

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
March 15, 2021

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

The following notice was read aloud “A Checklist to Ensure Meetings are Compliant with the Right-to-Know Law During the State of Emergency” (*regarding access to the meeting*)

Secretary Cindy Kirkpatrick called roll:

PRESENT ROLL CALL: Tim Doherty – present
 James Bergeron – present
 Cindy Kirkpatrick – present
 Roger Montbleau – present
 Danielle Masse-Quinn – present
 Alternate Paddy Culbert – present
 Alternate Bruce Bilakpa – present
 Alternate Samuel Thomas – present
 Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote – present
 Planning Director Jeff Gowen – present

Via Telecommunication:

Alternate Richard Olson – present via Zoom, no one in the room
Alternate Mike Sherman – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Alternate Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde – present via Zoom; no one in the room

ABSENT/
NOT PARTICIPATING: Paul Dadak

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Doherty appointed Mr. Culbert to vote in place of Mr. Dadak.

MOTION: (Kirkpatrick/Cote) To nominate Ms. Danielle Masse-Quinn for the Secretary position.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Mr. Culbert – yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Kirkpatrick/Montbleau) To nominate Mr. Jim Bergeron for the Vice-Chairman position.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
Mr. Montbleau – yes
Mr. Culbert – yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes
Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Montbleau/Cote) To nominate Mr. Tim Doherty for the Chairman position.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
Mr. Montbleau – yes
Mr. Culbert – yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes
Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty explained that he was now the Chairman, Mr. Bergeron was the Vice-Chairman, and Ms. Masse-Quinn was the Secretary. Ms. Kirkpatrick turned over the Secretary position to Ms. Masse-Quinn. Mr. Doherty thanked Ms. Kirkpatrick for holding the position for the past two years and thanked Ms. Masse-Quinn for taking the position.

MEETING MINUTES

February 18, 2021

MOTION: (Montbleau/Bergeron) To have the entirety of the February 18, 2021 meeting minutes be completed verbatim.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
Mr. Montbleau – yes
Mr. Culbert – yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes
Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

March 1, 2021

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the March 1, 2021 meeting minutes as written.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Mr. Culbert – yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

MASTER PLAN CONSULTANT INTERVIEWS

Mr. Thomas asked if the entire Planning Board, including alternates, would be allowed to vote or if just the Planning Board's voting members would be voting. Mr. Doherty replied that only the voting members were allowed to vote.

Mr. Thomas explained that three firms were coming in with separate proposals for the Master Plan. He informed that there was an evaluation packet given to each member to fill out for each firm to be turned into Mr. Gowan's office. He stated that each presentation would be 45 minutes and that discussions would be only on the presentation themselves and not the project's cost.

Resilience Planning & Design, LLC.

Mr. Steve Whitman, Ms. Liz Kelly, and Mr. Zak Brohinsky introduced themselves and Resilience Planning & Design. Mr. Whitman gave a brief overview of the company's history with relevant projects in the region. He informed that they helped to update the Master Plans in Littleton, Plaistow, and Wolfeboro, New Hampshire. One of their main highlights in these master plans was keeping each town's character unique to themselves. Mr. Whitman explained that they also completed work in Franconia, Newbury, and Dover, New Hampshire for a Water Resources Chapter, Housing Study and Regulatory Audit, and a Master Planning, Form-Based Code, & Architectural Guidance, respectively. Mr. Whitman stated that Master Plans help the firms get to know the community and help the community bring their vision to fruition.

Mr. Brohinsky stated that it is crucially important to take stock of the existing resources in a town. He explained that taking a complete inventory of the existing conditions of the natural and cultural resources sets the platform that the Master Plan will be based on and will continue to inform all future processes. He informed that by analyzing the existing development and conserved land in Pelham, in conjunction with other information, they could approach the Master Plan from an analytical perspective to see opportunities distinct to Pelham. He noted that they would also give a perspective on how Pelham fits into its surroundings, including abutting towns and environments. He reiterated that taking an inventory of existing conditions is crucial in creating a Master Plan for a Town. Mr. Whitman added that while maps are much easier to access now, the combination of a map with the data analysis is what really provides a lot of information.

