



Lakes Region Planning Commission

Area 2 Meeting

Monday, September 24, 2018

Holderness Town Hall

6:00 – 8:00 PM

On Monday, September 24, 2018, the Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC) meeting will hold a regular meeting in Holderness at the Holderness Town Hall. Topics/agenda items will include a formal review and acceptance of the proposed FY19 budget, a proposed update of LRPC's Development of Regional Impact Guidelines, and a Commissioner roundtable discussion of community best practices.

Please join us for this opportunity to learn and share information, and to strategize on behalf of the Lakes Region. All LRPC meetings are open to the public. For additional information or special accommodation, please contact the LRPC at 279-5334 or admin@lakesrpc.org.

AGENDA

- 6:00 pm 1 **Call to Order**
Approval of Minutes of May 21, 2018 Meeting
- 2 **FY19 Budget Approval** (recommended by Executive Board)
- 3 **Developments of Regional Impact (DRI) Guidelines**
Susan Slack, LRPC Principal Planner
- 4 **Commissioner Roundtable** — Best Practices
Opportunity to share noteworthy news and happenings from your communities
- 5 **Other Business**
Next Meeting: Monday, October 22, 2018, 6–8 PM
Franklin Savings Bank's Community Learning Center, 61 Laconia Rd, Tilton
- 8:00 pm **Adjourn**

Light Refreshments Available

Holderness Town Hall

1089 US Route 3
Holderness, NH 03245



Accessible Entrance: Ramp at left/rear of Town Hall

FY19 Commission Meeting Calendar

2018			
SEPTEMBER	Monday	September 24, 2018	6-8 PM
OCTOBER	Monday	October 22, 2018	6-8 PM
DECEMBER	Monday	<i>December 3 or 10, 2018</i>	6-8 PM
2019			
APRIL	Monday	APRIL 22, 2019	6-8 PM
MAY	Monday	MAY 20, 2019	6-8 PM
JUNE	Monday	JUNE 24, 2018	5-9 PM

Lakes Region Planning Commission

	FY18 Actual	FY18 Approved Budget	FY19 Proposed Budget	Comments
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
4010 · Contract Income	490,182.95	591,795.00	709,060.37	
			11,111.00	110 · Targeted Block Grant (TBG)
			2,250.00	215 · PRLAC
			10,000.00	271 · NH DES 319 Winnisquam Watershed Grant
			7,000.00	272 · CNHRPC 5305e Coordinated Plan Application [FY18/19]
			6,000.00	273 · NH DES 319 Squam Lakes Association Subcontract [BOA]
			8,775.00	274 · NH DES 319 Squam Lakes Association Subcontract [FPI]
				368 · Laconia Master Plan - zoning (project status leftover)
			12,000.00	370 · 604(b) Septic Assessment - \$6,000 to subcontractor (FY 18 rollover)
			6,000.00	373 · Effingham HSEM
			6,000.00	374 · Gilmanton HSEM
			6,000.00	375 · Northfield HSEM
			6,000.00	376 · Moultonborough HSEM
			6,000.00	377 · Wolfeboro HSEM
			2,674.00	380 · Tuftonboro Master Plan - Phase II
			33,846.00	408 · Brownfields Oversight
			245,567.00	409 · Brownfields - \$171,600 to subcontractor (FY 18 rollover)
			3,565.00	411 · Northern Border Regional Grant [Ashland]
			15,518.37	412 · USDA Solid Waste Management Grant - FY18
			3,804.00	413 · Northern Border Regional Grant [Wolfeboro]
			64,875.00	414 · USDA Solid Waste Management Grant - FY19
			5,365.00	415 · Northern Border Regional Grant [Bristol]
			7,100.00	416 · Northern Border Regional Grant [Laconia Area Community Land Trust]
			2,350.00	501.1a - TUF · Tuftonboro RSMS
			237,260.00	718 · UPWP FY18/19
4015 · Donations	4,074.31	3,000.00	3,000.00	HHW Donations at Sites
4020 · HHW Income				
4021 · HHW Local Income	94,165.00	94,165.00	97,489.00	Includes Tuftonboro
4022 · HHW State Income	15,367.00	15,800.00	15,800.00	
Total 4020 · HHW Income	109,532.00	109,965.00	113,289.00	
4040 · Interest Income	1,380.35	700.00	1,244.57	
4045 · Interest & Dividends - Invest	4,222.36	4,000.00	4,000.00	
4050 · Miscellaneous Income				
4053 · Annual Meeting	6,454.00	5,500.00	5,500.00	
4055 · Office Cost Recovery	3,600.00	3,600.00	1,800.00	LWA Only
4056 · Miscellaneous	233.26	-	-	
Total 4050 · Miscellaneous Income	10,287.26	9,100.00	7,300.00	
4060 · Local Appropriation Dues	117,206.00	117,206.00	125,029.00	Without Alton and Adding Plymouth
4070 · Sales Income				
4052 · GIS Income	-	-	-	
4071 · Land Use Book Sales	3,522.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	
Total 4070 · Sales Income	3,522.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	
Total Income	740,407.23	839,266.00	966,422.94	
Gross Profit	740,407.23	839,266.00	966,422.94	
Expense				
6030 · Custodian	3,421.00	3,224.00	3,900.00	Changed Vendor [Winnepesaukee Cleaners]
6040 · Depreciation Expense	1,900.72	1,900.68	-	
6050 · Education & Training	760.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	
6060 · Equipment Maintenance				
6062 · Equip. Maint	2.50	2,600.00	2,600.00	
6063 · Computer Maint.	281.25	1,000.00	1,000.00	
Total 6060 · Equipment Maintenance	283.75	3,600.00	3,600.00	
6061 · Equipment Purchases	7,557.87	4,000.00	19,000.00	Laptop with docking station for Dave New Copier [Purchase April 2019]
6070 · HHW Expense				
6072 · HHW Contractors	94,664.13	91,735.00	97,450.00	
Total 6070 · HHW Expense	94,664.13	91,735.00	97,450.00	
6080 · Insurance - Bonds & Business	2,553.00	2,600.00	3,084.00	
7010 · Publishing/Memberships/Meetings				
6020 · Books Land Use	2,458.50	2,450.00	2,450.00	
7011 · Annual Meeting	7,760.60	6,500.00	6,500.00	
7012 · Memberships	2,958.00	3,575.00	4,575.00	APA MMANH NH GFOA NHMA NH Planners NHARPC NADO
7013 · Commissioner/Other Meetings	1,032.49	960.00	1,000.00	
7015 · Publications, Subscriptions	391.00	500.00	500.00	
Total 7010 · Publishing/Memberships/Meetings	14,600.59	13,985.00	15,025.00	

