC
4I: Scenario Planning	N	UVLSRPC

C. Copeland distributed copies of SRPC’s Water Infrastructure chapter outline. C. Sinnot noted that the water infrastructure outline has a lot on water resources. Can we call the plan component water resources and have a water infrastructure subsection? Yes. C. Copeland noted the outline is based on a source water perspective and uses a broad view of infrastructure and ensuring sufficient water supply. K. Koulet noted that the protecting drinking water portion of the water infrastructure outline may be duplicative of part of the environment component outline. J. Hayes commented that he feels it is very forward thinking to discuss water supply as an essential part of our community infrastructure just like transportation.

The committee discussed whether it is possible to outline the vision or telling the story sections of the regional plans as those are more organic in their development and their final content will be formulated based on upon a process. They felt at a minimum, perhaps those sections could outline the process toward developing those parts of the plan and a bulleted list of what should be included within the Telling the Story plan component.

C. Copeland brought up the process of scenario planning and inquired what others were doing. There was a question about regrouping the scenario planning staff team. C. Walker offered to lead a staff brainstorming effort on how to approach scenario planning.

TASCs – Next Steps, Comments on Existing Conditions

J. Czysz asked that the directors all follow up with their TASC staff members. There are many outstanding requests for information from the TASCs, with the exception of the Community and Economic Vitality TASC (all work complete and submitted) and the Equity and Engagement TASC (different scope of work and up to date on all work tasks). The Housing and Transportation TASC still needs to schedule a meeting.

TASCs were asked to meet in April to:

1. Share the completed Regional Plan Framework and Appendices - a brief review, the document is complete at this time, objective is to make sure all know it's done and available online and to capture any errors that I may have made or new resources that came out in the interim that absolutely must get incorporated.
2. Discuss the draft Statewide Existing Conditions and Trends Assessment and collect feedback focusing on the TASCs livability principle based section.
3. Discuss next steps and how to structure technical assistance. Options identified so far include:
 - a. Is there a particular service your TASC would like to offer to the RPCs?
 - b. Is there a resource the TASC members wish to develop?
 - c. Is there an existing effort that the TASC can join forces with?
 - d. Each TASC should assign a "switchboard operator" to serve as a single point of contact to aggregate information requests and convene the committee on an as need basis.
 - e. TASCs should convene at least 1x to provide check-ups for regional planners or host "office hours" to discuss pre-identified or miscellaneous technical assistance topics.

TASC staff were asked to submit the following information to J. Czysz after their meeting:

- Last minute minor corrections to the Regional Plan Framework (only errors or omissions) – due by May 30th, 2013
- Edits and comments on their livability principle's section of the Existing Conditions and Trends Assessment – due by May 30th, 2013
- The TASCs plan for future meeting and continued streamlined technical assistance to the RPCs – due immediately if the TASC has already met , otherwise within 2 days of your TASC meeting
- Preferred RPC staff point of contact for the committee/individual agencies – If you have already met – due immediately if the TASC has already met , otherwise within 2 days of your TASC meeting

There is no defined role for the TASCs in phase two of the planning process and given the varying amounts of time and expertise available within each TASC, the TASC should work with their staff to define their role going forward.

Coordinated points of contact

Please send J. Czysz your recommended points of contact between your staff and TASC members. A list will be compiled and emailed out to all TASC staff, project managers, and directors. RPCs are asked to please use the points of contact if they have questions or need assistance. Point of contact in turn will share information with all RPCs via the Google site.

NRPC meetings with DES staff and Dr. Cameron Wake, UNH

J. Czysz and K. Goddu of NRPC met with Dr. C. Wake at UNH on April 23rd. Important updates for all RPCs include:

- Full draft of all Climate Change Impact Assessments will be complete by June 2013, final layout/version by late summer/September 2013.
- Will update Great bay climate assessment so all data is the same and comparable across all 3 regional reports when reviewing all finalized reports together.
- C. Wake will attend the statewide GSF project manager staff meeting in June to discuss the drafts .
- Once the final assessments are available C. Wake will do a total of 3 combined regional presentations. RPCs will need to decide on locations that are accessible to multiple regions.

J. Czysz and K. Goddu of NRPC met with staff from NH Department of Environmental Services on May 7th to discuss the scope of services that they will provide to the RPCs. A summary of planned activities and services include:

- J. Czysz will send chapter outlines to C. Russell at DES and she will coordinate a staff review to
 - See if realistic
 - How will document be used in future from DES standpoint
 - Needs assessment-link to DES sources of information
- C. Russell will meet with RPC project managers at their May staff meeting to identify additional RPC technical assistance needs
- DES staff offered to meet in person with the water Infrastructure chapter outline lead (SRPC)
- DES to get data together including:
 - Compile some basic drinking water related data by town
 - Break out waste water infrastructure needs by town and RPC.
 - Compile basic water quality information
- Based on Identified DES resources and RPC needs – hold two ½ day workshops during the regularly scheduled project managers staff meetings in July and August. Workshops will cover:
 - What there is
 - How to use data
 - What can be done w/data
 - DES help to interpret what #'s mean on a regional scale

HEAL and HNHfoundation

This was not discussed due to a lack of time.

6. Other Business

Public Comments and Questions

Seeing no further business or comments from the public, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.