Ms. Kelly stated that COVID provided limitations of gatherings in person over the past year, causing Resilience and Planning to shift their use of online engagement tools to best work with stakeholders and the Public during the planning processes. She stated that while it looks like in-person gatherings would be a possibility in the near future, they were opting for a hybrid option of engagement to help increase public participation in the planning process. Mr. Whitman added that they keep the things that work best and offer the most flexibility to those who cannot come to meetings. He stated that while they are excited to get back to being in rooms full of people, they want to keep some of the functionality that online engagement brings.

Mr. Whitman stated that they broke the Master Plan up into four tasks, each with their own subtasks, that they would love to dig deeper into and talk about once they get to know the Town better. He informed that Task 1 was Project Management and Meetings. He stated that the basic idea of this task is that regular meetings help track progress and keep things on schedule. Task 2 was Mapping and Analysis. Task 3 was Outreach and Engagement. He explained that they could set up a really engaging webpage with all information related to the Master Plan to help increase interaction with the Public. He noted that surveys and other methods could be utilized via this method. He stated that they have found that a combination of online tools and in-person meetings have proven to be very beneficial. Task 4 was Document Development and Delivery. Mr. Whitman noted that once the plan was completed, they would stay with the Board through the formatting and adoption of the plan and help to make it easily digestible to the Public. He believed that Master Plans are an implementation tool and should be action-oriented. He informed that a large part of the last third of the project was trying to figure out what actions need to happen and who will work with the Planning Board to help get those actions completed.

Mr. Montbleau asked what the population was of Newbury, New Hampshire. Mr. Whitmore responded that it has a population of about 4,500 people that doubles in the summer as about 50% of the housing there is seasonal. Mr. Montbleau asked what other towns they had done work in that are comparable in size. Mr. Whitmore replied that Dover and Portsmouth were both larger communities that they had done work in and that Plaistow was a similar community, though a little smaller in size. Mr. Montbleau stated that Plaistow was more of a commercial town, while Pelham has a more rural ambience. Mr. Montbleau asked if Newbury had any mixed-use or open space ordinances. Mr. Whitmore informed that Newbury had cluster housing ordinances, and they do have an open-space development provision that has a dedication piece, but they did not have it as a mixed-use tool, but it had been talked about there.

Mr. Montbleau stated he liked the idea of the brochure and asked Mr. Whitmore to explain that in further detail. Mr. Whitmore explained that Dover was one of the first communities to adopt a form-based code, which is more focused on building size and ability to have numerous uses in a building. He informed that this is in a downtown area, so it is different from Pelham. He explained that what they learned from it is that the form-based code is inherently more user-friendly and tells the developers what they can and cannot do. He stated that they could take that format to tell the applicant all in one location what they can do on their lot. Mr. Montbleau stated he really liked that aspect and would free up some employees to do some of the real work without interrupting them. Mr. Whitmore stated they had replicated this in multiple other towns so that the Planning Directors could give a resident a pamphlet with all of the information that they could and could not do on their lot. Ms. Kelly added that they have worked with other rural towns to help make their planning process more transparent to the Public by creating educational materials and resources for them to best navigate their way through obtaining different permits and zoning approvals.

Mr. Doherty stated that Pelham is very big on open space and connectivity and wanted to know how the company worked on connecting open space in the city of Portsmouth. Mr. Whitmore replied that Portsmouth asked them to help create an open-space plan. He stated that they completed a GIS analysis and many site visits to look across the whole network for connectivity and flood resistance opportunities. He explained that it was a very deep dive into exploring the patchwork of properties and how else, besides land

protection, they could create green quarters in the downtown area. He stated that they are very used to complex open space networks.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked why they did not compare Pelham with a similar community within the region, as Dover has about 17,000 more people than Pelham and was not very comparable. Mr. Whitmore replied that they had not completed a Master Plan for a community of similar size to Pelham but provided the best examples they thought matched up the best to Pelham that they had completed. He noted that the average population for a town in New Hampshire is about 2,500 people, so they often work with towns that are either much smaller or much larger than Pelham. He stated that they are happy to research and find information from similar towns in the region, even if they had not previously worked with that town.

