



**Community-Guided Planning for Somerset and  
Franklin Counties:  
Workshop One**

Report to the Land Use Planning Commission  
from  
Planning Decisions, Inc. and LandForms

Submitted July \_\_, 2014

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Workshop Minutes

II. PowerPoint Presentation

III. Handouts

IV. Workshop Attendees

V. Straw Man Proposal

Appendix: Consensus Procedures

# I. WORKSHOP MINUTES

**Community Guided Planning for the  
Unorganized Territories of Franklin and Somerset Counties  
6:00 – 8:30 pm; June 24, 2014**

**Approved \_\_\_\_\_**

**Conveners:**

John Maloney, AVCOG  
Jim Batey, SEDC  
Chris Huck (for Rosie Vanaderstine), KVCOG  
Samantha Horn Olsen; Planning Manager, LUPC  
Hugh Coxe; Senior Planner, LUPC

**Facilitator:** Frank O'Hara, Planning Decisions

**Recorder:** Alison Truesdale, LandForms

**Steering Committee members in attendance:**

Steve Steward, Bingham Selectman  
Luke Muzzy, Plum Creek Timber Company  
Russell Walters, Northern Outdoors  
Tom Rumpf, The Nature Conservancy  
Lloyd Trafton, Somerset County Commissioner  
Janet Peruffo, CSM Real Estate  
Gordon Gamble, Wagner Forest Management  
Clyde Barker, Franklin County Commissioner  
Jay Wyman, First Selectman, Eustis  
Rich Wilkerson, Sugarloaf Mountain  
Alison Hagerstrom, Greater Franklin Development Corporation  
Betsy Squibb, High Peaks Alliance  
Alan Michka, Friends of Highland Mountains  
Don Kleiner, Maine Professional Guides Assoc.

**Other attendees:**

1. Bruce Bell, Redding Mountain Wind
2. Kaitlin Bernard, Appalachian Mountain Club
3. Kirsten B. Burbank, Friends of Highland Mountains
4. Eliza Donoghue, Natural Resources Council of Maine
5. Bill Gilmore, Land Use Planning Commissioner
6. Karen Bessey Pease, author, blogger; Lexington Twp.
7. Claire Polfus, Appalachian Trail Conservancy
8. David Spencer, Asst. Dist. Atty., Somerset County
9. Jim Taylor

**AGENDA**

Introductions  
Overview of Community Planning Process  
Brainstorm Opportunities and Risks  
Setting Priorities  
Comments from Public Members at the Meeting  
Next Meeting

**GENERAL IDEAS**

- Convert natural assets into economic benefit.
- Consider incentives for large landowners as compensation for public access.
- Provide flexibility in land use regulations to allow for new land uses such as huts and trails model and zip lining (e.g., regs based on impacts, not land use definitions).
- Businesses must be able to operate in 3-4 seasons in order to survive.
- Snowmobiling is a significant use but probably not expanding (and may be declining due to aging population and the cost of entry).
- ATV use is growing.
- Destination mountain/trail biking is growing.
- Local food movement is worth noting.
- Maple sugaring is a growing business.
- Wood products industry continues to be a significant and important part of the economy but is not likely to experience significant growth and has experienced some reduction in employment, primarily from production and operations efficiencies in this sector.
- Any new uses should be planned and sited so as to avoid or minimize potential impacts to the wood resources of the area.
- Recreation and tourism appear to be poised for growth in economic activity and employment.
- Focus of planning process should be on land use policies that respond to economic opportunities and less so on trying to fix any perceived land use regulation problems.

