



Granite State Future Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting

February 27, 2014 | 1:30 – 3:30 PM
25 Triangle Park Drive
Concord, NH

Agenda – Regular Meeting – 1:30-3:30 PM

1. **Introductions**
2. **Election of a Chairperson**
3. **November 2013 Statewide Convening Follow-up**
 - a. Review of presentations and key findings
 - b. Review consolidated strategies identified by the TASCs
 - c. Brainstorm additional strategies that should be considered
4. **Statewide Snapshot and Plan Implementation**
 - a. Timeframe and process to develop the Snapshot
 - b. Ideas for Snapshot Content
 - c. How can we collaborate in the future?
 - Case study ideas for RPCs
 - Formalizing communication channels between RPCs and state agencies
 - Recommendations for state, regional, and local efforts to act on identified statewide needs
5. **Next Meetings**
 - a. Regularly Scheduled Meetings:
 - May 22, 2014
 - August 28, 2014
 - November 27, 2014
6. **Public comments**





Granite State Future
Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting
February 27, 2014 | 1:30 – 3:30 PM
NH Local Government Center
Concord, NH

Meeting Notes

Members Present

Glenn Coppelman, Community Development Finance Authority
Ben Frost, NH Housing Finance Authority
Jeff Hayes, Lakes Region Planning Commission
Terry Johnson, HEAL
Bruce Mallory, UNH Carsey Institute, NH Listens
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
Terry Smith, NH Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Family Assistance

Members Not Present

Deborah Avery, Business Resource Center, NH Det of Resources and Economic Development
Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Commission
Van McLeod, Department of Cultural Resources
Vacant, NH Department of Transportation
Vacant, NH Municipal Association

Staff

Jen Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Commission

The meeting convened at 1:35 PM.

1. Introductions

The committee went around the table and introduced themselves.

2. Election of a Chairperson

J. Czysz noted that B. Frost declined to accept the role of chair. The committee discussed whether they need to have a chair. They decided that a chair was not necessary at this time and took no action.

3. November 2013 Statewide Convening Follow-up

The committee began by discussing key themes and important takeaway points each heard at the Statewide Convening in November. K. Peterson noted he thought there were three key themes that he identified that were threads through all of the presentations. The first was *natural resources* that were

frequently cited as a top priority during the NH Listens based listening sessions, was rated it a top priority for investment in the UNH Survey, as well as a key finding of all nine regions' outreach. Second was *transportation* that while it was referenced as a shortcoming or need throughout all outreach and research, the specific priority varied by region. Lastly, the third theme was the many *dichotomies* or many instances of seeming inconsistencies. How can the State, regions and communities bridge the gap?

B. Mallory noted there were many commonalities and distinctions. For example in the North Country the commonly cited need was transportation related to the atrophy of roads and bridges where in Southern NH the identified transportation need is a lack of transit. It is important that the Statewide Snapshot highlight commonalities and distinctions by theme. The challenge is getting people to plan and make decisions today that have a 20-30 year horizon. There is a need to keep educating the public on the need to plan including on the need to plan for climate change.

J. Hayes noted that he was struck by the UNH Survey that natural resource protection was so significantly more valued as priority for investment, this is new, exciting, and he is hopeful that we can support that finding. T. Johnson asked what has been typically a top priority. J. Hayes responded that it has been jobs in the current recession. There is a disconnect between public policy and findings. B. Mallory added that the most recent Granite State Poll asked what you are most concerned about in NH. When forced to make a choice, it's jobs. Education and state funding system is much lower now. The committee asked why the difference in results? Part is how the question is posed. The Granite State Poll is general and open ended. The question from the GSF Survey specifically asks about public investment. The committee looked closer at the environment question in UNH survey to find out what are the more specific areas that are supported.

The committee discussed the findings and discussed where public sentiment and data point to needed policy change. Highlighting these areas is what will make the snapshot compelling. High level highlights to show where priorities are across the State. What are the threads that bump up and need state agency action?

C. Russell asked what other parallels exist between the Granite State Future research and other existing studies. It is important that the TASCs take time to think about what the findings have been in other studies as well as the new research presented in November. J. Hayes noted that identifying those issues that are frequently repeated is a good way to prioritize actions and strategies for the future. Where are we hearing similar things multiple times?

B. Frost cautioned that when reading the survey responses one must carefully think of perspective of respondents when replying. When 96% of respondents said water quality is the top priority in order to protect drinking water readers must remember that more than 80% of residents in NH get their water from private wells. This is very personal for them and not so much about infrastructure investment. It may be a response to not wanting development next door to protect their well.