Mr. Thomas asked if they had reviewed the prior Master Plan released in 2002. Mr. Whitmore replied that he had and that it was a standard Master Plan for 20 years ago. He believed that they had more powerful tools on their desktops not compared to 20 years ago to help them bring more readers in.

Mr. Thomas asked what their methodology regarding validation of the data that they collect was. Mr. Whitmore explained that they cite all of their sources. He stated that Mr. Brohinsky received a lot of his information from the GIS data provided through UNH but also looks to DES, FEMA, and other agencies along those lines. Mr. Brohinsky added that he maintains contact with State agencies across New Hampshire. He explained that one of the most crucial aspects is to conduct site walks to ensure that what they see on the maps is true to what is happening on the land.

Mr. Thomas asked if they could expand upon their firm's technical management and quality control methodologies noted in their proposal. Mr. Whitmore replied that they are a very small team, so they would be working with them throughout the entire project.

Mr. Thomas asked if they provide the Planning Board and the Master Plan Committee with interim reports and what the frequency of those would be. Mr. Whitmore stated that they would get a report during the existing conditions process, the outreach and engagement process, and all drafts of the actual plan. He explained that in the first process, they could send multiple reports for different topics each month or complete one full report during that section to make it more concise.

Mr. Thomas explained that they had nine to eleven different areas of interest that they want to highlight in the Master Plan and if he planned to address each one simultaneously or one at a time. Mr. Whitmore explained that they tend to go over all of the topics together in the existing conditions period, except for the vision and future land use. He informed that they need to work with the Public to help tease out what their vision is for the Town, how the 2002 vision still rings true and what has changed, what people want to see, and to what degree.

Mr. Thomas noted that they indicated on the timeline that they would like the project to be completed in 14 months and asked how realistic that was from an expectation standpoint. Mr. Whitmore stated that it is very rare to be earlier and more likely to be from 14-16 months in time.

Mr. Thomas asked what their social media and public relations were like. Mr. Whitmore explained that they would create a landing webpage with interactive information for the Public to keep them engaged. He stated that they could push information out via a social media platform of the Town's choosing. He explained that they like to use a combination of print and online sources.

Ms. Kirkpatrick asked how often the document should be updated. Mr. Whitmore informed that every ten years is the recommendation.

Mr. Montbleau asked what the scope of work regarding water resources was. Mr. Whitmore noted that embedded in their natural resource analysis, they look at groundwater, surface water, potential sources of contamination, and what the existing regulation is now, and how those protect water resources in Town.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked how they disseminate information to those without access to the internet. Mr. Whitmore explained that in the most recent place they completed a Master Plan, Lancaster, he spent a lot of time talking with older residents of the community as well as to kids in the schools to get their points of view and explain to them the process. He explained that they try to identify the populations that can get missed out on the conversation easily and create print sources of information that can be made available to them at the library, Town Hall, senior center, etc.

Mr. Bergeron asked for clarification on the average New Hampshire town size. Mr. Whitmore explained that the median value was 2,500 people. Mr. Bergeron informed that he saw a source state that the average lot size in the State is just above 2 acres and asked Mr. Whitmore if he knew of that. Mr. Whitmore replied that he could not verify that information but stated that it would not surprise him if that were true.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the Conservation Commission was looking to expand their open space from about 2,000 acres to about 4,000 acres. Mr. Whitmore replied that they had completed work within seven small communities to look into open space and connectivity among those communities. He informed that he would be excited to help the Conservation Commission with that goal.

DuBois & King Inc.

Mr. Chris Sargent, the Planning Manager, and Mr. Dayton Crites, the Senior Planner and Senior Transportation Planner of Dubois & King, came forward via telecommunications to discuss their proposal for the Master Plan. Mr. Sargent gave an overview of their firm as well as the team that would be working on this project. He explained that himself, Mr. Crites, Ms. Julia Ursaki, the Transportation Planner Engineer and GIS Manager, Ms. Emily Lewis, the Landscape Architect and Environmental Planner, and the Town of Pelham would comprise the team working on the Master Plan. He believed that they had an extensive range of expertise on their team to get into all the discrete parts that are typically found in a Master Plan.