**Service centers:**

- Allow development that supports population centers;
- Augment culture, community and education in order to retain population, attract new residents (address reasons why people – young and old – are leaving)
- Don't forget the ski mountains and UT's that act as service centers:
  - Sugarloaf
  - Sunday River
  - West Forks
  - Rockwood

- Eustis
- Pleasant Ridge

**Maintain the wood basket:**

- Value-added wood processing may be an area of potential growth – in addition to the significant mills already in the area
- Trails need to be compatible with forest management
- Long term wood supply contracts need to be met

**PRODUCT IDEAS**

1. Opportunity zones
2. Rezoning and development standards along scenic byways
3. Prospective zoning, especially looking at the need for infrastructure, capitalizing on opportunities
4. Recreational Trail Plan
  - Existing trails:
    - Bike Trails (on- and off-road)
    - Snowmobile trails (ITS and club)
    - Northern Forest Canoe Trail
    - Maine Huts and Trails (built and planned)
    - Appalachian Trail
    - Fly-Rod Crosby Trail
    - Scenic byways
    - Benedict Arnold trail?
  - Flexibility for identifying future locations for development and uses
    - not locking land uses in now
  - Looking at invigorating or revitalizing service centers/recreational hubs based on allowing UT to provide more value to the hubs
  - Preserve connectivity for wildlife habitat, especially across scenic byways
  - hub and spoke model
  - limit the number of trails so that they can be maintained at a reasonable cost (may be a certification issue for landowners)
  - Emphasize quality over quantity
  - Allow flexibility for landowners so forest management is not compromised
  - Buffers needed? Or zoning standards along trails?
  - Ensure local capacity for emergency services (e.g. backcountry rescue)
  - Consider compatibility of motorized and non-motorized uses
  - connect trails to service centers

### **THE STAKEHOLDERS**

- Service Centers
  - Coordinate with their growth management plans
- Landowners
- Residents
- Businesses
- Scenic byway communities
- Maine Huts and Trails
- Appalachian Mountain Club
- Northern Forest Canoe Trail
- State government (trail easements, public lands)
- Network of Networks
- Tourism groups, chambers of commerce
- Arts and culture groups

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

- Should be broad-based
- Members should assist with outreach to local people and remote areas
- Planning process should be transparent
- Will need to be clear about how it will conduct a planning process across county lines or with multiple service center communities

### **QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER FOCUS**

If the focus of the planning process were to look at invigorating or revitalizing service centers/recreational hubs based on allowing the UT to provide more value to the hubs, what sorts of changes would there need to be to the LUPC regulations? How would the group go about identifying that set of needed changes and what would it need from the LUPC to do so? For instance, since trails are already permitted within the M-GN, what regulatory changes would need to be made to enhance the opportunity for high quality trail development, with attendant services and infrastructure that fed back to the recreational hubs and service centers?

### **NEXT STEPS**

#### **Tentative Dates and Agenda for Future Workshops**

#### **Workshop #2: July 22-25**

Based on Workshop #1 discussion, the facilitators will create a “straw man” proposal for a Franklin-Somerset community-guided planning process and mail it to committee members prior to Workshop #2.

**Agenda:**

- Review, reshape, elaborate on, add detail to, and sharpen the straw-man proposal.



## II. POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

### III. HANDOUTS

## COMMUNITY GUIDED PLANNING & ZONING INFORMATION

### INTRODUCTION

Community Guided Planning & Zoning (CGPZ) is an initiative of the Maine Land Use Planning Commission (LUPC or Commission) through which the Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments (AVCOG), Kennebec Valley Council of Governments (KVCOG) and the Somerset Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) will assist Somerset and Franklin Counties to proactively plan for land uses in its unorganized and deorganized areas (the UT). This prospective planning and zoning initiative will provide those living, working, and owning land, as well as others with a direct interest in a region, an opportunity to evaluate the present and future land use needs for their region and to develop a strategy for meeting these needs. Prospective planning and zoning also will allow the LUPC to ensure greater predictability of land use regulation for businesses, property owners, and others with an interest in the use of land and development patterns in the UT.

Many approaches to planning proactively for land use in the UT are possible through CGPZ. The goal is to produce practical and effective recommendations – perhaps for a rezoning, the creation of new zones, a transportation and infrastructure plan, an industrial growth plan, a recreation plan, an open space strategy, a habitat connectivity strategy, a comprehensive plan for a specific area, or some other approach or some combination of the above approaches – in light of the need for more prospective or proactive planning, particularly in identifying appropriate areas for economic development.