B. Frost gave an overview of draft findings from NH Housing's forthcoming statewide needs assessment. Current zoning is retrospective, a response to past development patterns (slow development through large lot sizes), but there has been a paradigm shift and growth isn't occurring now. Therefore, what is the purpose of those regulations? B. Mallory recounted a conversation with the Exeter Town Planner who noted that planning conversations have changed from being how do we slow growth to how do we stimulate it. J. Hayes stated that looking to the past to discuss how to address the future won't work.

Even past development patterns, traditional settlement patterns, conflict with good adaptation planning to mitigate the effects of flooding and natural hazards. T. Murphy added that the RPCs are now hear more questions about regulations serving as barriers, are regulations still viable, or are they getting in the way. Some solutions to address adaptation planning to mitigate climate impacts and still promote growth may be to support redevelopment and promote low impact development techniques.

T. Smith asked how real the impact of climate change is to residents and is it enough to provide a catalyst to affect change. J. Hayes replied that significant storms are real to residents and especially DPW staff, but climate change, doesn't resonate. T. Murphy followed up by inquiring what happens when the new flood insurance rate maps are released.

4. Statewide Snapshot and Plan Implementation

K. Peterson shifted the conversation to the Statewide Snapshot and how can it be used to shift the paradigm to a forward looking resource based on current needs associated with population decline, climate change, and economic development? NH Charitable Foundation is looking at how they can positively affect increasing the State's young population. T. Johnson asked whether there is there an opportunity to hire a communications consultant to help review and frame the final snapshot to make sure it isn't too wonky and resonates. G. Coppleman said we need to make sure we have a plan for how to use the document once it's written.

J. Hayes said he would like to see a robust outline and implementation plan, a framework for public policy. We need the analysis and research that will be the foundation of the Snapshot. The implementation component of the Snapshot will be the documents living element.

The committee understands that each region would like to have autonomy, but would be nice if all nine regions had a single implementation plan format that could be merged together for the Snapshot. T. Murphy described the matrix in the statewide broadband plan being used by all nine regions in their broadband plans' implementation plans. The committee asked J. Czysz to adapt that template to the regional plans.

K. Peterson asked if we want a public roll out of the Snapshot and Regional Plans. One option would be to do a briefing for the governor, senate president, leadership, agency commissioners and present key issues, but not the solutions. What are the key items that rise up to the state level? J. Hayes gave an overview of the regional plan adoption and public notice requirements for regional plans, noting that adoption will require notification of all selectmen, libraries, etc. Therefore, for the RPCs there is a requirement for a public roll out.

J. Czysz gave a quick overview of planned TASC process for the last year to help generate strategy ideas for inclusion in the Snapshot. T. Murphy noted that the list of strategies from November's brainstorming is incomplete. Where is the core discussion of housing stock needing to address needs? Broadband? Aging Infrastructure? J. Hayes said he would like to see three or four strategies for each plan section with a policy statement where we have statewide consensus. The committee noted that strategies relative to housing needs and stock, broadband, aging infrastructure, and transportation were missing from the list of strategies brainstormed thus far.

K. Peterson questioned whether using the TASCs as structured was going to work? Should we instead have a few people work as a small team to create the structure, big picture ideas, etc.? C. Russell was concerned there was too much for committees to sift through the research, need to make a draft for

committees to respond to. B. Frost noted that his staff colleagues are done brainstorming. K. Peterson returned to the idea that there should be a small group composed with staff from each TASC to distill the research, identify key policy issues and send a draft to the Advisory Committee for review, then to the TASCs to review and refine. There was generally no support for moving forward with process as drafted. Greatest support was for staff to convene and make a first pass at policy statement through a merger of research and regional plans.

K. Peterson would posit that we need a public debate about how we pay for and set state funding policies as current policy runs contrary. T. Murphy asked for clarification whether the committee was talking about writing policy or high level strategies. C. Russell envisioned a small set of high level of statewide strategies that is responsive to statewide research and regional plans. Then clarify what is it and why is it important.

The committee discussed the final Statewide Snapshot and its role once complete. B. Frost asked why couldn't it serve as the foundation for the State Development Plan or simply be the State Development Plan. K. Peterson said if the Advisory Committee members are all there saying this is a great piece of work to the governor, why wouldn't this be adopted as such?

5. Next Meetings

The committee plans to meet next in early April.

Next steps identified:

- Compile high level findings from November
- Outline snapshot - include top themes and synthesis
- Convene staff team to develop strategies to act on top themes in Snapshot outline

6. Other Business

There being no further business, no public comments, and no participants for the Business Leaders Roundtable conversation the meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.