Mr. Sargent stated that their approach is very collaborative based. He stated that they work within the town and within the community through engagement and other investigations to find out what the vision for the community is. He stated that it would be like starting over in Pelham, as the last Master Plan had not been updated in quite some time and that community input would be very crucial in creating the new Master Plan. He informed that they have started to take new approaches to engage with the Public due to COVID. He explained that they have started to use more online materials, created places where people can trickle in throughout the day to receive information as opposed to one singular meeting, and have begun to implement story maps. He explained that story maps are a great way to get people information, help them understand the information, and then receive feedback from the information they took in.

Mr. Crites informed that they try to focus on creativity throughout the process. He explained that they do not have a single template where they just substitute different towns in. He stated that they work with the Board and the community to develop a creative approach to work within this specific community. Mr. Crites also explained that they try to make Master Plans as understandable as possible. He stated that Master Plans need a lot of detail and guidance on how to follow codes and all the intricacies that connect land use to transportation, etc., and that if that information is strictly in text format, it can easily lose people's interest. He explained that they try to put all of that detail behind straightforward, clear images, whether through renderings or simple maps, as he finds visual representations to be impactful and easy to digest.

Mr. Sargent informed that he wanted to make sure that the Master Plan is designed in a way to make it implementable. He wants to identify projects, policies, and goals that the Town is likely to implement.

Mr. Crites stated that when creating a Master Plan, they need to look at the entire region and not just the community alone. He stated that things in surrounding communities could have effects on Pelham, so it is important to take those things into consideration. He stated that planning is crucial to keep the community the way it is now in relation to the urbanized communities that surround the Town and that without looking at surrounding communities, it is not possible.

Mr. Doherty asked how they would go about finding out what the wishes are of the people. Mr. Sargent responded that that is the heart of making a Master Plan. He stated that it takes a creative approach to increase engagement. He informed that the one possible approach outlined in the proposal is just one option and should not be prescriptive. He explained that they would have a conversation with the Board to look at what opportunities are already available in the Town for engagement. He stated that one option would be at an annual Town event or a farmer's market. He described a possible "visioning session" for members of the community to go to where they can help find a concrete set of ideas of what people are liking or not liking. Mr. Crite added that he looks at engagement from a hybrid approach. He wants to mix the digital and in-person to allow more people to engage. He stated that he is very big on tracking responses from people and putting that documentation of public input into the Master Plan. Mr. Sargent informed that they had learned a lot through COVID about how to incorporate hybrid approaches.

Ms. Kirkpatrick asked what they thought an appropriate timeline would be for the completion of the project. Mr. Sargent replied that he was confident that they could complete the project in ten to twelve months. He informed that they would be flexible and willing to adjust the timeline as needed and work with the committee on when the best times for certain events might be. He explained that if the plan is spread out over too long of a period, they end up losing Public interest, and if it's too bunched together, people will become overloaded with meetings.

Mr. Montbleau asked if all of the Master Plan work that Mr. Sargent had done with Dubois & King were all in Vermont. Mr. Sargent replied that, for the most part, yes, though he had worked on a project in Bedford. Mr. Montbleau asked if he completed the Master Plan for Bedford. Mr. Sargent responded that he worked on the transportation and natural resources, and energy, as their Master Plan was a team effort.

Mr. Montbleau asked what the average population was in a small town in Vermont. Mr. Sargent responded that the average population for a small town was between 1,500-2,500 people. He informed that much of the Master Plan work he had completed was on the regional level. He explained that he had worked with communities ranging from 280 people to 10,000 people, though he typically works in very rural towns. Mr. Montbleau asked if he had completed any Master Plans for towns with a population of 13,000-15,000 people. Mr. Sargent replied that he had, though he had not completed a lot as much of Vermont is rural. Mr. Montbleau explained that he was trying to figure out if he had done work of a similar size, although it is more important to focus on the process and not just the size.