After an open application period, the LUPC selected Somerset and Franklin Counties as the second region to participate in the CGPZ process. (Aroostook County was selected as the first region in the spring of 2013 and is currently underway with their CGPZ planning process.) AVCOG, KVCOG and SEDC have appointed a Steering Committee representing diverse interests whose task will be to develop the details of the regional land use planning process. A professional facilitator hired by the LUPC will assist the Steering Committee to develop a process to 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 different views.

Following the Steering Committee's work, the Commission will consider the proposed process for approval. Once the process has been approved, AVCOG, KVCOG and SEDC will select a Planning Committee, lead the regional land use planning effort, conduct regular meetings open to the public, and develop a draft final report and recommendations. All Steering Committee meetings and subsequent regional land use planning meetings will be open to the public.

### WHAT IS PROSPECTIVE PLANNING AND ZONING?

Prospective planning and zoning is a process that allows residents, property owners, businesses and other interested parties in the UT to work together to plan for future land uses of specific

areas, including to allow for new appropriate uses which may include business, residential and/or recreational uses. Rather than a “top – down” plan from a State agency, this is an opportunity for a locally-driven redrawing of the map in the UT where co-operative, “bottom – up” solutions can be agreed upon by the participants and documented for LUPC consideration.

In regions that participate in a prospective planning and zoning process, suitable areas may be identified prospectively for commercial, residential and/or recreational uses, so that businesses and property owners can propose new uses with greater assurance that the proposal is appropriate for that location.

A CGPZ process may include, or result in, rezoning of specific areas for future development. This may allow businesses or property owners to propose new uses or development without the need for seeking a rezoning of the land. This would allow proposed projects to go straight to the application processes for the actual development work, thereby simplifying and expediting the review process. New prospectively zoned areas may allow residents, property owners, businesses and other interested parties to plan ahead with greater confidence for strategic investment in land use decision-making, whether for commercial and residential development, resource management or conservation.

#### WHAT IS THE LUPC'S ROLE AND WHAT IS IT LOOKING FOR?

The LUPC is a nine-member board charged with overseeing land use planning and much of the land use permitting in the UT, an area that covers almost half of the State. The Commission acts much as a planning board would in an organized town. Among the LUPC's responsibilities, as set forth in State law, is to encourage appropriate residential, recreational, commercial and industrial land uses; to honor the rights and participation of residents and property owners in the UT while recognizing the unique value of these lands and waters to the State; to discourage the intermixing of incompatible industrial, commercial, residential and recreational activities; and to encourage well-planned and well-managed multiple uses, including conservation, of land and resources and to encourage and facilitate regional economic viability.

Ultimately, any product developed through the CGPZ process will require Commission acceptance if it is to be implemented by the Commission and any rezoning or modification to the Commission's rules must satisfy statutory criteria. Throughout the CGPZ process, LUPC staff will assist AVCOG, KVCOG, SEDC and the Planning Committee by providing information and highlighting the relevant statutory requirements. This will help ensure that the result of the Somerset and Franklin region's significant commitment of time and resources will both achieve local goals, and be consistent with LUPC's statutory review criteria as well as the Commission's statutory purpose and guiding principles.

When the LUPC receives the maps, plans or recommendations that the Planning Committee and AVCOG, KVCOG and SEDC produce, the Commission has identified a set of Overarching Principles that it will apply when determining whether to approve and act upon the

recommendations. The product of the CGPZ effort and the process through which it is developed must:

- Ensure a locally driven, locally desired process
- Encourage broad participation
- Respect property owner equity
- Balance regional uniqueness and statewide consistency for stakeholders
- Be consistent with statutory purpose and guiding principles

The goal of land use planning in the UT is to encourage the well-planned and well-managed multiple use, including conservation, of land and resources and to encourage and facilitate regional economic viability.

### *Prospective Zones Are Different*

Prospective Zoning is different from the Commission's usual approach. It establishes districts large enough to accommodate all anticipated growth in a region within a certain time period rather than designating districts on a case-by-case basis to make room for particular development projects.

