

Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC)
MP Elements Coordination
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 3, 2021

Attendance via Zoom: MPSC Members: Stacy Lennon, Janne Corneil, Jack Troast, Bob Zogg, Kate Reid, John Ballantine, Kerry Kissinger.

Community Member: Christina Christodoulopoulos

Meeting Start: 7:03pm.

Topics discussed:

Approval of Minutes

- Kate moved to accept the draft minutes of the February 3 MPSC Captains Meeting. Seconded by Bob, the minutes were approved by a vote of 7-0.

Public Comment from Christina Christodoulopoulos

- Christina shared concerns around the proposed survey and the mention of deer hunting in the Feb 2 meeting. See her complete statement in the Appendix on page 3.
- Group members thanked Christina for her comments and agreed that the survey should include a “no preference” option. The group also agreed that impartiality is critical to the credibility of the master plan process, and Bob clarified that he had not intended to promote deer hunting per se as he discussed the potential open space challenge of over-browsing. Deer hunting itself is not a topic the MPSC sees as within the scope of the master plan process.

Select Board (SB) Presentation Update

- Jack and Stacy provided a Master Plan process update to the Select Board on Feb 23. SB Members indicated their desire for the Master Plan to be complete – or substantially far enough along – by the end of the year to inform SB planning for 2022. This group felt that that seems achievable.

GIS Update

- Two interns are currently updating the parcel database and should complete their work in the next two weeks or so. The GIS technician will begin his work shortly thereafter, and initial draft of the maps will be available for analysis in April.

P/PM Candidate Update

- Jack and Stacy will conduct “pre-interviews” with the two candidates who submitted credentials for the P/PM role. They will then determine whether to proceed with the candidates to the formal interview process with the full P/PM selection committee (Jack, Stacy, Sara Smith), or to solicit additional candidates.

“1-Pager” Homework

- Captains’ 1-Pagers are substantially complete and will help guide analysis and option generation; they will also be shared with the eventual P/PM as quick reference guides.

Next Steps for Captains

- Captains are asked to use this interim time (before GIS maps are ready) to collect/prepare Best Practices and examples from other towns that could be viable or interesting to consider for Carlisle.
- Janne and Stacy will develop a ‘Best Practices’ template for Captains to use for this task.

Land Use Options “Charrette”

- Once GIS maps are available, Janne suggests a land use options charrette in April – a zoom meeting where we have maps we can talk about, where we explore various possibilities, and where we collectively begin to sketch out scenarios to explore in greater depth, e.g. a status quo version, a ‘maximize development’ version, and a middle ground version.
- Captains will then develop and refine these scenarios through early May, aiming to solidify a few master plan scenarios to share with the public starting toward the end of May.
- It was noted that the Public Engagement group may want to begin sharing information about the master planning process itself: that it will include exploring a range of options and testing a variety of ideas with the community, and that community feedback will guide the refinement of the options.

Next Meeting

- The next MP Elements Coordination meeting will take place on April 7 at 7pm.

Meeting End: 8:40pm.

**Appendix:
Statement from Christina Christodoulopoulos
(Hemlock Hill Rd)**

My 1st concern pertains to surveys

I understand creating a master plan is a monumental undertaking.

I also understand that input from questions posed in a “this or that form” can answer specific questions members of the steering committee may be seeking to have answered.

However, this form of question has the potential of omitting large portions of pertinent information or priorities that members of the public may have.

There is also potential for distortion in survey results if a ranking system of 1-3 is used. Only being able to rate something 1-3 in importance can give a misleading impression that whatever is being rated is actually of interest.

An option 0, or not important at all, is also needed because questions on a survey may not be of ANY interest to someone. There should be a way to express this.

My second concern is about impartiality.

My understanding is that the role of the steering committee is to impartially collect and collate data that represents the “will of the Carlisle people” and that the recommendations and options the steering committee provides will be based on that public input and not on personal recommendations and goals.

I’ll be specific.

What raised this concern is Mr Zogg’s summary from the Feb 3rd meeting and his repeated recommendation that Carlisle needs to have a hunting program on town land.

And as Mr Zogg himself expressed on the 3rd, he included this recommendation in his summary because HE feels it is important.

Deer hunting is indeed a very controversial topic and the question of whether or not the residents of Carlisle believe there should be hunting on town land is scheduled to be put to a vote at next town meeting.

The question will be decided there, by the residents. Doesn’t it make sense to wait for the outcome of the vote before MPSC makes any recommendations on the subject?

Again, my understanding is that the MPSC is supposed to be impartial. It should not be a platform from which to advocate for hunting, or anything else for that matter.

Care should be taken not to use the influence and authority of the committee to promote one goal over another or to sway public opinion

If the majority of the committee decides that it is imperative to prematurely include the subject of deer hunting in reports and community outreach, then the topic needs to be presented fairly and equitably, with equal and impartial consideration given to both “sides of the coin”.

I want to be clear, my concern does not reflect in any way on Mr Zogg himself and I’m not suggesting that there is any intentional misuse of the position.

I understand Mr Zogg’s passionate views on hunting and I also understand how such strong beliefs can inadvertently influence things.

I’d like to stress that, among other things, the success of the MP is reliant on impartiality.

Thank you