Mr. Montbleau asked if Mr. Sargent could explain the hazard planning component mentioned in the proposal. Mr. Sargent replied that he has a lot of experience with resiliency planning and that there was a time when he wrote hazard mitigation plans. He explained that it is crucial to be aware of the natural hazards and plan to work around them or present a plan to maintain and develop infrastructure that is resilient and less likely to be negatively impacted by the hazards. Mr. Montbleau asked for an example. Mr. Sargent noted that flooding is typically the most significant hazard among smaller communities. He stated that they could look to see if the Town wants to discourage building within flood zones and, if not, how are they going to protect the people who will be moving there. He stated that they could create plans to ensure that the designs of the roads in those areas are less likely to be damaged by significant flooding.

Mr. Thomas asked, beside Bedford, had they completed any other Master Plans in New Hampshire. Mr. Sargent replied that he did not have an extensive amount of Master Planning work in New Hampshire to date but has been diligently trying to find more work in the State. He noted that he had worked with several different regional planning commissions in the State and that the firm he works for has completed work in the State.

Mr. Thomas asked if they had a chance to look at the previous Master Plan. Mr. Sargent expressed that he had and believed it was time for an update. He stated that given when it was written, it seemed very much like what a Master Plan was like at that time. He was confident that they could find a way to provide a more concise plan that was easier to disseminate information in a more effective way.

Mr. Thomas asked what their process of validation of data was that they were generating. Mr. Crite informed that they comb through all of the data they collect to make sure it is accurate and that there are no duplicate entries and then rely on reputable sources such as the US Census and the regional planning commission to find locally sourced data to inform the decision making. Mr. Sargent added that some of the best data is gathered through observation. He believed that site visits were one of the best ways to understand exactly what is going on in a community and ensure that the information they gather is accurate.

Mr. Thomas asked how they planned to keep people informed of the progress. As the project manager, Mr. Sargent stated that he would work with a primary point of contact to communicate on a weekly basis and then envisioned that they would have about six work sessions throughout the process. During these work sessions, they would sit down and go over progress and what was still missing. He noted that he could send a report every month on their progress if that was something that they would like him to do.

Mr. Thomas asked about the 11-month timeline listed on the proposal and if he felt that was reasonable for Pelham. Mr. Sargent replied that they could work on a timeframe that worked best for the community. If they wanted it to be 16 months, they could make 16 months work. He stated he found that 11 months was a good in-between of having too much or too little time to keep engagement at its fullest.

Mr. Thomas asked if they planned to dedicate a webpage to what they were doing in the Town so that people could track the progress. Mr. Sargent replied that they do a lot of story maps. The preference is not for them to create a tab on their webpage but to use the Town's webpage to create a landing page for people to go to. He added that they could put story maps, data, surveys, and documents on that site so that it is all readily available to those who wish to access it.

Mr. Lynde asked if they would make reference to Towns reaching their capacity, and how they would go about it. Mr. Sargent replied that the Master Plan would definitely touch upon that in some capacity. He stated that it depends on if the Town wants to reach their capacity or if they want to prolong it, but either way, it would get addressed in the Master Plan.

Mr. Montbleau asked if, during community outreach, would they create a webpage or a Facebook page for people to interact with. Mr. Crite informed that they typically provide content that the Town can disseminate through their existing channels, as it is usually the most efficient way to spread the information. He noted that they could create one if that is what they would like them to do. Mr. Sargent added that he has found it best to utilize the towns existing webpages but is willing to work with the community, as there are numerous options available.

Mr. Montbleau asked if they send out any questionnaires or surveys for public engagement. Mr. Crite responded that they do. Mr. Sargent added that they typically like to do a mix of hard and digital copies.

He explained that they normally have Town's send out the surveys, and then they collect them and perform data analysis on them.

Mr. Gowan stated that he spends a lot of time in Vermont and believes that many of those communities share very similar values to that of Pelham so that their experience in Vermont can be applicable to Pelham.

Nashua Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Jay Minkarah, the executive director of the NRPC, and Ms. Sara Siskavich, the assistant director and manager of the GIS program, came forward via telecommunications to discuss their proposal for the Master Plan.

