

**The Community Technical Assistance Program**  
**Steering Committee**  
Meeting Minutes  
15 March 2007

**Opening:**

The CTAP Steering Committee began at approximately 3:45 PM on March 15, 2007. The meeting convened at the offices of New Hampshire Department of Transportation in Concord, NH. Ansel Sanborn, NH DOT Project Director conducted the meeting.

**Present:**

Steering Committee Members in Attendance:

Gile Beye - Local Government Representative [Deerfield]  
Jeff Gowan - Local Government Representative [Pelham]  
Stephen Henninger - Local Government Representative [Concord]  
Dave Danielson - Local Government Representative [Bedford]  
George Sioras – Local Government Representative [Derry]  
Bill Scott – Local Government Representative [Salem]  
Mike Speltz – NGO/Agency Representative [SPNHF]  
Dan Reidy – NGO/Agency Representative [UNH Cooperative Education]  
Dean Christon – NGO/Agency Representative [New Hampshire Housing and Finance Authority]  
Bill Norton – NGO/Agency Representative [Concord 20/20]

Others in Attendance:

Carolyn Russell – NH Dept of Environmental Services  
Ansel Sanborn – NH DOT  
Joanne Cassulo – NH Office of Energy & Planning  
David Preece – Southern New Hampshire RPC  
Sharon Wason – Central RPC  
Steve Williams – Nashua RPC  
James Gruber – ANEI Project Director  
Shawn Margles – ANEI Project Manager  
Mary Schmidt – ANEI Project Assistant

**Opening:** Ansel Sanborn greeted all attendees and new Committee members to the meeting. Each person briefly introduced themselves. Mr. Sanborn went over the agenda items for the afternoon. He also said there will be continued support of CTAP by the NH DOT with the recent change of Commissioners. Mr. Sanborn also discussed the roles of the management team (day-to-day management), the RPC's (Year One work), and ANEI (support). Mr. Sanborn moved forward to the first agenda item.

**Proposed Guidelines for CTAP Collaborative Efforts:**

Mr. Sanborn discussed the proposed guidelines for CTAP collaborative efforts. The reason for collaborative efforts is to leverage other resources to meet CTAP goals. This has been actively sought since the beginning of the CTAP. The guidelines were developed with SPNHF (Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests) for their collaborative project on open space planning. Mr. Sanborn talked about the details of the guidelines. There is a requirement that the collaborating organization share a minimum of 50% of the total cost of the project. This could be in the form of money, other resources or staff time. The project has to be related to the goals of CTAP and preference will be given a multi-organizational endorsements and/or efforts. There also has to be a detailed

scope of work and Memorandum of Agreement. A contract will need to be drawn if the project requires financial support from CTAP. Also, an advisory group may have to be established. The project has to be approved by the steering committee.

Mr. Sanborn opened the floor for discussion on the guidelines. Mike Speltz mentioned that the organization types that may participate should be spelled out on bullet three. Sharon Wason brought up concerns that there might be perceived conflicts of interest between the steering committee representative and the organization working on the collaborative effort. Jeff Gowan mentioned that those representatives could step back from voting on those projects. Dave Danielson said that it needs to be clearly defined. Mr. Speltz suggested a recusal clause be added. Stephen Henninger brought up that the 50% rule would scare off some potential collaborators. Dean Christon also mentioned that it might be too high of a match. Mr. Sanborn responded that it is not intended for communities to be collaborators. Dan Reidy mentioned that the definition of “in most cases” was unclear. Mr. Sanborn responded that intent was to give flexibility to the process. Cliff Sinnott mentioned the steering committee should have the ability to waive the 50% requirement. Mr. Speltz suggested adding these considerations into the guidelines. Ms. Wason said that the exception clause is there so that each project does not have to be evaluated, just the exceptions.

Mr. Sanborn summarized that the following three items were being discussed: (1) the 50% threshold or the wording needed to be changed (2) add the types of organizations that may participate in collaborative effort and (3) add a recusal clause for steering committee members that are part of the collaborative effort. Mr. Sanborn asked for comments from each person around the table.

Gile Beye was unsure about the 50% number. Bill Norton suggested a 50% requirement with a waiver clause. George Sioras agreed. Mr. Danielson asked what if the organization wanted to give more than 50% and also the steering committee should be able to negotiate the terms. Bill Scott asked if there was a cap on the grant and that details on how the funds will be allocated should be added to the guidelines. He also mentioned that grant applications could be used as a scope for these projects. Mr. Sanborn said that the intent of the collaborative projects was not for individual municipalities but between the overall CTAP region and organizations. Mr. Scott also suggested issuing RFP's for all the programs of CTAP. Mr. Henninger said that the 50% cost would be hard to reach. Mr. Reidy questioned if the percentage needed to be articulated in the guidelines. Mr. Christon said that the goal was to stretch CTAP dollars and that setting up a percentage would be a turnoff. He suggested that we see if organizations use the waiver more and then revise guidelines accordingly. Mr. Speltz stressed that one collaborative effort per year was not enough and we should welcome anyone who wants to help. He also said the terms “fair share” implies a moral judgment. The comments will be reviewed by the management team and revisions will be made for review by the steering committee.

