



## Granite State Future Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting

November 3, 2014 | 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM  
25 Triangle Park Drive  
Concord, NH

### Agenda

1. **Introductions**
  
2. **Statewide Snapshot**
  - a. Review and Comment on Draft
  - b. Alternate title ideas
  - c. Next Steps
  
3. **Coordination with the Community Planning Grants Case Studies**
  
4. **Ensuring Plan Implementation**
  - a. Application submitted for funding for Snapshot Marketing
  - b. Institute for Sustainable Communities Leadership Academy on Plan Implementation
  
5. **Next Meeting**
  - a. 1<sup>st</sup> week in December, date TBD
  
6. **Public comments**





## Granite State Future Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting

November 3, 2014 | 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM  
25 Triangle Park Drive  
Concord, NH

### Meeting Notes

#### **Members Present**

Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
Ben Frost, NH Housing Finance Authority  
Terry Johnson, HEAL  
Janine Lesser, NH Department of Health and Human  
Services, Division of Family Assistance  
Tim Murphy, Southwest Regional Planning  
Commission  
Kevin Peterson, NH Charitable Foundation  
Carolyn Russell, NH Department of Environmental  
Services  
Susan Slack, NH Office of Energy and Planning

#### **Members Not Present**

Deborah Avery, Business Resource Center, NH Dept  
of Resources and Economic Development  
Meena Gyawali, Community Development Finance  
Authority  
Todd Fahey, NH AARP  
Jeff Hayes, Lakes Region Planning Commission  
Bruce Mallory, UNH Carsey Institute, NH Listens  
Van McLeod, Department of Cultural Resources  
Bill Watson, NH Department of Transportation  
Vacant, NH Municipal Association

#### **Staff**

Jen Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Commission

The meeting convened at 1:10 PM.

### **1. Introductions**

The committee went around the table and introduced themselves.

### **2. Statewide Snapshot**

J. Czysz gave an overview of work that has been conducted and revisions drafted since the committee's August meeting. Since that time, NRPC worked with the eight other regional planning commissions to collect key concepts included within each region's plan such as outreach comments, issues and trends, and goals and objectives. These were categorized by chapter and theme to allow cross region comparisons to begin to identify where there were commonalities and distinctions among each. Additionally, J. Czysz, K. Diers, S. Slack, T. Johnson, and G. Reagan attended a Leadership Academy focused on Implementation. At that event, the NH team had time to work on developing the organization and key opportunities for the Snapshot. Following which, and incorporating the committee's feedback from the August meeting, J. Czysz revised the draft document.

C. Russell noted that the draft is very comprehensive and includes a lot of information which can make it difficult to find key messages. Formatting could help things jump out. K. Peterson had the same reaction. He further noted that he is not sure how some of the opportunities for implementation tie back to the three opportunities for the future highlighted in the Executive Summary. He felt there needs to be three levels of detail: a one page summary (as is found in the current draft Executive Summary), a bulleted list that represents a condensed version of the key content, and the full document (a completed version of the current draft). C. Russell noted that the Snapshot jumps right in without introduction or background. For example, what are the demographic shifts? The Executive Summary doesn't explain what resiliency is; it needs a definition.

T. Murphy stated that, in his view, the audience is community leaders, legislators, and other high level policy individuals who don't have time to read a long document. There needs to be a shorter version that and removes all jargon. K. Diers said the intent of this first draft is to develop the full content, make sure we have that right, and then adjust from there to streamline and condense to create a shorter variant. K. Peterson liked the short bulleted list that summarized key findings relative to the livability principles from the earlier draft's executive summary. J. Czynski removed that for now since it will be revised to focus on opportunities rather than problems or issues.

The committee discussed the difference between focusing on opportunities rather than the issues, which could read as doom and gloom. B. Frost noted that demographics are more a simple statement of fact. That said, we should be clear to state we are "in midst of a demographic change" not "on the precipice of a demographic shift." K. Peterson asked that the Snapshot be written in the active voice as the passive voice makes the report one step removed from the reader and too generic.

Conversation then turned to the "priority ranking" as noted in the implementation tables. It is not accurate to say that any of these actions are a low priority. Instead, relatively, there are some projects that currently have a higher perceived level of feasibility and impact than others. Anything with an associated cost automatically would have a lower relative feasibility. C. Russell clarified that all projects that the subcommittees identified and are listed in the Appendix are high priorities. Each subcommittee then evaluated the high priority actions based upon feasibility and impact to identify those of relatively higher priority. Perhaps instead of labeling the strategies as high, medium and low they are instead rated as 1, 2, or 3 so to not say that something is a low priority. Additionally, perhaps the table column should be labeled as relative ranking of high priority strategies. Details on how the rankings were conducted should be added with a foot note at the bottom of each page of tables.

K. Peterson said the Snapshot is an incredibly powerful document that pulls together a wealth of information that's been developed over the last three years. While the draft is dense, it's readable and powerful to have it all in one place with the accompanying nine regional plans that were developed with a common foundation. It would not be hyperbole to mention that this is the first time that such a land use related endeavor has been completed successfully in New Hampshire. B. Frost said from his perspective, the closest match is the State Development Plan from the 1980s developed under Sununu. J. Lesser asked what impact did that document have? B. Frost replied that the effort predate his work and was uncertain.

