



Granite State Future Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting

August 4, 2014 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
25 Triangle Park Drive
Concord, NH

Agenda

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Statewide Snapshot**
 - a. Review and Comment on Conceptual Draft
 - b. Alternate title ideas
 - c. Next Steps
 - d. Preliminary planning for presentation of the completed Snapshot
- 3. Planning Metrics Gateway**
 - a. Quick look at the GIS viewer for core metrics
- 4. Ensuring Plan Implementation**
 - a. How can we collaborate in the future? Potential partnerships?
 - b. How can we ensure plan implementation at the regional and state level?
- 5. Next Meeting**
 - a. September 22, 2014, 1:30 – 3:30 PM
 - b. Early November, date TBD
- 6. Public comments**





Granite State Future Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting

August 4, 2014 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
25 Triangle Park Drive
Concord, NH

Meeting Notes

Members Present

Deborah Avery, Business Resource Center, NH Det of
Resources and Economic Development
Glenn Coppelman, Community Development Finance
Authority
Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Commission
Todd Fahey, NH AARP
Ben Frost, NH Housing Finance Authority
Jeff Hayes, Lakes Region Planning Commission
Terry Johnson, HEAL
Van McLeod, Department of Cultural Resources
Tim Murphy, Southwest Regional Planning
Commission
Kevin Peterson, NH Charitable Foundation
Carolyn Russell, NH Department of Environmental
Services
Kellie Walsh, NH Office of Energy and Planning

Members Not Present

Bruce Mallory, UNH Carsey Institute, NH Listens
Terry Smith, NH Department of Health and Human
Services, Division of Family Assistance
Vacant, NH Department of Transportation
Vacant, NH Municipal Association

Staff

Jen Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Commission

Guests

Kate Dykgraaf, US Department of Housing and Urban
Development

The meeting convened at 10:05 AM.

1. Introductions

The committee went around the table and introduced themselves.

2. Statewide Snapshot

4. Ensuring Plan Implementation

The committee began with a review of progress by the nine regional planning commissions since the last meeting. J. Czysz gave an overview of the status of the conceptual Statewide Snapshot draft and its

development process. The committee proceeded to discuss general comments, notable trends, opportunities, and next steps.

K. Peterson commented that demographic change is probably the biggest issue and as such needs to read as the strongest and stage setting for the remainder of the snapshot. It was recommended to pull key strategies from topics that have greatest impact on demographics and present those together. Alternatively K. Peterson suggested looking to a chart from Climate Action Plan that compares cost and benefit of all recommendations as an example of how to plot all actions so the reader can quickly see where costs and benefits or relationship among strategies. B. Frost noted that planners typically identify a problem and then recommend a solution. But is demographics something we change or respond to? There are however, specific programs such as Stay Work Play that seek to change the demographic trend.

T. Johnson asked how strategies would be weighted or prioritized. J. Czysz noted that currently the TASCs are evaluating strategies based upon their feasibility and impact, part of which looks at how many planning areas might be addressed by one strategy. T. Johnson suggested also using equity and demographics as part of how projects are weighted.

T. Murphy noted that part of the problem is that not all communities know about current demographic shifts, in particular, and equity. There is still a trend toward practicing growth management. This is in part an educational process and this document is the vehicle with which to do so. Related, J. Hayes noted that the text on page 4 “a shift from accommodating growth to accommodating change” could be the tag line for this document.

K. Peterson asked if there is a way to show buy in from communities and state agencies. K. Diers replied that NRPC’s plan frames each goal with “What can NRPC do?” and “Considerations for municipalities.” Other regions have done similar to help. K. Peterson followed up by asking how do we show this in the snapshot and do we need to. J. Czysz suggested perhaps the report could include a methodology section.

C. Russell asked what about recommended local and regional strategies? Should these all be represented in the snapshot? K. Diers and J. Czysz indicated there were too many to merge all. Recommendation from the committee was instead to highlight the top priorities from each region and identify those recommendations that relate to common issues.

T. Murphy noted that we need to be clear on what the intent of the snapshot is? Could this be the document that folks turn to when they don’t have the time to read 9 regional plans? V. McLeod replied that authors always need to focus on purpose. In this case it’s not just that of the snapshot, but the process as a whole. For him, he viewed the GSF effort as an opportunity to “connect the dots,” noting that state agency commissioners have been working to get out of their respective metaphorical silos and this effort has the potential to highlight those areas of connection between agencies.

V. McLeod referred to the Snapshot as essentially being a business plan, wherein the final product should include:

- 1 page bulleted highlights
- 4 page executive summary
- 15 page report body
- 80 page detailed appendix

He noted in the end, because there are many different audiences, we need to be cognizant of how we tailor or market the document to each audience. However, we don't have marketing people at the table.

T. Johnson – is this a live piece that can get updated over time. Sheer number of partners across sectors is what impressed me. How can I use this to represent the public health sector? For me this isn't about the nitty gritty of planning. For example if our residents have better access to housing, transportation, good schools, jobs, it means they have the opportunity to lead healthier lives.

V. McLeod stated that the Snapshot needs to be a living document that can continually grow. K. Peterson inquired whether there is a marketing plan. K. Diers replied that this input is needed from the Advisory Committee. What would resonate? K. Peterson replied that the Advisory Committee should identify key organizations, state agencies, elected leadership to share the Snapshot with once drafted. V. McLeod added that presentations should be straightforward and concisely state what the process was and what is in the Snapshot.

