

**Community-Guided Planning and Zoning for the
Unorganized Territories of Somerset and Franklin Counties: Workshop 2**

**Kennebec Valley High School
Bingham, ME**

July 22, 2014; 6-8:30 pm.

Attendance

LUPC: Hugh Coxe, Samantha Horn-Olsen, Gwen Hilton, Robert Dunphy

Convening Agencies: Jim Batey, Somerset Economic Development Corporation; Chris Huck, Kennebec Valley Council of Governments; John Maloney, Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments

Steering Committee: Tom Rumpf, Don Kleiner, Luke Muzzy, Steve Steward, Alison Hagerstrom, Alan Michka, Luke Muzzy, Steve Seward, Alison Hagerstrom

Facilitators: Frank O'Hara, Alison Truesdale

Members of the public: Dave and Carolyn Small, Carrying Place Twp. landowners; Daniel Wood, lodge owner in Mayfield; David Spencer, Somerset County UT Coordinator; Kaitlyn Bernard, Appalachian Mountain Club; Kay Michka, resident of Lexington Twp.; Karen Pease, resident of Lexington Twp; Julie Richards, Bingham Second Selectman and Principal of Kennebec Valley High School.

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Overview of agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Straw Man proposal discussion
5. Brainstorming of names for future participants (committees and chair)
6. Brainstorming of potential resources
7. Next step for Steering Committee

After everyone introduced themselves and the agenda was approved, Frank O'Hara first asked all the attendees to express their hopes for an outcome for this workshop:

Don Kleiner: wants to end with a workable process, that's not easily hijacked by any particular interest.

Tom Rumpf: supports Don's thoughts; the process is important; let's learn from the experience in Aroostook and come up with a process that will move forward.

Steve Steward: hopes the plan will work for the UTs, and is not shelved.

Gwen Hilton: hoping for a successful outcome.

David Spencer: hoping for progress.

Alison Hagerstrom: would like to end up with a workable process.

Alan Michka: hoping for an open and transparent process inclusive of all UT residents.

David Small: interested in what will happen to the environment.

Kay Michka: wants to see residents included in process.

Karen Pease: wants to see residents included in process.

Minutes of the previous workshop were not available; Frank and Alison will send those minutes and the minutes for the current workshop to the Steering Committee members for their approval outside of the meetings.

Review of Strawman Proposal

The following outline contains the strawman proposal in the left column, with comments and suggestions on the right. The strawman proposal is essentially the same as what was proposed with two exceptions. Under item #1, the Steering Committee agreed to have the three agencies act as sponsors of the planning process (the county commissions were eliminated as an option); and under item #7, rather than have "other" listed as a member of the subcommittees, "resident" was added.

<u>Proposed Structure</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<p><u>1) Sponsoring organizations</u> <i>The sponsoring organizations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Approve the final process document</i>• <i>Appoint the chair and committee members</i>• <i>Approve the final product before it is submitted to LUPC</i> <p>AVCOG, KVCOG, SEDC</p>	<p>Clyde Barker, Franklin County Commissioner, and Lloyd Trafton, Somerset County Commissioner, are comfortable with 1) the County Commissioners being apprised of developments as they happen; 2) approving the process document; and 3) reviewing and commenting on the planning document before it goes to LUPC Commission for approval.</p> <p>It was agreed to make SEDC, KVCOG, and AVCOG the sponsoring organizations.</p> <p>Jim Batey: steering committee and public nominate planning committee members for approval by SEDC, KVCOG, AVCOG boards.</p>
<p><u>2) A decentralized planning structure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>A 2-county planning committee to approve one final proposal for LUPC</i>	<p>Don Kleiner: COGs could do the planning work, SEDC could play the Coordinator role, overseeing and</p>

- *But it meets infrequently, and relies on the work of subcommittees to do the bulk of the detailed work.*
- *See details of model below*

A. The 2-county planning committee

In order to save people long travel to meetings, only meets 3 or 4 times over course of project

- ***(optional) To select an area of focus.***
The committee could simply be given an area of focus (i.e. a recreation plan, see point 9 below); or instead could choose its area of focus itself, at a facilitated meeting.
- ***To set overall goals.*** Once an area of focus is set, then the committee needs to set up the overall framework within which the subcommittees will work – the goals of the process, the common vision, the underlying values, the specifications for products. This also would be a facilitated meeting, with map and visioning exercises
- ***To have a mid-point check in.*** After receiving the instructions from the large group, the subcommittees get to work within their own regions applying the principles and goals to their own areas. But after the data gathering is complete, and initial plan ideas start to take shape, the subcommittees need to come together again as a committee of the whole – to share their results, to talk over linkages, to critique each other’s work, to revisit and refine the goals, vision, and products.
- ***At the end of the process.*** After the check-in meeting, the subcommittees go back to work to develop their plans. At the end, the subcommittees again come together to look at the final product, to make improvements, and to approve a document for submission to the

making sure the work is done. Who funds?