K. Diers felt the collective impact achieved through the process is the greatest strength of the past three years of work and that continued relationship building is the best way to ensure the regional plans are implemented. K. Peterson asked how we ensure a continued backbone to this effort, to ensure it has an entity to sustain the work into the future. K. Diers has been speaking with NHHFA about this. At least

for the next five years in which NHHFA has committed to monitoring impact of its CPG grants, could we merge our initiatives to track implementation of both our work efforts? NHHFA has a CPG steering committee, plus the GSF Advisory Committee, is there an opportunity to merge these two efforts to sustain dialogue? This may be an annual convening, OEP planning and zoning conference track, NHPA professional development, or other similar opportunity to share information and resources with the larger audience.

C. Russell said the hard work of all the regions should be reflected in the document and it is valuable to mention that keeping this effort alive is essential to implementation. The Snapshot is the call to action. It answers what did we learn and what can we do about it? K. Peterson added the value of highlighting that we are a lot more alike than we are different, while there are distinctions there are several very powerful concepts that draw us together and we do not need to deal with the challenges we face in isolation. It is good to be connected and not have to reinvent the wheel.

J. Lesser asked how open towns are to hearing what other towns have done? K. Diers replied it is of huge value for communities to be able to see what other communities have done, so long as it is something they are considering for themselves. First barrier for a municipality to overcome is having an example of where something has already been conducted in New Hampshire. B. Frost provided an example of where years ago, Hollis developed one of the first Conservation Subdivision Ordinances. Dublin later was interested in doing similar, contacted Hollis, and members of their planning board visited and toured existing developments in Hollis. Then the town later did in fact adopt something similar. This is an example of direct technical assistance not only between communities but between regions as well.

C. Russell said the Snapshot needs to have more of an introduction to tie together all the past work. K. Peterson added it needs a statement of purpose that highlights the past work; something that connects all of the research and summarize each past effort. Intent of the snapshot is to provide an overarching view of all past work, make connections and add context.

T. Murphy drew the conversation to possible alternative titles. He suggested options such as "At a Glance" or "A Call to Action."

### **3. Coordination with the Community Planning Grants Case Studies**

B. Frost gave an over view of the Community Planning Grants (CPG) Benchmarks effort that NRPC is currently developing. The result will be an amalgamation of data points that grantees can tabulate, that are not onerous, and when combined demonstrate the impact of the overall program and individual grantee performance. K. Peterson mentioned that Local Energy Working Group is developing a benchmarking campaign to measure and track community energy consumption. Is there something similar that could be done here and connect the efforts? K. Diers added the CPG Benchmarks work will also look at where communities have similar goals to identify how we can determine implementation effect. B. Frost recognized that 5 years is a short term to measure the impact of changed development patterns. K. Diers said some of the questions could be incorporated into the OEP planning and zoning annual survey or survey of building permits.

B. Frost announced that most if not all of the committee members are aware that NHHFA is hosting a CPG grantee convening on Friday in Concord that is free with plenty of capacity for additional attendees. One of the things that NHHFA will be doing at that session, in addition to presenting the performance measures, will be a panel of five CPG grantees that will share their planning experience under the

program. NHHFA is working with JHT Associates to develop a case studies book highlighting the work of 12 grantees as demonstration efforts and to identify common themes among grantees that lead to success. Other presentations will include the fair housing guidebook and the Facilitation Lab that UNH Cooperative Extension has recently launched.

K. Peterson asked what the mechanism is to get the actual regulatory materials shared. B. Frost said NHHFA will be working with NRPC to create a website to highlight the case studies, regulations and finished work products from grantees, and include a performance measures portal. K. Diers said it is interesting to see how the two efforts are coming together here at the end and that it is impressive to see the different approaches communities have chosen to pursue to achieve similar goals.

#### **4. Ensuring Plan Implementation**

J. Czysz noted that at this point, NRPC has intentionally limited work on the Snapshot to content development. NRPC submitted an application to the NH Charitable Foundation for grant funds to hire a marketing and graphic design consultant to help with editing and layout to ensure the final document is readable and digestible. The consultant would also develop outreach materials to present the Snapshot and regional plans to policy makers and stakeholders. Once the final results of the Charitable Foundation Grant Applications are announced, NRPC will then either forward materials to a consultant for final layout and design, if successful, or work on layout and final messaging if not awarded.

K. Diers also mentioned that Lakes Region Planning Commission is developing a guide on to how to use your regional plan that many of the other regions may similarly utilize to help with implementation in each of the nine regions.

#### **5. Next Meeting**

Next steps:

- J. Czysz send out doodle poll to set meeting date for the week of Dec 15<sup>th</sup>
- Comments on draft Snapshot from committee due 11/14/2014
- Revised draft Snapshot to be sent out by December 1<sup>st</sup>
- Subsequent committee comments due by December 8<sup>th</sup>
- Tentative meeting week of December 15<sup>th</sup> (if needed following draft review)

#### **6. Public comments**

There being no further business and no public comments the meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.