



Granite State Future
Executive Committee Meeting
July 29, 2013 | 1:00 – 3:00 PM
NH Local Government Center
25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Agenda

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. NH Listens**
 - a. Draft report out and data from the Communities of Interest and Place sessions
 - b. Next steps following conclusion of the Communities of Place sessions
- 3. REMI Modeling**
 - a. Scope of work discussion with NH Department of Employment Security
- 4. UNH Survey**
 - a. Preliminary Results
- 5. Statewide Coordination and Project Updates:**
 - a. Chapter Outlines
 - b. Upcoming Staff Trainings
- 6. Other Business**
 - a. Public Comments and Questions (10 min. time permitting)





Granite State Future
Executive Committee Meeting
July 29, 2013 | 1:00-3:00 PM
NH Local Government Center
25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Meeting Notes – Draft

Members Present:

Mike Tardiff, Central NH Planning Commission
Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Comm.
Cliff Sinnott, Rockingham Planning Commission
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:

Tara Bamford, North Country Council
Jerry Coogan, Lakes Region Planning Commission
Jennifer Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Comm.

Guests:

Bruce DeMay, NH Employment Security, ELMI
Katrina Evans, NH Employment Security, ELMI
Annette Neilson, NH Employment Security, ELMI
Bruce Mallory, Carsey Institute

T. Murphy called the meeting to order at 1:12.

1. Introductions

All in attendance introduced themselves.

2. NH Listens

J. Czysz gave an overview of the two points for discussion relative to NH Listens. First, is to comment on the draft report out of the Communities of Interest (CoI) and Communities of Place (CoP). NH Listens staff is looking for comments on the structure, depth and scope of detail and report organization. The second item to discuss is the final phase of the NH Listens process. Originally there were to be approximately 3 regional forums across the state, grouping 3 regions into a single forum as part of the third phase of the scope of work. Concerns with this structure, in no particular order, were that the process of getting people in the door was not cost effective; grouping regions would lead to over representation of voices from the host site's region and under representation from other communities; the cost of conducting the CoP exceeded the original budget; and finally, at this point in the process the RPCs have done extensive outreach to identify local values, where results are now showing a clear

pattern of priorities for regions and are now looking to translate the comments received thus far into strategies.

D. Preece asked how much time RPCs have to get comments on the draft report out of the Communities of Place and Interest. B. Mallory requested comments by August 15, 2013. B. Mallory noted that the report will additionally highlight regional distinctions. Goal is to finish the report by the end of August.

C. Copeland noted there are two distinct functions where transportation is being mentioned as a priority: road and bridges versus transit. Could the report look at whether this split existed as well in the CoI and CoP? B. Mallory will look into what was stated and will also look at the different interests at the regional level as well. Further, T. Murphy suggested that the final report have additional detail for each RPC that highlights individual group conversations. B. Mallory noted that the sample regional differences will be expanded. Additionally, NH Listen's will help RPCs to connect with other NH Listen's summary reports of interest and look to break out comments of relevance to each region (Transport NH and the Business and Industry Association).

B. Mallory gave an overview of what NH Listens would like to propose as an alternative scope of work for the third phase of the contract. He proposed offering help each RPC develop on-going strategies for engaging regional allies, partners, stakeholders and citizens for implementation of specific actions. This would be offered upon request from each RPCs. This assistance may include coming to each region to meet with staff and/or regional advisory committees or other partners.

B. Mallory asked J. Czysz to coordinate the requests for assistance and if there are a few common items identified for assistance, then they would look at how to provide a statewide package. Otherwise, they would assume assistance would be provided by visiting each of the RPCs to provide in person assistance.

D. Preece noted that regions draft plans are due June 2014 and some are planning to do so sooner. C. Copeland is planning a "check-in" with Strafford RPCs communities this fall on what they've heard thus far and where they plan to go.

Conversation ensued about how the CoI results could or should be interpreted and utilized. This was one area where all nine regions would appreciate additional technical assistance.

Next step, each RPC director will send J. Czysz a statement as to how they would like to proceed with the third phase of the scope of work. J. Czysz will consolidate all requests and forward to B. Mallory.

3. REMI Modeling

J. Czysz noted that the director of and staff from NH Employment Security's Economic and Labor Market Information Bureau were in attendance to start the preliminary planning in anticipation of commencing the process of running REMI econometric modeling for each of the RPCs between the fall of 2013 and spring of 2014. As part of the scope of work it is necessary to set up the modeling with each individual RPC and phase the work.