Tom Rumpf: The LUPC reorganization focused on not having their staff do the planning, but empower counties to do the work. The assumption was that they would find a way to fund it.

COGs will have to be in close communication in order to keep the two counties from diverging too much.

As a practical matter, it will be essential to have the planning topic be defined before funding can be found.

Alison and Frank will solicit names from the agencies for the planning committee; the agencies will make final decisions on the planning committee membership.

sponsors and LUPC.

B) The subcommittees

- Geographically focused
 - One for the Eustis – Carrabasset-Kingfield corridor in Franklin County
 - One for the Bingham-Forks-Jackman corridor in Somerset County
- Apply the overall principles, values, and goals to a specific region – work out the details of the plan within the region
- Meet more frequently than the large group

3) Project chair(s)

- One chair (or two, one for each county) appointed by the sponsors.
- Should be widely respected, no ax to grind, lend credibility to the effort among the public, and have the time to lead the effort.
- Role is not administrative, but big picture – to make sure that the process is on track, that it is working on things of value, that the right parties are being engaged.

The co-chairs attend the larger regional meetings. One is designated as the lead. They can fill in for each other in order to reduce the meeting time. The County Commissioners can nominate people, but the three agencies appoint them. Nominate a limited number of people from the subcommittees to go to the regional meetings, but others can go as well.

4) Staffing

- AVCOG shall provide the primary staff for subcommittees within Franklin County.
- KVCOG (and SEDC?) shall provide the primary staff for subcommittees within Somerset County.
- Consultants may be used to provide research to the subcommittees (as in the case of the Somerset ED planning program).
- LUPC shall make staff available to help with research, mapping, and understanding of the LUPC statute and rules.
- Region-wide committee meetings should be jointly staffed by AVCOG, KVCOG (and SEDC?).

No comments.

5) Project coordinator

If resources could be found, a project

The Project Coordinator is a critical role. Without this person there is no

<p>coordinator would make the process run more smoothly and efficiently. Such a person could play a purely administrative role, helping to coordinate meetings and materials; or could play a larger planning role, helping design and oversee the planning process.</p>	<p>accountability and no ability to keep the project on track and on time. It should be a paid position; a funding issue. Any of the agencies could play this role; the agencies should go to the county commissioners for Coordinator funds.</p>
<p>6) Administrative team AVCOG, KVCOG (and SEDC?), LUPC staff, the project coordinator (if one is found), and when possible the Project chair, should meet regularly to coordinate timing, products, and formats.</p>	<p>No comments.</p>
<p>7) Committee and subcommittee membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcommittees should include, at a minimum, representatives of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County • Municipalities (especially “hubs”) • Large property owner • Tourism business sector • Small property owner • Recreation interests • Environmental interests • Tourism groups, chamber of commerce • Resident • Members to be appointed by the sponsors in each county. • Every member of a subcommittee is a member of the 2-county planning committee. 	<p>AMC, NRCM and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy agree that either the AMC or ATC would be good representatives. The ATC representative lives in Farmington, so might be more available.</p> <p>Karen Pease: residents need input. Consider former representatives Melville Gilmore and Wright Pinkham as Coordinators who might not ask for pay.</p> <p>Kay Michka: get the word out so that people can put themselves forward.</p>
<p>8) Public Input</p> <p>Goal: provide opportunities for a broad spectrum of residents, property owners, and interested parties to participate, as well as to allow for a respectful consideration of divergent views.</p> <p>Opportunities for extensive public input might be provided at the key junctures of action for the 2-county planning committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At first meeting of the 2-county planning 	<p>A website sponsored jointly by KVCOG and AVCOG is easily done.</p> <p>Kay Michka: A letter should be sent to every resident of the UT in Somerset and Franklin counties inviting input.</p>

<p>committee, a substantial input session for the public to brainstorm ideas and concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At an early point in the subcommittee process, meetings in each county dedicated to public input on key questions • At the end of the subcommittee process, public comment sessions in each county to make suggestions on plans • At the last 2-county planning committee meeting, an opportunity for comment on the final recommendation <p>All meetings in the process should be publicized in the media, and provide an opportunity for (at least) brief public comment at some point during the meeting</p> <p>The project should have an up-to-date web site with all documents. Written comments accepted at any point.</p>	
<p>9) Initial principles for planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize quality over quantity • Preserve “wood basket” for paper and wood products industries • Support revitalization of service centers such as Jackman, Eustis, The Forks, Kingfield, ski resorts, etc. • Preserve connectivity for wildlife habitat • Allow flexibility for property owners • Attract and retain young people with economic opportunity, arts and culture, education, etc. • Provide for a “sustainable” solution – i.e., trails that can be realistically maintained 	<p>Add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CLUP principles • LUPC statutory mission. • connectivity of trails.
<p>10) Options for the subject of the planning process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Could be left entirely open</i> – let the 2-county planning committee go through a planning process to come up with the issue • <i>Could suggest starting with idea of recreation plan containing</i> 	<p>COGs narrow the scope of plan topics for approval, amendment by larger committee.</p> <p>SECD will issue its report at the end of September on the potential for development and conservation in the</p>

