

**CECIL COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
CITIZEN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
17 September 2008**

Present: Pugh, Mike; Walbeck, Carl; Hutton, Randy; Gilley, Paula; Clewer, Jeff; Ellerton, Vaughan; Shaffer, Henry; Jackson, Ann; Derr, Dan; Lane, Diane; Smyser, Chuck; Priapi, Vic; Whitehurst, Dan; Denver, John; Doordan, B. Patrick; Wiggins, Ken; Butler, Eileen; Rossetti, Rupert; Kilby, Phyllis; Hodge, Robert; Edwards, Sandra; Thorne, Owen; Bennett, John; Cairns, Ed; Stewart, Gary; Broomell, Diana; Strause, Vicky; Tapley, Donna; Polite, Dan; Colenda, Sarah; Day, Shawn; Buck, Walter; Snyder, Linda; Gell, Robert; Folk, Patricia; Bayer, Michael – ERM; Graham, Clive – ERM; Sussman, Ben – ERM; Di Giacomo, Tony; Sennstrom, Eric

Absent: Bolender, Brian; Whiteman, Will; Bunnell, John; Deckard, Donna; Duckett, Vernon; Poole, John;

Observers: Valentine, Nancy; McWilliams, Tom; Hoffman, Tony; Wein, Al; Manlove, Bill

Call to Order: Chairperson Diane Lane called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. Chairperson Lane proceeded to provide a synopsis of today's meeting agenda and contents of meeting package.

Approval of Minutes: Motion was made by Patricia Folk to approve the 16 July 2008 meeting minutes. Motion was seconded by John Bennett. All members present voted in favor of motion to approve the July meeting minutes. Motion carried.

New Business: Michael Bayer provided an overview of the purpose of today's meeting and explained the agenda and its contents. Mr. Bayer reviewed where we have been, where we are presently, and where we are headed. The subcommittee process was reviewed (issues & plans, goals & objectives, preliminary issues, refine issues) and the future meeting objectives were provided (October – choosing by advantages, November – review preliminary plan, December – subcommittee reports from Land Use & Infrastructure and Transportation, January – Ag Preservation and Economic Development, February – Infrastructure & Housing & Recreation, March – draft Plan, April – public forum).

Mr. Bayer asked the Citizen Oversight Committee to provide their expectations for today's meeting. Ann Jackson responded that she would like to have her subcommittee's efforts reflected in policy draft. Rupert Rossetti stated that he would like to have 3 or 4 scenarios depict possible futures. Paula Gilley said the committee needs to feel like they accomplished something. Robert Hodge said the scenarios need to be narrowed down to 1 or 2 options. Ken Wiggins noted the scenarios are broad brush and need to be brought into sharper focus. Carl Walbeck noted infrastructure depends on water resources. Mike Pugh opined that the committee needs to assume all 3 scenarios are equally viable. Diana

Broomell said a fourth scenario is needed and that there is too much growth corridor and not enough resource land. Ed Cairns noted that more transit oriented scenarios are required. Vaughan Ellerton queried as to what occurs if optimum choice is the synthesis of 2 scenarios. Jeff Clewer urged the committee to get off the fence and start making hard choices to move forward. Michael Bayer said that at the end of October we will know better how each scenario stacks up, that all plausible and fatal flaws would be addressed to eliminate scenarios, and that the committee needs to let ERM know what the scenarios should mean. How the issues are worked out is part of today's exercise. ERM needs to be told where the committee needs to be and reach consensus on where we need to go. B. Patrick Doordan reflected that there are 3 scenarios with one reflecting today's county and that the committee examine more growth and less growth. Mr. Doordan requested accurate data concerning current situation in terms of density and zoning so that the COC can look at the buildout using current situation as a yardstick. Michael Bayer noted that these are build out scenarios, not trend scenarios and that if looked at in detail with density assigned, more growth could be the result. Mike Pugh said that there are big differences of opinion and that will affect how this all sorts out. Diana Broomell suggesting listing the committee's comments and seeing their associated outcomes. Michael Bayer indicated a matrix will be developed that will link subcommittee goals to scenarios and the comments they will generate. Diane Lane inquired as to when the work get reflected in the scenarios, what is the most plausible, will it address the concerns regarding focus, and how the two 7 hour sessions will resolve issues. Michael Bayer responded that ERM has tried to make the process as transparent as possible and to maximize input and participation of committee. The September, October and November meetings will pull efforts together. Rupert Rossetti queried as to when the details will be hashed out if October's preferred scenario results in more demand than Ben's wastewater and water needs. Michael Bayer responded that it can be followed up in a November meeting. He pointed out that this process is not typical in that there is a 41 member oversight committee involved in the process. Randy Hutton interjected that the Maryland Departments of Planning and the Environment were running the numbers.