Mr. Minkarah explained that the NRPC is one of nine regional planning commissions in the State created under State law with 13 communities in the region. He explained that the NRPC is governed by a board of commissioners, noting that Mr. Lynde and Mr. Hennessey were both one of the 33 commissioners who meet quarterly. He informed that regional planning commissions have three primary goals:

1. Creating a regional plan
2. Creating a regional housing needs assessment
3. Reviewing projects of regional impact

Mr. Minkarah explained that everything else provided is an optional service. He then introduced all eleven members of the NRPC, who would all be involved in the project if they were to be picked. He then explained all of the services that the NRPC offers, including various transportation, environmental, economic development, GIS, and land use services.

Mr. Minkarah added that in addition to being the regional planning commission, they are also the MPO (metropolitan planning organization) in the region. He explained that this means that they have a formal role in reviewing how federal transportation dollars are spent in the region under federal law. He noted that they also do long-range transportation plans and have a formal role in vetting and recommending projects for the 10-year plan in the region. He then went into further detail on what they do regarding traffic counting.

Ms. Siskavich explained that NRPC had been doing GIS since GIS became a thing. She explained that GIS supports the day-to-day work in transportation and land use. She noted that as it has grown and matured, they have offered and extended the GIS to their communities, such as Pelham. She explained that many communities have started to rely on the NRPC GIS partially due to their robust parcel-based map, which is the backbone of some of the more traditional GIS services, like town tax maps.

Mr. Minkarah stated that they do a lot of work with Master Plans and CIPs, including completing Pelham's Master Plan in 2002. He noted that the most recent Master Plan they completed was for the town of Mason. He stated that they are currently working with Pelham's Council on Aging to create a Senior Needs Assessment on the Town. He stated that the NRPC also focuses on updating the housing needs assessment every five years, working on environmental planning with a focus on mapping and trails, maintaining their household hazardous waste program, working on energy aggregation programs to help keep costs affordable for towns, working on hazard mitigation plans, focus on economic development, and working on their Brownfield assessment program which focuses on getting sites that are contaminated back into productive use. He also informed that they helped the Conservation Commission with their Natural Resources Inventory recently.

Mr. Minkarah believed that intensive public engagement is critical for determining the needs of the community. He informed that they could use combinations of online and hard copy surveys. He was hopeful that the plan would start to be completed by the time they could start meeting in person again. He noted that he would like to create an online public engagement hub where they would manage all or most of the communications and coordination with the Public.

Mr. Minkarah stated that data collection is a large part of what the NRPC does that they conduct in a variety of ways. He explained that they already have a lot of information on Pelham that would be relevant to the Master Plan, which is why they are more cost-competitive against others. He stated that they would still need to collect some data, including traffic studies and demographic information.

Ms. Siskavich went on to explain what a build-out scenario is. She explained that the build-out analysis could be very beneficial in terms of seeing what potential the Town has in different scenarios.

Ms. Siskavich then explained how story maps could be very beneficial to use. She explained that story maps are interactive online maps that help to configure a map in a way to tell a story and walk an audience through a narrative that they come away with an understanding of what was trying to be communicated. She noted that the story maps can be very flexible and could be of the entire Master Plan, a general theme, or even one section of the Master Plan that they wanted to highlight. She stated that they created the story map for the Pelham Forestry Committee that can be found on the Town's webpage. She further explained that it is a map with embedded text and thumbnails to help navigate through the page.

Mr. Minkarah stated that he appreciated the desire to have a final document that is concise, visually appealing, and easily readable. He wanted a highly visual document that they could print and keep online.

Mr. Doherty asked out of the thirteen communities in the region which ones had they not completed Master Plans for. Mr. Minkarah informed that over the NRPC's history dating back to 1959, they had completed Master Plans for all but Nashua. He noted that while they had not worked on Nashua's Master Plan, they have completed work in Nashua.

Mr. Cote asked if they had ever done a Master Plan for a community outside of the region. Mr. Minkarah explained that they only work within the boundaries of the region unless they are doing a joint project with other regional planning commissions or under contract with the State.