A. Neilson noted that the phasing is primarily needed to have a good dialogue with each region to shape the scenario to be run and ensure time for an iterative process. The process of running the model itself is not time consuming.

Each RPC will need to have something concrete to test such as spending a certain amount on a capital improvement project, population will change by a certain amount, change in migration, or other measurable scenario. The key will be to test a measurable change.

C. Sinnott noted that Rockingham Planning Commission is interested in looking at testing how the economy will be impacted by an increasing number of seniors and decline workforce aged population. A. Neilson noted this is certainly feasible.

C. Walker noted that perhaps those RPCs that are not conducting other forms of scenario planning should be first in the phasing process. It will be important for regions to be able to link their various scenario planning efforts to assess land use changes with economic impacts through REMI modeling if using more than REMI to conduct scenario planning.

C. Copeland asked if there are examples of good scenarios to test. A. Neilson noted that each scenario and run is unique and based on County data and will be averages. You can use a percentage of a county to closer model the RPC geography. The geography included in the model would depend on the specific change to be modeled. For example, if you are modeling the impact of job growth in one community on the region, you would ask, where would the impacts be expected, then pull those counties or portions thereof where impact would be felt.

J. Cysz mentioned that staff from the regions will be gathering in early September to review the various scenario planning tools available and invited A. Nielson to do a demonstration on how the REMI model works and what might be tested. All agreed a demo would be very valuable.

Is there a list of the parameters or variable that can be input or modified in the REMI software? A. Neilson can provide a list of the various inputs, however, it's important to have a dialogue so she can help each RPC determine what additional variables may also be affected or included in the scenario. T. Murphy asked if there are sample questions a region might be able to ask and test. K. Evans noted that ELMI has several "what if" and "real" evaluations available online. K. Evans and A. Neilson will forward links to examples for all to review.

The RPCs went around the table and noted when they would most likely want to begin the REMI modeling process. This will be used to set up an approximate phasing of the modeling efforts to be conducted through the scope of work.

C. Sinnott noted that each region's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy would be a good starting point for identifying strategies to test through REMI to determine the possible economic impact. K. Diers asked if it was possible to quantify the economic impact of special community events such as the Milford Pumpkin Festival. A. Neilson said, yes, however there were a few cautions to keep in mind, the model works on annual average data so the model should include all events that would occur over the course of a year. The result would look small as it would be averaged out over the year.

C. Walker asked if you could compare economic impacts of two different locations where a major business change might occur. A. Neilson said it depends. It is not possible if the two locations are in the same county, in that case the result would be the same regardless of the location. However, if the locations are in 2 different counties, then yes, it could be run as a comparison.

J. Coogan asked if the final product was just numeric output or a summary report out. B. DeMay noted there would be a brief summary to go with the numeric input.

C. Sinnott asked if the various individual regional scenarios could be applied statewide. Given that regional analyses are likely to be based upon specific local changes, they would not necessarily be transferrable.

4. UNH Survey

As a reminder, please send any comments on the report format and structure to Rockingham Planning Commission. The structure for the statewide survey will be used to produce the reports for the regional oversample reports. Deadline for comments on the statewide report format is August 9, 2013. C. Sinnott noted that the oversampling data and reports are expected out in August.

J. Czysz asked if the surveys completed as part of the regional oversampling would be included in the statewide sample. It is uncertain if they will. If they were, the results for the statewide sample would have to be weighted so as to not skew the findings toward individual regions with additional samples.

The report needs to clarify the context in which responses should be interpreted. For example, if something ranks last within one question, it does not mean it's not important, it just means it isn't as great of a priority as the other options offered.

5. Statewide Coordination and Project Updates

Chapter Outlines

As a reminder, all staff should update and repost their chapter outlines based on feedback received from the Technical Advisory Subcommittees and other RPC staff members.

Upcoming Staff Trainings

The June staff training sessions were very informative. As a reminder, please make sure all staff are on time to the August and September training sessions.

6. Other Business

Climate Change Impact Assessments

J. Czysz gave an update of C. Wake's progress on the Climate Change Impact Assessments for northern and southern NH. A first draft will be available in August 2013 at which time UNH Carbon Solutions NE will be looking for feedback from the RPCs on the report structure and format. The final reports should be available by early Fall 2013. After the final report is released, C. Wake would like to schedule presentations in the North Country, Keene, and either Manchester, Concord, or Nashua.

Public Comments and Questions

Seeing no further business or comments from the public, the meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.