Ed Cairns reflected on how the evaluations will take place. Michael Bayer responded that that will be discussed at 6:00 p.m. He briefly touched on the scenario building process, overview of scenario process, what was done, how we got here, objective vs. subjective track, TAC resources, trends and constraints, growth rates, capacity analysis (build out rather than 2030), employment trends, transportation projects, driving forces of change, givens, possible futures, and what can be done. He further explained the goals, objectives and overlaps. ERM will document and use as a guide along with the Town's comments, desired futures provided by the committee, the common elements of the 3 scenarios, key points and land use categories. Ed Cairns questioned as to why the build out scenario was chosen. Clive Graham stated that there are 3 different pictures of future County build out. 3rd scenario can't absorb 1st scenario's build out. Discussion ensued regarding build out scenarios. Eileen Butler asked if Green Infrastructure Plan was used by ERM. Michael Bayer responded that the plan's data was considered along with other reports. He continue by listing the next steps which include models (growth simulation, transportation, water resources), and preliminary density assumptions. The key questions for today include scenarios vs. goals, match goals, possible futures not shown, what

details need inclusion, what added information is required for inclusion, what information is needed for inclusion.

The Citizen Oversight Committee divided themselves into three groups to review each scenario. The Citizen Oversight Committee regrouped at the conclusion of their reviews.

Diane Lane stated that it is important to frame the direction more specifically and succinctly based on the feedback received, to comeback with 2 scenarios for evaluation that capture what is happening, do the choosing by advantages exercise for the 2 scenarios, it may include elements from each. Dr. Lane reminded the oversight committee that October's meeting will commence at 12:00 p.m. in room 208 of Cecil College's Technology Center. She also requested that each subcommittee send their most recent goals to her by Monday (9/22/08).

Michael Bayer presented a description of the Choosing by Advantages method. Mr. Bayer stated that between now and October, ERM will review today's comments and evaluate the scenarios based on those comments. The oversight committee will select the preferred alternative. Decision making will use water resources, traffic, growth simulation, quantitative vs. qualitative, agricultural land affected, impervious surfaces, quality of life, cost, implementation, decisions will be made based on importance of advantages, differences between alternatives, anchored to importance of differences, decision making terms are used precisely and not interchangeably. An example of a CBA exercise to select a marine research educational center in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands was presented. Ann Jackson asked if each member will have a matrix. Michael Bayer responded in the affirmative. Diane Lane asked if each member will weigh advantages. Michael Bayer said yes. Discussion ensued regarding Choosing by Advantages process. Oversight committee requested aerial views of different density levels. Rupert Rossetti questioned how attributes/advantages tie into criteria. Michael Bayer stated criteria are actual factors.

Randy Hutton, Mike Pugh, Ann Jackson, Paula Gilley, Rupert Rossetti, Donna Tapley, Carl Walbeck and Owen Thorne will meet at Mike Pugh's office located at 117 North Street, Elkton, MD on Thursday, 9/25/08 at 3:00 p.m. to discuss Choosing by Advantages process.

Meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, 15 October 2008, 5:00 p.m., Room 208, Cecil College Technology Center

Respectfully Submitted:

Eric S. Sennstrom, AICP
Director of Planning & Zoning