

Maryland Sustainable Growth Commission Meeting

May 16, 2011/1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**Bel Air Armory
Bel Air, Maryland**

Meeting Summary

Members: Jon Laria, Derick Berlage, Martin Bierbaum (for Gerrit Knaap), Karl Brendle, Greg Bowen, Dave Carey, Diane Chasse, Cheryl Cort, Sandy Coyman, Timothy Doyle (for Bob Walker), Rich Hall, Don Halligan, Frank Hertsch, Brigid Kenney, Stephen Lafferty, David Lever, Mary Ann Lisanti, Sam Parker, Dru-Schmidt Perkins, Ray Skinner, Rollin Stanley, Duane Yoder

Attendees: Marty Baker, Jamie Bridges, Candace Donoho, Kurt Fuchs, Carol Gilbert, Les Knapp, John Kortecamp, Jenn Leonard, Jim Lynn, Tom Osborne, Chris Schlehr, Kevin Small, Craig Ward

MDP Staff: Chuck Boyd, John Coleman, Amanda Conn, Peter Conrad, Rich Josephson, Jenny King, Shannon Marino, Matt Power, Andy Ratner, Pat Russell, Joe Tassone

Introductions/Administrative Matters

The Chair, Jon Laria began the meeting at 1:20 p.m. He introduced Dave Carey, Mayor of Bel Air and Commission member who announced that before beginning the actual meeting, he was taking members and staff on a quick tour outside of the Armory. He noted that Bel Air is a good example of a smart growth success story. He thanked Secretary Skinner and his staff for DHCD's commitment to the Armory. Mr. Carey introduced Chris Schlehr, Town Administrator and Kevin Small, new Director of Planning. He then shared a bit of background information on the Armory facility itself. He noted renovations have been done and are continuing to be done. Also recently, the Armory was selected as one of Maryland's Smart Sites; and Armory Park received Community Legacy funding.

Members and staff then proceeded outside for the tour. Upon return, Mr. Laria thanked the Mr. Carey. Jenny King noted a couple of reminders before going back to the agenda – please submit Ethics Forms if you haven't already done so; and the next meeting is scheduled for July 25th in Prince Frederick.

Workgroup Reports

- **WIP Workgroup**

Jenny King said that Alan Girard, Chair of the group, was unable to attend today's meeting so she is giving the WIP Workgroup report. She noted that the group had their second meeting on May 11th. Mr. Girard sent out three questions for the group to answer to facilitate the second meeting. David Goshorn compiled the list and the group had a round table discussion and compiled summaries of their responses. These were put on a flip chart at their meeting and members voted on their top three priorities. It was decided to form a workgroup sub-group to recommend to the full workgroup at its third meeting top priorities since many of the votes were close and topics overlapped. The next meeting is scheduled in June.

- **Funding Workgroup**

Mr. Stanley noted that they will have their second meeting on Friday. They will have a link that can be sent out to remotely access the meeting. He hopes to get feedback from panelists at the next meeting. Mr. Stanley indicated there is a lot of information that can be found on the web from around the country and case studies around the State.

- **Concentrating Growth Workgroup**

Mr. Berlage said the workgroup has had three meetings. They had a presentation from a private sector developer, and would like to have a presentation at the next meeting from an academic person to talk about innovation clusters. They are in the fact finding stage right now.

- **Indicators Workgroup**

Mr. Coyman said the group has targeted four jurisdictions to do beta-testing.

- **Education Workgroup**

Peter Conrad said he will be organizing a conference call to get several new folks up to speed. There is an inventory of academic offerings at colleges and universities around the State. There is also a smart growth curriculum that was completed previously that needs to be updated. The workgroup is working with them on this effort.

- **Housing Workgroup**

Mr. Lafferty noted that the workgroup will hold its first meeting next week. He stated that Mr. Skinner started them off on the right foot with a genesis for a State housing plan. He said we need to look at the role, policy issues, what information and data do we need – try to keep it broad. Other issues to be looked at include where housing should be located; there is a lack of disparity of what houses should be built. Some of the concerns of houses today are size, type, and meeting the needs, and including role of septic. We need to look at the State models, other housing plans, cost burdens of housing, accessibility issues, e.g. design.

- **PlanMaryland Presentation**

Joe Tassone and Chuck Boyd presented a power point presentation. After completing the presentation, Mr. Tassone asked members and staff if they had any questions or concerns.

- Mr. Bowen inquired about preliminary designations.
- Ms. Schmidt-Perkins felt that the citizens were missing from the process, and that Marylanders need to be in this process.
- Mr. Parker was impressed with the Plan. He said we need to look at citizens input and their role, and adding a community level to the process.

Mr. Hall agreed and said this is a policy plan, but we do need to make it a Maryland citizens plan as well. He said we will need help from the members to figure this out.

Mr. Laria said the Commission's role is statutory to advise on the State Development Plan (PlanMaryland). Members need to figure out a way to talk with one another. They need to sort out the role of their workgroups and frame it. The PlanMaryland schedule is aggressive. By the next meeting, Mr. Laria said he would like to have a draft set of recommendations that can be adopted by the Commission.