Lakes Region Planning Commission

	FY18 Actual	FY18 Approved Budget	FY19 Proposed Budget	Comments
7020 · Miscellaneous Expense	1,900.01	300.00	500.00	MVSB Monthly ACH Fee Safe Deposit Box Fee Driver Records
7030 · Office Improvements	540.37	1,500.00	6,000.00	furniture, rugs, bookshelves etc...
7040 · Office Expense				
7041 · Supplies	3,473.03	2,400.00	3,250.00	
7042 · Software Renewal	5,728.73	5,600.00	5,600.00	Office 365 Office Exchange Adobe Acrobat Pro Carbonite ESRI
7045 · GIS	55.00	600.00	600.00	
Total 7040 · Office Expense	9,256.76	8,600.00	9,450.00	
7043 · Copier Lease	5,036.11	4,950.00	4,950.00	
7050 · Payroll Expenses				
7051 · Salaries & Wages	307,636.25	371,487.28	385,974.25	
			259,775.00	Core Staff
			7,793.25	3% performance increase for core staff
			2,000.00	Constant.Allen - Transportation technician
			16,640.00	Erin Daley-Assistant Planner
			4,500.00	Nicole Stevens-intern
			3,600.00	Risa Mosenthal-special projects intern
			3,000.00	McClure.Ian - transportation technician
			32,240.00	Bruce Reichlen [31 hrs / wk @ \$20 / hr]
			18,304.00	Samantha Tuttle [16 hrs / wk @ 22 / hr]
			38,122.00	Additional Staff (pt as needed)
7052 · Health Insurance	39,530.90	37,363.61	44,475.00	4% increase Susan Slack Added
7053 · Life Insurance	85.10	82.80	85.00	
7054 · Long Term Disability Insurance	867.53	900.00	1,225.00	4% Increase
7055 · Retirement Fund	23,370.07	22,247.90	22,942.08	
7056 · Dental Insurance	3,038.37	3,203.74	3,275.00	4% increase
7057 · Payroll Taxes	22,343.65	28,418.78	29,526.61	
7058 · Workmans Comp.	263.00	1,600.00	674.00	
7059 · Unemployment Insurance	-	1,000.00	1,000.00	
7061 · Short Term Disability Insurance	1,155.10	1,275.00	1,275.00	4% increase
Total 7050 · Payroll Expenses	398,289.97	467,579.11	490,451.94	
7060 · Postage & Printing				
6064 · Postage Machine Lease & Maint	254.88	192.00	400.00	stamps.com monthly fees
7062 · Postage	514.70	1,000.00	600.00	
Total 7060 · Postage & Printing	769.58	1,192.00	1,000.00	
7070 · Professional Services				
7072 · Consultant	119,328.99	177,600.00	251,567.00	Nobis Lake Winnepesaukee Assoc.
7073 · USDA Expenses	8,123.29		3,423.00	
7075 · Payroll Service	270.50	1,700.00	275.00	savings! Quickbooks fees
7540 · Investment Counseling Fees	1,865.68	2,750.00	2,750.00	
Total 7070 · Professional Services	129,588.46	182,050.00	258,015.00	
7071 · Audit	3,210.06	5,000.00	7,500.00	Transition
7074 · Legal		500.00	500.00	
7080 · Rent	9,672.00	9,672.00	9,672.00	
7090 · Traffic Equipment	900.92	7,600.00	7,600.00	Two (2) Black Cat Radar Recorders @ \$3,800 each
8010 · Travel Expense	5,493.15	6,000.00	6,000.00	
8050 · Utilities				
6090 · Internet	2,103.60	2,525.00	2,525.00	Consolidated DreamHost GoDaddy GreenInfo Networks Piper Mountain
8051 · Utilities-Propane	3,200.87	4,000.00	4,000.00	
8052 · Telephone/communications	7,544.61	9,804.00	8,250.00	Consolidated Communications and Verizon
8053 · Electric	1,557.88	1,800.00	1,800.00	
Total 8050 · Utilities	14,406.96	18,129.00	16,575.00	
8060 · Vehicle O&M	3,361.58	4,150.00	4,150.00	[Includes Business Auto Insurance - \$1,502]
Total Expense	708,166.99	839,266.79	966,422.94	
Net Ordinary Income	32,240.24	(0.79)	(0.00)	
Other Income/Expense				

