

## **Franklin/Somerset Community Planning Process for Townships & Plantations**

### **Full Committee Meeting Thursday, September 24, 2015 Meeting Minutes Solon Fire Station, Solon**

#### **Attending:**

Committee members: Kirsten Burbank, Julie Richard, Suzanne Hockmeyer; Kay Michka, Tom Rumpf, David Spencer, Tom Dubois, Claire Polfus

Staff: John Maloney, AVCOG; Chris Huck, KVCOG; Hugh Coxe, LUPC; Ben Godsoe, LUPC.

Public: Alan Michka, Lexington; David and Carolyn Small, Norridgewock; Gordon Gamble, Wagner Forest Management; Greg Drummond, Highland.

1. Julie Richard welcomed the committee and members of the public. Those present introduced themselves.
2. The minutes of the July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed and accepted.
3. Tom Rumpf introduced the draft of the stage one report. John Maloney and Chris Huck gave a quick background on how the report was put together. The staff discussed the purpose and process for approval by county and sponsoring agency boards and the LUPC.

Tom proposed going through page-by-page for comments and questions. On page 4, Kay Michka questioned the wording of the initial area of focus. Her version of the initial area of focus from the steering committee differed from other versions circulating in that it did not mention “other uses such as manufacturing” and included a step 2. There followed some discussion of the genesis of the area of focus and what was meant by “other uses.” It was decided that the area of focus should be amended by dropping “other uses such as manufacturing” and adding “without precluding manufacturing” to clarify that manufacturing and other uses should be a consideration of outdoor recreation development but not the subject of focus.

David Spencer suggested adding the title of County Commissioner to Lloyd Trafton.

Several committee members found the heading fonts difficult to interpret, and there was no clear idea of what was a major heading and what was a sub-heading. John will clean up.

Tom Rumpf commented on the discussion of the adjacency principle (page 8). He asked for some clarification on how the committee might consider exceptions to the principle. Perhaps it should be tied in with the second bullet on page 12.

On page 10, Tom Dubois questioned the terms “opportunistic” and “planned” in relation to the recreation issue. Tom Rumpf and Claire Polfus attempted to clarify the shift in character of recreation, from casual back country users to organized usage. John will reword.

Claire questioned the concept of recreational support business on page 12. She feels the first bullet should be used to better define the businesses we are talking about, their characteristics, and how development standards should fit in. Within the second bullet, Tom Dubois questioned how planning principle (1 (concentrating development near services) would be consistent with planning for recreation support businesses.

The bullet at the top of page 14 appears to be an orphan.

5. As it was the time listed on the agenda, Tom skipped to the time devoted for public comment. Gordon Gamble commented regarding issue of focus wording. His recollection is that the concern was that recreation not be the sole focus of planning. The trails question is a big one, in that established trails demand visual buffers over working forest land for aesthetic enjoyment.
- 3, cont. On page 14, Kay noted the last bullet point under “public input plan” mentioned feedback on the website. Chris noted that the feedback feature was planned for the web site but has not yet been installed.

Page 15 contains the timeline for stage 2. Tom Rumpf asked for an explanation of how the timeline operated. John provided a brief explanation. Kay suggested adding a meeting of the committee at month 9 so it could deal with comments made by county commissioners or sponsoring boards. We will mark that “as necessary” in case they have no significant comments.

4. The report led into discussion of future plans for the process. Chris and John laid out the funding options and timing. Tom Rumpf and Dave offered suggestions. Kay discussed the need to improve public notifications. One option that had been explored was notices to landowners in tax bills. The staff had considered that and rejected it as too much labor involved.

Julie asked what the next step will be for the committee. The staff responded that there would be a hiatus until more funding was apparent. That could be as early as October in the case of Franklin County, but more likely January.

- 5, cont. Tom asked for more public comment. Alan Michka was on the steering committee and didn’t recollect a discussion of “other uses” in the area of focus. David Small emphasized the need to get the word out to the public on the planning process.

*Prepared by: Chris Huck, 9-28-15*