Mr. Montbleau asked which community in the region had the same or similar population as Pelham. Mr. Minkarah replied that Amherst would be a little smaller than Pelham and Milford would be a little larger, but both were most likely the most similar to Pelham's population. Mr. Montbleau asked how recently they worked on the Master Plan in Milford. Mr. Minkarah replied that it was between 2017 and 2019, though he could not be positive on the date. He explained that Milford had been updating sections of their Master Plan every few years. Mr. Montbleau then asked which town in the region was most comparable to Pelham regarding square miles. Mr. Minkarah stated that he could not be certain but believed Hollis was closest in size to Pelham. He informed that Litchfield was the smallest town in terms of geography, and then Amherst or Merrimack would be the largest. Mr. Montbleau clarified that they were looking for a complete rewrite of their Master Plan and not just an update. Mr. Minkarah replied that he understood that and recognized that that was one of the reasons the project was so appealing.

Mr. Thomas asked if they thought they could complete all the needed work within the twelve months they put in their proposal and what do they do to provide interim reports. Mr. Minkarah replied that they would anticipate very frequent, regular communication with town staff at least weekly. He noted that they would also provide regular updates to the Planning Board and Subcommittee to show where they are at and if they had reached certain milestones. He highlighted that at every critical juncture in the plan, they would go

before the Board or Subcommittee to inform them of a more formal update. He explained that the Public Hub would be where they would consistently post their progress of the work as it is developed. He continued that they were happy to accommodate what the Board wanted, as every Board has a different approach. Mr. Minkarah stated that in terms of timeframes, he felt that a year was very doable and that they could meet that target. He said the only thing that could slow the process down is if the Town had to put a hold on the Master Plan to address things that may come up. For example, he informed that Hudson recently put their Master Plan on hold while the town addressed a controversial building proposal to ensure that the project did not interfere with their Master Plan.

Mr. Thomas noted that there were links on the presentation that he did not see in the proposals and if those are on the website. Mr. Minkarah replied that they were on the website, but he would also sent them to Mr. Gowan to forward to the Board.

Mr. Gowan asked what the State of the 2020 Census data was. Ms. Siskavich explained that normally they would have the first report by the end of March, but the census results and reports have been delayed due to COVID. She informed that the expected first report is now in September of 2021. She stated that she did believe that information from the census would become available in line with the timeline of the Master Plan.

Mr. Bergeron asked for more information on how the regional planning commissions are set up in the State and how they work. Mr. Minkarah explained that they were created by statute more than 40 years ago to encourage regional planning and encourage communities to work together. He informed that in the past, the regional planning commissions did not all operate the same way, but now they mostly do. He noted that all the regional planning commissions also do work on a contractual basis for their member communities.

Mr. Bergeron recognized that Pelham was a very unique community within New Hampshire, which lends both benefits and unique needs. Mr. Minkarah stated that he recognized that Pelham was a very distinct community as well, especially as it borders Massachusetts and other large New Hampshire communities. He stated that any distinguishing and unique factors would need to be reflected within the Master Plan.

Mr. Montbleau asked if the NRPC were chosen to complete the Master Plan, who would be the lead person. Mr. Minkarah replied that it would be him. He noted that he had a large staff and that many people would have a role to play, but he would be coordinating the process and the point person for the project.

DISCUSSIONS

Discussion regarding changes to Land Use Regulations.

This discussion was postponed to the following meeting.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

MOTION: (Masse-Quinn/Bergeron) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3, II, 1 (consideration of legal advice or council).

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
Mr. Montbleau – abstain
Mr. Culbert – yes

Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes
Mr. Doherty – yes

(6-0-1) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty noted that when the Board returned, after the non-public session, the Board would not take any other action publicly, except to possibly seal the minutes of the non-public session and to adjourn the meeting. The Board entered a non-public session at approximately 10:10 pm.

ADJOURN

MOTION: (Montbleau/Cote) To adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
Mr. Montbleau – yes
Mr. Culbert – yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes
Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jordyn M. Isabelle
Recording Secretary