Lakes Region Planning Commission

Municipal Appropriations
7/1/2019 - 6/30/2020 (FY20)

DRAFT

Municipality	2010 Census	2015 Total Eq. Valuation (\$000's)	Comparison		FY20 Share	FY19 Share	\$ Change	% Change
			2017 Total Eq. Valuation (\$000's)	Total Eq. % Change				
Alexandria	1,613	\$ 204,497	\$ 189,010	-7.57%	\$ 1,452	\$ 1,530	\$ (78)	-5.09%
Andover	2,371	\$ 251,497	\$ 268,500	6.76%	\$ 2,108	\$ 2,101	\$ 7	0.32%
Ashland	2,076	\$ 235,797	\$ 247,674	5.04%	\$ 1,882	\$ 1,887	\$ (5)	-0.24%
Barnstead	4,593	\$ 438,404	\$ 526,504	20.10%	\$ 4,102	\$ 3,920	\$ 182	4.63%
Belmont	7,356	\$ 591,248	\$ 664,245	12.35%	\$ 6,052	\$ 5,946	\$ 106	1.78%
Bridgewater	1,083	\$ 339,642	\$ 361,972	6.57%	\$ 1,655	\$ 1,638	\$ 17	1.04%
Bristol	3,054	\$ 470,431	\$ 497,087	5.67%	\$ 3,153	\$ 3,149	\$ 4	0.13%
Center Harbor	1,096	\$ 385,879	\$ 435,466	12.85%	\$ 1,875	\$ 1,785	\$ 90	5.04%
Danbury	1,164	\$ 110,663	\$ 114,314	3.30%	\$ 984	\$ 992	\$ (8)	-0.84%
Effingham	1,465	\$ 170,800	\$ 167,193	-2.11%	\$ 1,306	\$ 1,346	\$ (40)	-2.97%
Franklin	8,477	\$ 524,340	\$ 562,251	7.23%	\$ 6,386	\$ 6,376	\$ 10	0.16%
Freedom	1,489	\$ 497,979	\$ 530,240	6.48%	\$ 2,370	\$ 2,349	\$ 21	0.91%
Gilford	7,126	\$ 1,631,229	\$ 1,839,993	12.80%	\$ 9,325	\$ 8,963	\$ 362	4.04%
Gilmanton	3,777	\$ 450,396	\$ 477,220	5.96%	\$ 3,501	\$ 3,498	\$ 3	0.08%
Hebron	602	\$ 263,937	\$ 285,352	8.11%	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,137	\$ 27	2.37%
Hill	1,089	\$ 89,575	\$ 87,628	-2.17%	\$ 865	\$ 887	\$ (22)	-2.48%
Holderness	2,108	\$ 688,063	\$ 740,425	7.61%	\$ 3,326	\$ 3,273	\$ 53	1.60%
Laconia	15,951	\$ 1,883,868	\$ 2,172,653	15.33%	\$ 15,241	\$ 14,713	\$ 528	3.59%
Meredith	6,241	\$ 1,758,060	\$ 2,031,050	15.53%	\$ 9,381	\$ 8,845	\$ 536	6.06%
Moultonborough	4,044	\$ 2,734,135	\$ 3,172,659	16.04%	\$ 11,451	\$ 10,558	\$ 893	8.46%
New Hampton	2,165	\$ 310,285	\$ 312,139	0.60%	\$ 2,119	\$ 2,164	\$ (45)	-2.06%
Northfield	4,829	\$ 280,635	\$ 336,180	19.79%	\$ 3,684	\$ 3,578	\$ 106	2.96%
Ossipee	4,345	\$ 634,592	\$ 693,820	9.33%	\$ 4,447	\$ 4,375	\$ 72	1.65%
Plymouth	6,990	\$ 440,922	\$ 452,128	2.54%	\$ 5,232	\$ 5,248	\$ (16)	-0.30%
Sanbornton	2,966	\$ 389,743	\$ 445,165	14.22%	\$ 2,953	\$ 2,854	\$ 99	3.45%