With some exceptions<sup>1</sup>, the current process works like this -- when a landowner wants a permit for anything more intensive than a single-family home or home occupation within a Management or Protection Subdistrict, he or she must first file a petition to rezone the property to a Development Subdistrict. Under this project-by-project approach, development zones are dispersed somewhat randomly. While new zones must be located within a mile of a similar zone, what the Commission calls "adjacency," development can leapfrog and spread ever outward. In contrast, prospective zoning provides explicit and reasonable boundaries to meet the development needs of a region within the next 20 years.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exceptions include Lake Concept Plans, Resource Plans, and zoning for Greenfield and Madrid.

## IV. WORKSHOP ATTENDEES

<b>Pre-Planning Steering Committee</b>		
<b>Representative</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Location</b>
Clyde Barker	County Commissioner	Franklin County
Gordon Gamble	Wagner Forest Management, LTD.	Region-wide
Alison Hagerstrom	Executive Director, Greater Franklin Development Corp.	Franklin County
Don Kleiner	Maine Professional Guides Assoc.	Recreation
Alan Michka	Friends of Highland Mtns.	Western mountains
Luke Muzzy	Plum Creek Timber Co.	Region-wide; large landowner
Tom Rumpf	conservation	Region-wide
Janet Peruffo	CSM Real Estate	Franklin County
Steve Steward	selectman/public	Bingham; service center
Lloyd Trafton	County Commissioner	Somerset County
Russell Walters	business owner/tourism	Somerset County Forks/region-wide
Rich Wilkerson	Recreation/Sugarloaf	Franklin County
Jay Wyman	First Selectman, Town of Eustis	Franklin County; service center

<b>LUPC Staff/Conveners</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Jim Batey	Somerset Economic Development Corp.
Chris Huck	Kennebec Valley Council of Governments
John Maloney	Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments
Hugh Coxe	Land Use Planning Commission
Samantha Horn-Olsen	Land Use Planning Commission

<b>Members of the Public</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Bruce Bell	Redding Mountain Wind
Kaitlin Bernard	Appalachian Mountain Club
Kirsten B. Burbank	Friends of Highland Mountains
Eliza Donoghue	Natural Resources Council of Maine
Bill Gilmore	Land Use Planning Commission
Karen Bessey Pease	Lexington Twp.
Claire Polfus	Appalachian Trail Conservancy
David Spencer	Somerset County
Jim Taylor	Lexington Twp.



## V. STRAW MAN PROPOSAL

**DRAFT**  
**PROPOSAL FOR WESTERN MAINE COMMUNITY-GUIDED PLANNING PROCESS**  
**July 15, 2014**

<u>Proposed Structure</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<p><b><u>1) Sponsoring organizations</u></b>  <i>The sponsoring organizations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Approve the final process document</i></li> <li>• <i>Appoint the chair and committee members</i></li> <li>• <i>Approve the final product before it is submitted to LUPC</i></li> </ul> <p>There are at least 3 possibilities (and could be more). The 3 are:</p> <p><b>A. <u>AVCOG, KVCOG, SEDC</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ They submitted the proposals initially</li> <li>○ They will provide the staff</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reasons against: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ COG Board members are from municipalities, not unorganized territories, not familiar with issues</li> <li>○ 3 boards + LUPC is a lot to coordinate, especially if there are disagreements to work out</li> <li>○ Unbalanced - 2 from Somerset, 1 from Franklin</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>B. <u>Somerset and Franklin Counties</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ They represent residents of unorganized areas</li> <li>○ Some counties participated in formulating LUPC changes in the law</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reasons against: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ They didn't submit the local proposals</li> <li>○ They don't have staff</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>C. <u>AVCOG and KVCOG only</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Coordinating 2 boards is easier than 3</li> <li>○ Will be providing planning staff</li> <li>○ Jim Batey could represent SEDC as committee member</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reasons against: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SEDC an original proposal submitter</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>This is a basic decision. But the planning group may want to deal with it last, once the scope of the project is clearer.</i></p>

**2) A decentralized planning structure**

- *A 2-county planning committee to approve one final proposal for LUPC*
- *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 sponsors and LUPC.