- Emphasis on key trails – “hubs and spokes” among service centers
- For all modes – cars (scenic byways), motorized (ATV, snowmobile), bicycle, pedestrian
- Look at supporting infrastructure needed, standards for trail quality and buffering for different modes
- Outcomes include zoning changes, public investments, etc.

county over the next 20 years.

Agencies recruit people to meet in October to review studies and topic ideas and define a project. Agencies will then work up a budget and grant applications.

11) Milestones

So that the planning process does not stretch out indefinitely, the 2-county planning committee shall establish a work plan with specific planning milestones to meet by specific dates. Such milestones might address:

- The selection of the subject to address
- Completion of data collection and mapping
- Initial public input opportunities
- Development of goals, vision, values
- Development of alternative proposals
- Public comment opportunity around proposals
- Final plan or proposal development
- Public comment around final recommendation
- Submission to sponsor boards
- Submission to LUPC board

11) Tie milestones to the budget document. At the first meeting, associate the milestones with specific timeframes (# of months, rather than dates, then work backwards to establish halfway points, etc.). Scheduling will help people to participate because you can then establish meeting dates well in advance.

12) Resources

In order to expand the amount of research and facilitation for the process, the sponsors, staff, and LUPC shall look for additional resources to support the planning effort. Possible sources might be MDOT (trails), Parks and Lands, EDA, conservation organizations, and others.

UT budget money would not be available until July 1st. UT budget has to be approved by the legislature. A funding proposal would need to be submitted in October, then submitted to the legislature in December.

Agencies should start talking about potential funding sources. Funding can't come from an interested party.

	LUPC could do some research for the plan between the time that the topic is identified and the time resources are in hand, so that time would not be wasted.
<p>Funding ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counties. <p>TIF funding from wind developments is a possibility, but not available for 3 years.</p>	
<p><u>13) Coordination with tribes</u></p> <p>LUPC staff coordinate consultation with the tribal governments informed as needed.</p>	Not addressed
<p><u>14) Decision-making process</u></p> <p>Two options among many to consider</p> <p>(1) “modified consensus” – all members (less one) agree</p> <p>Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consensus gives more authority to recommendation when it moves to next step “Minus one” does not allow one person to have veto power over recommendation Aroostook County chose this <p>(2) simple majority rule</p> <p>Advantage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarity, ease of use <p>Minutes should be taken at every meeting</p>	Not addressed
<p><u>15) Roles of LUPC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff attend committee meetings, provide technical assistance as needed and as resources allow Staff and Commission provide input during the planning process with regard to specific ideas and procedures, consistency with the LUPC’s Overarching Principles, the statutory purpose and scope of community guided planning, and LUPC’s rezoning 	Not addressed

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> criteria • LUPC receives final report, approves or disapproves, and acts upon approved recommendations 	
<p><u>16) Approval of plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before submission to LUPC, the plan should be reviewed by both sets of County Commissioners, and approved by the boards of the sponsoring organization. 	Not addressed
<p><u>17) Approval of Community Guided planning process</u></p> <p>The County Commissioners for both counties should be given a chance to review and comment on the process as described in this document. Following County review, the boards from the sponsoring organizations shall review and approve the proposed process and submit it to the LUPC for its review and approval</p> <p>The LUPC shall review the process and approve, or send back to the sponsors for further work.</p> <p>Once approved by the LUPC, the work can begin.</p>	Not addressed
<p><u>18) Amendments to the planning process</u></p> <p>If the committee wants to amend the process as described in this document over the course of the community-guided planning, it must submit its request to the sponsors’ boards. The sponsors’ boards shall request input from the LUPC staff about whether the proposed changes are consistent with the LUPC’s Overarching Principles.</p> <p>If the LUPC staff determines that a serious issue is raised by the change, they may bring the issue to the full LUPC Commission for a determination of whether the change is consistent with LUPC’s Overarching Principles.</p> <p>Following input from the LUPC staff and/or Commission, the sponsors’ boards will act upon the</p>	Not addressed

committee's request.

As a number of aspects of the strawman proposal were not addressed, the Steering Committee agreed to a third meeting, sometime in first two weeks of September. In the meantime, Frank and Alison will distribute minutes from both workshops for the Committee's approval.