Sandwich	1,326	\$ 397,852	\$ 445,473	11.97%	\$ 2,033	\$ 1,954	\$ 79	4.04%
Tamworth	2,856	\$ 339,862	\$ 363,093	6.84%	\$ 2,654	\$ 2,642	\$ 12	0.46%
Tilton	3,567	\$ 503,914	\$ 528,259	4.83%	\$ 3,531	\$ 3,540	\$ (9)	-0.25%
Tuftonboro	2,387	\$ 970,190	\$ 1,090,525	12.40%	\$ 4,496	\$ 4,285	\$ 211	4.92%
Wolfboro	6,269	\$ 1,967,287	\$ 2,171,387	10.37%	\$ 9,802	\$ 9,495	\$ 307	3.23%
Total:	114,475	\$ 19,955,725	\$ 22,209,605	11.29%	\$ 128,530	\$ 125,029	\$ 3,501	

Total Appropriations for Municipalities:

\$ 128,530 **\$ 125,029**

Total FY19 Municipal Membership Appropriation: \$ 125,029
 Source: U.S. CPI U Unadjusted 12-mos [2.8%]. Ended May 2018: \$ 3,501
 Total FY20 Municipal Membership Appropriation: \$ 128,530

Note: Dues are derived by calculating each municipality's share of the region's overall population and equalized property valuation on the year of the decennial census. Population and equalized valuation are weighted equally by taking the average of the two shares for each municipality. Dues are then increased annually according to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics CPI index.

**Lakes Region HHW Appropriations FY20
based on housing figures**

Municipality	2010 Census		FY20 Approp
	Total	% Total	
	Dwelling Units	Dwelling Units	
Alexandria	967	1.59%	\$1,609
Andover	1,121	1.84%	\$1,865
Belmont	3,615	5.94%	\$6,016
Bridgewater	995	1.63%	\$1,656
Bristol	2,488	4.09%	\$4,140
Center Harbor	795	1.31%	\$1,323
Effingham	963	1.58%	\$1,603
Franklin	3,938	6.47%	\$6,553
Freedom	1,580	2.59%	\$2,629
Gilford	5,111	8.39%	\$8,505
Gilmanton	2,118	3.48%	\$3,525
Hebron	600	0.99%	\$998
Hill	512	0.84%	\$852
Holderness	1,510	2.48%	\$2,513
Laconia	9,879	16.23%	\$16,440
Meredith	4,728	7.77%	\$7,868
Moultonborough	4,940	8.11%	\$8,221
New Hampton	1,083	1.78%	\$1,802
Northfield	1,969	3.23%	\$3,277
Ossipee	3,057	5.02%	\$5,087
Sanbornton	1,612	2.65%	\$2,683
Sandwich	1,057	1.74%	\$1,759
Tamworth	1,969	3.23%	\$3,277
Tilton	1,845	3.03%	\$3,070
Tuftonboro	2435	4.00%	\$4,052
HHW Total (\$94,487 + 3%)			\$97,322
Universal			\$4,000
TOTAL	60,887	100.0%	\$101,322



103 Main Street, Suite 3
Meredith, NH 03253

REGIONAL IMPACT GUIDELINES

LAKES REGION PLANNING COMMISSION

WHY CONSIDER REGIONAL IMPACTS?