- **PlanMaryland Workgroup**

Marty Bierbaum presented the workgroup update stating that the Workgroup felt that there are fundamental issues that should be addressed and incorporated into the Plan. The Workgroup needs to come up with a set of recommendations, working with MDP and the Commission. Their schedule is to meet five or six times over the next two months. With regard to membership, it was determined that it should be expanded to include private sector people. Maryland's citizens are mostly interested in what the plan will do; its impacts and how much it will cost.

As for the process, need to look at what is meant by the Final Version 2011 of Plan Maryland. Will the group be asked to endorse this Plan at the proper time? Are the issue forums and open houses that MDP have conducted to date meaningful ways to gather the information and concerns that are required to ensure that PlanMaryland will be relevant and meaningful? We need a Plan that will address multiple audiences and look at how we reach them, including stakeholders and citizens. One suggestion is to redesign the Executive Summary as a citizen's guide.

Another area to look at is the State's role with respect to land use. Does the Plan adequately capture the role and does it capture the role with regarding to location jurisdictions and land use.

The legislative authority of the Plan should be highlighted at the outset. The role and function of PlanMaryland should be clarified.

Other areas to look at include what does the implementation strategy consist of and the links for relationship of data are not always clear. Need to strengthen the links in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 and be more explicit. For the final 2011 Plan, it needs to have a more balanced view. PlanMaryland should provide some explanation on PFAs and elaborate more on how GrowthPrint is improved upon. PlanMaryland should also include economic development and employment opportunities; public safety issues; better address some of the transportation issues; focus on land preservation and more about agricultural problems; focus on Chesapeake Bay initiatives; include maps identifying wastewater treatment plants; include discussion on Maryland's housing market in greater detail; and focus attention on social equity issues.

Looking ahead there needs to be clarification of the nature of GrowthPrint, review various substances and aspects of the Plan, identify and resolve some of the issues, and clarify with respect to PlanMaryland its implementation strategy.

Ms. Schmidt-Perkins commented that we need some kind of matrix saying where we want to go.

Ms. Lisanti said we need to engage the public. She felt the public cannot absorb this Plan. Need to clearly define the goals and objectives.

Mr. Bowen felt it should be more of a public document. He said we need to clarify the role of the State versus local in this process. We need to clarify the roles of who is doing what in this process. Mixing of urban and rural is inevitable, but we also need to look at how we will protect urban and agriculture.

Mr. Parker asked the question "who is this for?" He said if you are trying to get citizens or citizen organizations, they need to see themselves in this document. There is no discussion of how we interact with our regional partner.

Mr. Laria asked – what are we really trying to do here?

Mr. Hall said look at the statute from 1974; this really is a policy plan. He said there are two areas that need to be worked on and that includes the matrix and goal setting.

Ms. Cort noted that she appreciated the work done on GrowthPrint. She said she likes the established community's definition.

Mr. Laria asked when do you issue the "Plan?" You try and get enough out there, but how much are you willing to leave undone.

Ms. Kenney questioned is this a total State development plan? Is it going to be, all things considered, a "total" development plan.

Mr. Lafferty also inquired if this is a land use plan?

Mr. Bowen noted in addressing the TMDL's – is it going to be enforced. He said there are concerns from local governments. We need to establish a new GrowthPrint area. What is the State doing for the county's role in processing.

Mr. Coyman noted there should be an appendix that lists the criteria for the prints.

Mr. Carey said he had concerns with the definition of “sustainability” the first time he saw this (page 3) it was unsatisfying to him. He felt it should be just a more detailed definition, i.e. more general.

Mr. Hall advised he and staff will get back to the Commission and thanked everyone for their good comments. He added we need to think about integrating a public process that makes sense and work on the matrix and goals. He felt the matrix is a weakness in the draft.

Mr. Stanley advised being careful in setting goals.

Mr. Carey said this group has done a tremendous amount of work.

Public Comments

Mr. Craig Ward said he heard some fantastic comments and in observing as an outsider, he felt the Plan is written for the experts. Concerning regulatory and land development need to look at what the details are. The goal is to get the community level engaged. They want to know these details. He suggested including a few case studies as part of the written document, e.g., two thirds of Harford County is rural. Need to encourage growth to go out of these more rural areas.

Mr. Laria thanked everyone for their comments. He said a lot of work is still to be accomplished. He will be in touch with the workgroup Chairs a little more directly. It is important to organize some of these conversations. Mr. Laria said he appreciates everyone's time and discussion.

Mr. Rich Josephson reminded everyone about the PlanMaryland Open Houses. They are listed on MDP's PlanMaryland website. He encouraged everyone to attend at least one of them.

Mr. Laria said he hopes to see everyone at the July 25th meeting in Prince Frederick, Maryland. Jenny King will be sending more details and an agenda for the meeting at a later time.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.