

Aroostook CGPZ Planning Committee Meeting Minutes January 15, 2015

Attendance: Mark Draper, Cheryl St. Peter, Ned Berce, Fred Corey, Sarah Medina, Bill Paterson, Paul Bernier, and Jim May

Others Present: Alain Ouellette, Nick Livesay, Billie MacLean, Hugh Coxe, Ben Godsoe, Elgin Turner, and Jay Kamm

Mark Draper, Chair, opened the meeting at 9:10 with welcomes and introductions.

Alain Ouellette welcomed those to the meeting and discussed the partnership with LUPC and NMDC's commitment to the process. He thanked Steering Committee members for their comments during the December telephone calls. Alain also stated that the partnership between NMDC and LUPC should help with the development of a worthwhile product.

Nick Livesay also reiterated LUPC's commitment to the process and the development of a product that the region and LUPC could utilize. Nick stated that the focus of Phase II of the CGPZ process was to focus on the creation of a product and meeting a revised timeline. Steering committee members should be considering where development should occur and how to best get information out to the public.

The objectives for this meeting were outlined as:

- Identify topic (s)
- Agree on a timeline
- Focus on Products

Minutes of September 14, 2014 meeting

The minutes of the September 14, 2014 meeting were accepted as presented.

Presentations

Community Guided Planning and Zoning Goals

Jay presented the five (5) goals of the Community Guided Planning and Zoning process. After discussion, wording for Goal #3 was changed from "*Proactively seek to protect the natural and cultural resources of Aroostook County from inappropriate development and sprawl, for the benefit of future generations*" to "*To protect the natural and cultural resources from incompatible development and sprawl for the benefit of future generations.*"

Locational Consideration

Hugh Coxe asked members to discuss the homework assignment presented an overview of locational considerations for zoning and LUPC's use of the adjacency principle. Hugh's presentation included a discussion on the following topics:

- Ensure adequate public services for new development
- Ensure that any additional service needs may be added efficiently and economically
- Encourage well-planned and managed multiple uses
- Reduce land use intrusions and conflicts
- Minimize development near productive natural resource based activities
- Promote economic health of development centers
- Protect resources and values of the jurisdiction
- Ensure that future development is in keeping with character of the area
- Ensure orderly growth by pacing development
- Allow for incremental assessment of impacts from development.

There was considerable discussion to each item. Steering Committee members felt that it would be easier to begin thinking about potential zones and locations if maps were provided that included the following information: mills and processing plants, Service Centers, settlements, conservation easements, transportation infrastructure, soils, and important infrastructure. Jay will provide these at the February meeting.

Proposed Timeline

Before the Committee began to think about locational consideration in depth, Jay presented a new proposed timeline in an attempt to guide product development. The new timeline, as approved, is:

February 2015

Develop draft conceptual strategies such as revised standards & new zones.

March 2015

Plan for public/ stakeholder outreach & develop materials for public/ stakeholder outreach

April – May 2015

2 sub-regional meetings - April 2015

Develop proposals (revised standards, new subdistricts, etc.) incorporating public input

Analyze locational criteria and data

June 2015

Address locational considerations

July 2015

Seek input from public/stakeholders about proposals and recommendations

August 2015

Finalize project recommendations

Decisions

Hugh presented a follow up to his locational consideration presentation. Hugh presented an overview of developing a specific zone(s) and rezoning specific target areas where a few key locations were identified and mapped for development. This would be the most time consuming and significant new data would need to be generated in order to justify the development of specific zones on the ground.

A second consideration would be the development of criteria to identify appropriate development locations and the development of revised land use Subdistricts. These could be considered “floating zones” and would allow for more flexibility in the rezoning process.

Committee members discussed the following:

- Do away with the rezoning/permitting as separate processes. Make it a one stop shop which would make the zoning piece more predictable.
- The one road mile rule helps protect the resource but perspective zoning is looking at the bigger picture. One road mile adjacently rule may not work well in all situations in Aroostook County.
- We should not forget why people locate and live in Aroostook County. Quality of Life.
- Need to better identify the characteristics of a small businesses and their needs including infrastructure locations, existing land uses, location of existing agriculture and forestry processing facilities.
- Need to keep it simple for the residents and LUPC staff.

There was discussion on the creation of a subcommittee that would look into the product development more thoroughly.

Public Participation

Jay provided a copy of a letter received from the Maine Forest Products Council.

Next Meeting/Adjourn

The next meeting will be at NMDC on February 18, 2015 from 9 a.m. to noon.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10PM