### **Approval of Open Space Collaborative**

The next item on the agenda was the details of the open space collaborative between SPNHF (Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests) and CTAP. Mr. Sanborn talked about how originally the local open space planning scope, developed by the SNHPC, would cover one-third of the CTAP communities in the first year. At this point

SPNHF proposed a collaborative effort where all communities would be done in the first year. The proposal for discussion is the revised scope. SPNHF would be sub-contracted by SNHPC. The other RPC's would also be involved. The assessment phase would require one-third of the cost. SPNHF would be bringing in half that money. Mike Speltz reviewed the revised detailed scope and memorandum of understanding. Phases 0 and 1 are what is being considered in the memorandum. Phase 2 would be based on the results from Phase 1. Phase 3 would be the implementation of the project. He mentioned that this would be beyond a NRI survey; that communities would be asked to assess where conservation lands were, determine why they are important and how to protect them. The RPC would document and offer GIS support. The floor was open to discussion.

Mr. Norton asked about the open roads piece and asked if recreational areas are also part of the assessment. Mr. Speltz responded that part of the process was to assign importance to each piece of land including recreation. Mr. Scott asked how this would lead to an application piece. Mr. Speltz answered that it would provide data to the communities. Mr. Norton mentioned that it would bring forward technical assistance. Mr. Danielson asked how this initiative is different from other existing efforts on open space planning. David Preece stated that the planning approaches would be unique to each community. Mr. Sinnott suggested changing the term "open space" to "land conservation". Mr. Sioras said that buying land for open space, conservation and recreation instead of just open space would have more public support at the local level. He also mentioned that a NGO should buy land because there is a mistrust that the local government will sell off conserved land. Mr. Gowan agreed; more inclusive language would allow for more inputs. He also said that this scope was better than the original plan of only covering seven communities in the first year. Ms. Beye asked what assistance would be offered after the assessment. Mr. Sanborn suggested that the discretionary funds could be used. Mr. Speltz said that the assistance would be covered by the other tasks of the CTAP program. Mr. Gowan stated that the open space plans could be an addendum to the master plan. Mr. Preece stressed that this was an active project and that the communities would be integrated in the process. Mr. Sanborn closed the discussion and the scope will be revised to include the comments.

### **CTAP Evaluation Model**

Ansel Sanborn talked about the purpose of the evaluation model and discussed the three level approach. Level 1 would ask if we are doing things right. It would include the task monitoring, reporting form and major task deliverables. Level 2 would ask if we are doing the right things. It would include community assessments for baseline, identification of indicators of progress and a baseline data survey. Level 3 would ask if CTAP is working or not. He also explained the guiding principles of the evaluation.

Mr. Norton suggested that the delegates of the steering committee could work on different components of the evaluation. Mr. Scott suggested trying to fit the model to the programs already out there and using a website. Mr. Henninger said that the level 1 was not too onerous but questioned if the changes would actually be seen in the small communities in level 2. Mr. Gowan asked if this would be the same questions asked in the community assessments. Jim Gruber answered that the survey included one question on each sub-theme and other questions on community capacity and awareness. Mr. Gowan questioned the real world application of the survey; if the survey would actually

be completed by the intended parties. He also mentioned that subcommittee of CTAP for each community might be better suited for the survey. Ms. Beye said that the survey needs to be targeted or might be seen as busy work. Mr. Gowan suggested different surveys to answer with each stakeholder group. Mr. Sinnott said that the key question is who is being asked. He said it has to be the same person or the survey will not work. Mr. Gruber answered that the point of the survey was awareness and if the values are still there as people change. Mr. Gowan suggested two kinds of surveys; one to gauge awareness of the selectmen and one for people that are actually working with CTAP. Ms. Beye mentioned that the results for Year One might be negative because of the learning curve. Mr. Speltz said that measuring indicators might be better than individual surveys. He questioned how much effort should be spent on the evaluation. He also mentioned that he was more concerned about the average person's awareness in the community than the selectmen's. Mr. Scott mentioned that maybe the number of projects that communities have done could be measured. He also asked how CTAP educates the press. Mr. Sioras said that the survey should be based on the size of the communities because of the different levels of knowledge. Mr. Gruber answered that the town size was added to the demographic questions of the survey to uncover differences. Ms. Beye warned that the towns might become inundated with surveys. Mr. Sinnott addressed the resources on the evaluation. Mr. Sanborn summarized that the consensus was that the three level approach makes sense. The comments will be pulled together and revised.

### **Year One Program Updates**

Ansel Sanborn briefly went over the work program document for year one. Mr. Speltz asked about the numbering system of the tasks. Shawn Margles mentioned that it coincides with the detailed scopes document contracted to the RPCs.

### **Upcoming Events:**

Ms. Margles discussed the upcoming CTAP events. This includes the working group meetings, Conservation Commission institutes, and community assessments. Mr. Preece said that the next institutes would be driven more by the participants based on feedback. Mr. Sanborn briefly talked about the I-93 transit study meeting on April 19<sup>th</sup>. Presenters will include Ken Kinney on Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and Steve Williams on a light rail project. Ms. Margles stated that the next steering committee will be on May 17<sup>th</sup> and the community meeting on May 31<sup>st</sup> will be discussed at this meeting.

### **Close:**

Mr. Sanborn thanked everyone for participating.

### **Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 5:54PM

Minutes submitted by Mary A. Schmidt, ANEI