K. Diers asked what are the key themes and messages. Are they equity and demographics and how does each relate to each of the different planning sectors. T. Fahey replied that the Snapshot needs to talk about opportunity and hope. For example when writing or discussing large numbers of baby boomers nearing retirement age don't just focus on the possibility that there is no workforce, remember there is an older workforce, that is a strength.

J. Cysz asked if there were other resounding trends other than equity and demographics. K. Peterson suggested climate, particularly the amount of rainfall coming down and the need to ensure our infrastructure adequate. A recent example of disaster reimbursement: FEMA will only refund to rebuild exactly as something was, not to change the infrastructure to be better sized to meet storm loads and mitigate climate change impacts. Therefore, infrastructure is being rebuilt and may not weather another storm.

J. Hayes suggested that resilience is a larger concept still, thinking of change, resiliency incorporates in climate change and more – demographics, economy, etc. V. McLeod added that it is important to show as public servants there are solutions if we act as a community and that the concept of public service is important.

The committee discussed the remaining project timeline and deadlines. The grant concludes at the end of December 2014, therefore the Snapshot must be complete by that time. J. Hayes cautioned all to be careful. The RPCs need to adopt their regional plans this fall. Should the regional plans be adopted first before the snapshot is final? Is it ok to complete the snapshot before all regions have adopted?

The committee conversation flowed from the general discussion of the Snapshot, Agenda item 2, into the discussion of implementation, Agenda item 4.

It was asked what the final role of the Snapshot will be. Is it to be handed over to the Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) to become the State Development Plan? General consensus was no, that would not be appropriate. That said, it should be presented to OEP as a solid foundation from which they could prepare a State Development Plan.

T. Johnson asked who would serve as the backbone or primary entity for implementation when this is done, acknowledging that NRPC has held the burden thus far. J. Hayes replied that RPCs will take on their portions, but statewide it is uncertain. The process has yielded nine regional plans with a common framework. K. Diers cited the NH Center for Public Policy Studies' work as an example of preparing document that highlights key issues and information for use by statewide policy makers; much like the Snapshot is intended. T. Johnson followed by asking if it is then is it up to the nine regions to implement. K. Diers replied yes, and clarified that the majority of recommendations included in the regional plans do not have funding, but their inclusion in the regional plan provides a direction for each and identifies where as a region time and programmatic efforts should be invested.

K. Peterson noted that one of the strengths of this document is the ability to call out common themes across the state, and provide a single source a state agency can point to and says this is important in all nine regions, thus it gives power to state agencies to support local and regional priorities. V. McLeod highlighted the importance of providing local input to state policy makers. If the Snapshot is broken down at the regional level, and then common themes are presented, that adds strength.

K. Peterson asked whether there was a HUD implementation program? J. Czysz noted that there is not at this time. B. Frost noted that NHHFA is about to prepare a handbook on implementation case studies. K. Dykgraaf noted that HUD does have some funding in the proposed budget, but it has yet to be voted on by Congress. V. McLeod asked if there is there a way to network with private organizations to fund implementation. K. Peterson suggested contacting the Home Builders and Remodelers Association to ensure they are engaged in the final project phase.

Committee members noted a couple of opportunities to integrate priorities into other initiatives or collaborate to further implementation. Some suggestions included the 50 by 60 Food Systems Report, New England Food Systems Report, NH State Health Improvement Plan, and the Business and Industry Association where there might be an opportunity to make a presentation to present to one of their committees once the snapshot is done.

The committee suggested making presentations to the following constituencies and regarding each as a key audience to whom the Snapshot should be tailored:

- Senate President
- Speaker of the House
- Legislators (via a legislative breakfast or committee presentations)
- Governor
- Office of Energy and Planning
- State Agency Commissioners (via Commissioner's monthly meeting)
- Council on Resources and Development
- Local officials (via RPCs' individual outreach efforts)
- Local organizations such as Rotary and Kiwanis (via RPCs' individual outreach efforts)
- Key statewide organizations such as the Endowment for Health, BIA, Homebuilders

The committee discussed the feasibility of creating a coordinated outreach kit with a single PowerPoint presentation that can be used for statewide audiences that provides local and regional examples. A regional variant of the presentation could include a slimmed down version that summarizes the statewide findings and leaves space for RPCs to add their own findings. Also suggested was to create a speakers' bureau. The committee recommended to again reaching out to the original 100 plus partners

and interested organizations to hold a final get together and presentation. Through all it is important to show that all agencies, organizations, regions and municipalities are connected within a larger community in New Hampshire.

T. Johnson noted that framing from the perspective of collective impact is key element to communicate as well. As an advocate of implementation, he will hone in on the priorities that align with his organization's priorities. T. Murphy noted that equity was another theme or feature that is of an integrative nature, removing of the silos is an important theme to have stated up front. We need solutions that cover a full range of solutions. K. Diers summarized the key themes suggested during the meeting: equity, demographics, resiliency, and collective impact.

V. McLeod noted that the final message needs to be clear that all are listening to responses to the Snapshot and that people will come up with great responses that aren't considered in the snapshot.

The title "Statewide Snapshot" was discussed. All agreed that it is not reflective of the intended product, but for now to refer to it as a working title. Once there is a complete draft, perhaps a name will be more apparent.

3. Planning Metrics Gateway

J. Czysz gave a brief overview of progress to format all core metrics data compiled by the 9 RPCs. Final products will include Excel data for download and an online GIS data viewer. Focus is on making common planning information available as consistent statewide data at the municipal level.

5. Next Meeting

- a. September 22, 2014, 1:30 – 3:30 PM
- b. Early November, date TBD

6. Public comments

There being no further business and no public comments the meeting adjourned at 11:50 AM.