*This proposed structure is based on what seemed to be the consensus approach of the steering committee at the June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. Other structures discussed include a “centralized” approach that has one committee that plans for both counties.*

**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

<p><b><u>3) Project chair(s)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One chair (or two, one for each county) appointed by the sponsors.</li> <li>• Should be widely respected, no ax to grind, lend credibility to the effort among the public, and have the time to lead the effort.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>4) Staffing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AVCOG shall provide the primary staff for subcommittees within Franklin County.</li> <li>• KVCOG (and SEDC?) shall provide the primary staff for subcommittees within Somerset County.</li> <li>• Consultants may be used to provide research to the subcommittees (as in the case of the Somerset ED planning program).</li> <li>• LUPC shall make staff available to help with research, mapping, and understanding of the LUPC statute and rules.</li> <li>• Region-wide committee meetings should be jointly staffed by AVCOG, KVCOG (and SEDC?).</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>5) Project coordinator</u></b></p> <p>If resources could be found, a project 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><b><u>6) Administrative team</u></b></p> <p>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><b><u>7) Committee and subcommittee membership</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subcommittees should include, at a minimum, representatives of:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County</li> <li>• Municipalities (especially “hubs”)</li> <li>• Large property owner</li> <li>• Tourism business sector</li> <li>• Small property owner</li> <li>• Recreation interests</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>LUPC does not have an approval role on individual appointees, but has a role in informing the appointing bodies if the teams do not appear to meet the</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental interests</li> <li>• Tourism groups, chamber of commerce</li> <li>• Other?</li> <li>• Members to be appointed by the sponsors in each county.</li> <li>• Every member of a subcommittee is a member of the 2-county planning committee.</li> </ul>	<p><i>LUPC's standard of "broad participation by all with an interest in the region."</i></p>
<p><b>8) Public Input</b></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"> <li>• At first meeting of the 2-county planning committee, a substantial input session for the public to brainstorm ideas and concerns</li> <li>• At an early point in the subcommittee process, meetings in each county dedicated to public input on key questions</li> <li>• At the end of the subcommittee process, public comment sessions in each county to make suggestions on plans</li> <li>• At the last 2-county planning committee meeting, an opportunity for comment on the final recommendation</li> </ul> <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><b>9) Initial principles for planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasize quality over quantity</li> <li>• Preserve "wood basket" for paper and wood products industries</li> <li>• Support revitalization of service centers such as Jackman, Eustis, The Forks, Kingfield, ski resorts, etc.</li> <li>• Preserve connectivity for wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Allow flexibility for property owners</li> <li>• Attract and retain young people with economic opportunity, arts and culture, education, etc.</li> <li>• Provide for a "sustainable" solution – i.e., trails that can be realistically maintained</li> </ul>	

<p><b><u>10) Options for the subject of the planning process</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Could be left entirely open</i> – let the 2-county planning committee go through a planning process to come up with the issue</li> <li>• <i>Could suggest starting with idea of recreation plan containing</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis on key trails – “hubs and spokes” among service centers</li> <li>• For all modes – cars (scenic byways), motorized (ATV, snowmobile), bicycle, pedestrian</li> <li>• Look at supporting infrastructure needed, standards for trail quality and buffering for different modes</li> <li>• Outcomes include zoning changes, public investments, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>The clearer the charge to the 2-county committee, the more quickly and efficiently they can work.</i></p>
<p><b><u>11) Milestones</u></b></p> <p>So that the planning process does not stretch out indefinitely, the 2-county planning committee should consider establishing a work plan with specific planning milestones to meet by specific dates. Such milestones might address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The selection of the subject to address</li> <li>○ Completion of data collection and mapping</li> <li>○ Initial public input opportunities</li> <li>○ Development of goals, vision, values</li> <li>○ Development of alternative proposals</li> <li>○ Public comment opportunity around proposals</li> <li>○ Final plan or proposal development</li> <li>○ Public comment around final recommendation</li> <li>○ Submission to sponsor boards</li> <li>○ Submission to LUPC board</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>12) Resources</u></b></p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b><u>13) Coordination with tribes</u></b></p> <p>LUPC staff coordinate consultation with the tribal governments informed as needed.</p>	

