



Granite State Future

Executive Committee Meeting

December 13, 2012 | 12:30 – 1:30 PM

NH Local Government Center | John B. Andrews Room

25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Agenda

1. **Review Scope of Work & Next Steps**
2. **UNH Survey Center Proposal**
3. **Data Team Progress Updates**
4. **Update on Online Public Forum Development**
5. **Technical Advisory Subcommittees & Advisory Committee**
 - a. Wrapping up Phase I research (looking for comments on draft reports)
 - b. Role during Phase II
6. **Other Business**
 - a. Public Comments and Questions (10 min. time permitting)





Granite State Future

Executive Committee Meeting

December 13, 2012 | 12:30 – 1:30 PM

NH Local Government Center | John B. Andrews Room

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.
Michael King, 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:

Jennifer Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Comm.
Tara Bamford, North Country Council

K. Koulet called the meeting to order at 12:45.

1. Review Scope of Work & Next Steps

J. Czysz began by explaining that given recent questions she's received regarding the scope of work the first thing on the agenda was to review the scope of work associated with all regional planning commission's (RPCs) contracts. She distributed excerpts of the scope of work that focus on the those tasks directly related to developing the individual regional plans. In the document she highlighted the items where there is to be consistent deliverables produced by each RPC and included annotations indicating possible areas that may be streamlined and clarifications.

The first specific item to discuss and opportunity to streamline are the various references to the regional review of existing conditions and trends and the needs assessment. T. Bamford felt the review of existing conditions and trends in Task 3.C and the Needs Assessment of Task 3.F could be combined into a single deliverable and the references to the Needs Assessment within the vision (Task 3.H.1) would instead be the key findings incorporated into the telling the story section of the plan. C. Walker stated that Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC did not plan to develop a separate trends assessment plan

component and instead intended to include all data and needs analysis into the individual plan components.

J. Czynsz said that all RPCs need to agree to a consistent approach and make sure the existing conditions review and needs assessments are not neglected. Based on a literal review of the scope of work these are two deliverables but there is opportunity to create one combined as standalone plan component or if all preferred integrated in each chapter. M. King asked what works best from perspective of statewide coordination. J. Czynsz replied a separate document or plan component with existing trends & needs assessment for each RPC.

Discussion ensued about the technical appendices. T. Bamford preferred that these should be called technical components and not appendices. C. Sinnott noted the structure of the identified plan technical appendices differs from the traditional statutory plan components and for some this is a problem. T. Murphy stated our job is to help municipalities and the RPCs need to create plans that are most useful to local master plan development process.

J. Czynsz reminded all that the list of technical appendices is the minimum and each RPC has the flexibility to respond to each component as appropriate for their region and can expand and customize each, but all must have the consistent basic framework. C. Copeland does not feel married to the statutory framework and feels the data is the most valuable component in the end.

C. Sinnott gave the example of Climate Change Impacts which is not the same thing as Natural Hazards and Scenario Planning is a process not a chapter. He felt this will be confusing to towns. M. Tardiff asked in confirmation that the list of plan components is the minimum and we can add additional components.

J. Czynsz noted that if we changed what the minimum chapters are at this point we will have an incomplete plan framework document which is our preliminary research conducted by the TASCs. K. Koulet stated that each one of us needs to decide how we are going to organize our own work.

The ultimate conclusion to the discussion of plan components was that the framework stands as is for technical appendices, or plan components, and each region can go beyond that list and can utilize the statutory outline instead if they so choose. However, each RPC must make it clear how they have met the minimum.

The final conclusion to the discussion of the Existing Conditions and Trends Assessment and the Needs Assessment is that these two tasks could be merged to become an "Existing Conditions, Trends, and Needs" but there was no resolution as to whether this was a standalone element or integrated into the individual plan components.

2. UNH Survey Center Proposal

C. Sinnott gave an updated on the survey and participation by each RPC. Overall, as revised the survey will have a .2% margin of error for statewide survey and a 4.9% margin of error for RPCs that are oversampling. The survey could include 70 questions for a 20 minute survey or 55 questions for a 15 minute question. However, every time there is a discrete question and response it's a separate question. So a 70 question, 20 minute survey would look more like a 30 question paper based survey. The directors each reviewed their participation levels, costs of participation and potential funding sources for the proposed contract with UNH.

C. Sinnott asked for volunteers to set up a committee to develop the survey questions. S. Bogle would serve as the lead from Rockingham Planning Commission. Staff that will assist in the process are to contact S. Bogle.

3. Data Team Progress Updates

J. Czysz gave a quick overview of the remaining agenda items. The data team has gone through a process of identifying core and optional metrics for use by all nine RPCs. They are now looking to further narrow down the list of core metrics. RPCs should review the core metric list and share revisions with their data team member. The next step will be to develop consistent methodologies for the selected core metrics. T. Murphy, had a question about time investment into the data teams work. RPCs are advised to balance the time staff put into the data team efforts to ensure we have the basics needed but to not expend more time than necessary.

4. Update on Online Public Forum Development

J. Czysz relayed the most recent updates on the development of the online public forum. The designers are working on styling and visual look and feel right now. At the end of the week, they will be running through the entire forum again to check for bugs and functionality. A few have popped up that they have fixed, but more will surface, they always do, therefore they have another full run through and troubleshooting phase planned over the next two weeks. After that, we will have links for the RPCs to be able to go in and test the forum. They have built in a way for each RPC to download their data as a CSV download. There will also be a way for a single report of all data to be downloaded at once.

5. Technical Advisory Subcommittees & Advisory Committee

J. Czysz noted that the committees are now transitioning from the first phase of statewide research to the second phase in the process. As we do so, we need to identify ways in which we can use the committees to support and assist all nine RPCs and serve as a central hub for information and guidance as we proceed. It is imperative that the statewide partners not be inundated with uncoordinated requests from nine separate RPCs. Each RPC is asked to think of ways we might use the committee structure to provide ongoing technical assistance in a coordinated manner.

6. Other Business

Seeing no further business or comments from the public, the meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM.