

## **Aroostook CGPZ Planning Committee Meeting Minutes February 18, 2015**

**Attendance:** Mark Draper, Cheryl St. Peter, Sarah Medina, Bill Paterson, Paul Bernier, Jim Nadeau, and Jim May

**Others Present:** Alain Ouellette, Ken Murchison, Billie MacLean, Hugh Coxe, Ben Godsoe, and Jay Kamm

Mark Draper, Chair, opened the meeting at 9:12 with welcomes and introductions.

### **Minutes of January 21, 2015 meeting**

The minutes of the January 21, 2015 meeting were accepted with a minor modification. The date should read January 21, 2015 and not January 15, 2015.

### **Review of Roles of Steering Committee.**

Jay briefly reviewed the roles of the Steering Committee as there appeared to be some confusion during the January meeting. The Steering Committee is being asked to “look at the big picture” and not develop product. NMDC and LUPC staff will be developing draft products for the meeting for the Committee to react to. We are also asking that Committee members to bring their knowledge of the unorganized and deorganized when we are developing standards.

### **Revised Timeline.**

Jay reviewed the revised timeline and assured the Committee that the new timeline was being followed and that we are on schedule.

### **Presentation and Work Session- Small Business Development Subdistrict (D-SBD).**

Hugh and Jay presented several documents relating to the development of the Small Business Development Subdistrict (D-SBD). The Steering Committee was asked to help refine the **Purpose** and **Description** of what the Subdistrict should achieve. They were also asked to begin identifying locations in Aroostook County where the D-SBD would, could or should go.

The Committee felt that the D-SBD should support the traditional forestry, agriculture, and recreational industries and allow for the expansion of additional uses including processing and value added. The district should also allow for the development of business beyond the traditional uses and those not associated with forestry, agriculture, and recreation as long as some size limits is created. There was also some concern (in the Purpose statement) when it identifies “rural growth centers or hubs.

The Committee felt the D-SBD needs to focus on development and make it easier for small business (beyond forestry and agriculture) to grow (or locate) in the unorganized or deorganized. Committee members asked for staff re-word part of the **Purpose** statement to include

“concentrate development in areas that are suitable for potential growth.” These sentences will be re-worded by staff and provided to the Committee for review.

Committee members also reviewed the **Description** of the zone. Generally, the **Description** was approved as presented with the removal of the following wording. The fourth sentence was changed to read “The subdistrict is not designed to accommodate high traffic businesses ~~such as retail establishments or self-storage facilities~~ which would be better located in a community center or rural settlement; or to facilitate strip development along highways.” There was also a discussion whether this sentence should be struck in its entirety. This will be revisited at the March meeting.

Committee members were also provided with a DRAFT list of potential small businesses and public facilities that could potentially be located in the D-SBD. It was explained that this was not a complete list and should only be used for discussion purposes. Of the 19 potential uses provided, “Commercial uses associated with residences, other than a home occupation” was removed. Several others were refined and/or needed definitions. It was suggested that staff group each of the uses into 3 or 4 categories so that it they would be easier to consider. Staff will complete for the March meeting.

There was also considerable discussion concerning location. LUPC and NMDC staff were not looking for specific locations within a township or plantation but towns, plantations, or townships where this subdistrict should be located. A list of 18 townships, plantations, and towns was provided. Discussion revolved around if the creation of performance standards rather than the identification of specific areas would provide better results. Committee and staff determined that a hybrid approach (standards and locational) may be the best alternative.

Border towns such as the Big Twenty (Escourt), St. Pamphile, and Daaquam were also discussed. In most cases, there is significant development located on the Canadian side of the border at those locations as well as border crossings. Committee members felt that if allowed in these location, the district should be with a certain distance of the border. No set distance was discussed and this will be re-visited.

The Route 11 Corridor (T9 R5, T8 R5, T9 R5 and T14 R6) were also discussed and should be considered due to potential future economic growth. The Committee felt that any new development should be clustered along this corridor and that the number of new curb cuts be limited. In more developed townships, members felt that the distance could be increased (2 miles was discussed) but no motion or agreement was made.

The following towns and plantations were removed from the list: Hammond and Glenwood. The following were added: Macwahoc and Molunkus. Staff will revise the documents and provide at the March meeting

## **Public Participation**

Jay indicated that it is time to begin thinking about the first series of public meetings. The objective of those meetings would be to update the public concerning activities to date and to

potentially generate new ideas for a product. Committee members were cautioned that the generation of totally new ideas could lengthen the timeline.

Jay felt that the audience should include:

- Landowners
- General public
- Municipal officials
- Natural Resource Professionals
- Environmental groups
- Major employers
- Tribes
- Interested Parties List
- Others as deemed necessary by the Steering Committee

Advertising for each meeting will include utilization public service announcements (PSAs) of local media sources, email, website announcements, direct telephone calls, and letters.

CGPZ Steering Committee will sponsor 4 subregional meetings in an effort to obtain public input. Each meeting will be in the evening from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. Meeting will be scheduled, whenever possible the night before the regularly scheduled CGPZ meeting. Meeting locations may include:

- Oakfield
- Van Buren
- Fort Kent
- Ashland

#### Next Meeting/Adjourn

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

Meeting adjourned at 12:05PM