<p><b><u>14) Decision-making process</u></b>  <i>Two options among many to consider</i>                  (1) <b><u>“modified consensus”</u></b> – all members (less one) agree                  Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consensus gives more authority to recommendation when it moves to next step</li> <li>• “Minus one” does not allow one person to have veto power over recommendation</li> <li>• Aroostook County chose this</li> </ul> <p>(2) <b><u>simple majority rule</u></b>                  Advantage:</p> <p>(i) familiarity, ease of use</p> <p>Minutes should be taken at every meeting</p>	<p><i>See attachment on page 8 for a discussion of alternative consensus formats.</i></p>
<p><b><u>15) Roles of LUPC</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff attend committee meetings, provide technical assistance as needed and as resources allow</li> <li>• 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 criteria</li> <li>• LUPC receives final report, approves or disapproves, and acts upon approved recommendations</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>16) Approval of plan</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before submission to LUPC, the plan should be reviewed by both sets of County Commissioners, and approved by the boards of the sponsoring organization.</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>17) Approval of Community Guided planning process</u></b>                  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>	

**18) Amendments to the planning process**

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.

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.

Following input from the LUPC staff and/or Commission, the sponsors' boards will act upon the committee's request.



## **Appendix: Discussion of Consensus procedures and options from Wikipedia**

(See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consensus\\_decision-making](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consensus_decision-making))

### **Decision rules**

The level of agreement necessary to finalize a decision is known as a decision rule. Possible decision rules for consensus vary within the following range:

- Unanimous agreement
- Unanimous consent (See agreement vs. consent below)
- Unanimous agreement minus one vote or two votes
- Unanimous consent minus one vote or two votes
- Super majority thresholds (90%, 80%, 75%, two-thirds, and 60% are common).
- Simple Majority
- Executive committee decides
- Person-in-charge decides

In groups that require unanimous agreement or consent (unanimity) to approve group decisions, if any participant objects, they can block consensus according to the guidelines described below. These groups use the term consensus to denote both the discussion process and the decision rule. Other groups use a consensus process to generate as much agreement as possible, but allow decisions to be finalized with a decision rule that does not require unanimity. In this case, someone who has a 'block' or strong objection will still have to live with the decision made.

### **Agreement vs. consent**

Giving consent does not necessarily mean that the proposal being considered is one's first choice. Group members can vote their consent to a proposal because they choose to cooperate with the direction of the group, rather than insist on their personal preference. Sometimes the vote on a proposal is framed, "Is this proposal something you can live with?" This relaxed threshold for a yes vote can achieve full consent. This full consent, however, does not mean that everyone is in full agreement. Consent must be 'genuine and cannot be obtained by force, duress or fraud' <sup>[17]</sup>

### **Near-Unanimous Consensus**

Healthy consensus decision-making processes usually encourage and out dissent early, maximizing the chance of accommodating the views of all minorities. Since unanimity may be difficult to achieve, especially in large groups, or unanimity may be the result of coercion, fear, undue persuasive power or eloquence, inability to comprehend alternatives, or plain impatience with the process of debate, consensus decision making bodies may use an alternative benchmark of consensus. These include the following:

- **Unanimity minus one** (or U-1), requires all delegates but one to support the decision. The individual dissenter cannot block the decision although he or she may be able to prolong debate (e.g. via a filibuster). The dissenter may be the ongoing monitor of the implications of the decision, and their opinion of the outcome of the decision may be solicited at some future time. Betting markets in particular rely on the input of such lone

dissenters. A lone bettor against the odds profits when his or her prediction of the outcomes proves to be better than that of the majority. This disciplines the market's odds.

- **Unanimity minus two** (or U-2), does not permit two individual delegates to block a decision and tends to curtail debate with a lone dissenter more quickly. Dissenting *pairs* can present alternate views of what is wrong with the decision under consideration. Pairs of delegates can be empowered to find the common ground that will enable them to convince a third, decision-blocking, decision-maker to join them. If the pair are unable to convince a third party to join them, typically within a set time, their arguments are deemed to be unconvincing.
- **Unanimity minus three**, (or U-3), and other such systems recognize the ability of four or more delegates to actively block a decision. U-3 and lesser degrees of unanimity are usually lumped in with statistical measures of agreement, such as: 80%, mean plus one sigma, two-thirds, or majority levels of agreement. Such measures usually do not fit within the definition of consensus.
- **Rough Consensus** is a process with no specific rule for "how much is enough." Rather, the question of consensus is left to the judgment of the group chair, this makes it more difficult for a small number of disruptors to block a decision, it puts increased responsibility on the chair, and may lead to divisive debates about whether rough consensus has in fact been correctly identified.

### Dissent options

When a participant does not support a proposal, he does not necessarily need to block it. When a call for consensus on a motion is made, a dissenting delegate has one of three options:

- **Declare reservations:** Group members who are willing to let a motion pass but desire to register their concerns with the group may choose "declare reservations." If there are significant reservations about a motion, the decision-making body may choose to modify or re-word the proposal.
- **Stand aside:** A "stand aside" may be registered by a group member who has a "serious personal disagreement" with a proposal, but is willing to let the motion pass. Although stand asides do not halt a motion, it is often regarded as a strong "nay vote" and the concerns of group members standing aside are usually addressed by modifications to the proposal. Stand asides may also be registered by users who feel they are incapable of adequately understanding or participating in the proposal.
- **Block:** Any group member may "block" a proposal. In most models, a single block is sufficient to stop a proposal, although some measures of consensus may require more than one block (*see* previous section, "Decision rules"). Blocks are generally considered to be an extreme measure, only used when a member feels a proposal "endanger[s] the organization or its participants, or violate[s] the mission of the organization" (i.e., a principled objection). In some consensus models, a group member opposing a proposal must work with its proponents to find a solution that will work for everyone.

## Consensus Process

There are multiple stepwise models of how to make decisions by consensus. They vary in the amount of detail the steps describe. They also vary depending on how decisions are finalized. The basic model involves

- collaboratively generating a proposal,
- identifying unsatisfied concerns, and then
- modifying the proposal to generate as much agreement as possible.

After a concerted attempt at generating full agreement, the group can then apply its final decision rule to determine if the existing level of agreement is sufficient to finalize a decision.

## Specific models

### Consensus decision-making with consensus blocking

Groups that require unanimity commonly use a core set of procedures depicted in this flow chart.

Once an agenda for discussion has been set and, optionally, the ground rules for the meeting have been agreed upon, each item of the agenda is addressed in turn. Typically, each decision arising from an agenda item follows through a simple structure:

- **Discussion of the item:** The item is discussed with the goal of identifying opinions and information on the topic at hand. The general direction of the group and potential proposals for action are often identified during the discussion.
- **Formation of a proposal:** Based on the discussion a formal decision proposal on the issue is presented to the group.
- **Call for consensus:** The facilitator of the decision-making body calls for consensus on the proposal. Each member of the group usually must actively state their agreement with the proposal, often by using a hand gesture or raising a colored card, to avoid the group interpreting silence or inaction as agreement. The number of blocks is counted to determine if this step's consent threshold is satisfied. If it is, dissenters will be asked to collaborate on a minority position or statement so that any unique or shared concerns with proceeding with the agreement, or any harms, can be addressed/minimized. *This can happen even if the consent threshold is unanimity, especially if many voters stand aside.*
- **Identification and addressing of concerns:** If consensus is not achieved, each dissenter presents his or her concerns on the proposal, potentially starting another round of discussion to address or clarify the concern.
- **Modification of the proposal:** The proposal is amended, re-phrased or ridered in an attempt to address the concerns of the decision-makers. The process then returns to the call for consensus and the cycle is repeated until a satisfactory decision passes the consent threshold for the group.