In New Hampshire, local land use boards (Planning Board, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Historic District Commission) are charged with determining when a local development project may have the potential for creating regional impacts as outlined in N.H. RSA 36:54-58. This statute establishes the framework to be followed by a municipality that is reviewing a development proposal with potential impacts beyond its municipal boundaries. As RSA 36:54-58 explains, a determination of regional impact affords abutting communities and the regional planning commission the status of abutter during land use board hearings. It is also an opportunity to broaden the scope of review, and in doing so, gain additional input and technical support in the review of large or complex development proposals.

The Lakes Region Planning Commission has developed this guidance document to aid our 30-member municipalities in evaluating whether or not a development should be determined to have regional impact. The document summarizes the statutory process that must be followed under New Hampshire state law and suggests a number of triggering factors that should be considered for making this determination.

The criteria suggested here are recommendations: they have no regulatory force. Municipalities should consider finding that projects have regional impact as a way of maximizing the thoroughness of municipal project review. In doing so, a community can gain insight from the professional planning staff of the regional planning agency as well as from land use board members and professional planners in abutting towns or cities. The LRPC has professional staff planners with training in the fields of transportation, municipal land use and natural resource management. This process should be helpful to a host municipality's local review and not a hindrance to it. Neither the LRPC nor the neighboring municipalities have any authority under the regional impact statute to interfere with the decision-making power held by the land use board of the host town or city.

PURPOSE OF REGIONAL IMPACT STATUTES

The New Hampshire legislature cited three reasons for enacting the DRI statutes:

1. It wanted municipalities that are potentially affected by a proposed development in a neighboring town or city to receive timely notice of the land use board's meetings and public hearings involving the proposed development.
2. It wanted the RPCs and the potentially affected neighboring municipalities to furnish "timely input" to the municipal land use boards with jurisdiction over the proposed development.
3. It wanted to "encourage" the land use boards with jurisdiction over the development proposal "to consider the interests of other potentially affected municipalities." In other words, the legislature wanted towns and cities to think regionally when land use development has impacts beyond their own municipal borders. When a proposal is determined to have the potential for regional impact, the result is that the neighboring municipality (or municipalities) and the RPC have the status of abutters during the board's consideration of the project. In this case, abutter status is limited to a right to receive notice of the board's meetings and public hearings and a right to give testimony.

According to NH RSA 36:54, the purpose of the regional impact statute is to:

- I. Provide timely notice to potentially affected municipalities concerning proposed developments which are likely to have impacts beyond the boundaries of a single municipality.
- II. Provide opportunities for the regional planning commission and the potentially affected municipalities to furnish timely input to the municipality having jurisdiction.
- III. Encourage the municipality having jurisdiction to consider the interests of other potentially affected municipalities.

REGIONAL IMPACT PROCESS

The process for a local land use board to follow when making a regional impact determination involves three steps:

- At the earliest point possible after a local land use board has received an application or proposal for review, the board should determine if the project has the potential to create impacts beyond the municipality's boundaries. **If such impacts are reasonably expected, the statute directs that a local land use board shall formally determine the project to be one of regional significance.** Note that the statute directs that if the land use board isn't sure whether or not the development will have regional impact, doubt shall be resolved with a determination that it does have regional impact. This vote should name the municipalities that are believed to be potentially affected by the proposal.
- Not more than five (5) business days after a local land use board makes this determination the affected municipalities and the appropriate regional planning commission shall, by certified mail, be made aware of this decision. At this same time the local land use board shall send to each affected municipality and the regional planning commission a copy of the minutes of the meeting at which the determination was made as

well as one copy of the initial development plan set (the cost of which shall be borne by the applicant).

- All affected municipalities and the regional planning commission shall be notified by certified mail at least 14 days prior to the public hearing for which public comment will be taken that they are afforded the right to testify as an abutter to the subject development proposal.

LOCAL LAND USE BOARDS

The regional impact statutes apply to all local land use boards, defined in RSA 672:7, not just to the planning board. Local land use boards in the context of RSA 36:54-58 include planning board, zoning board of adjustment, historic district commission, building code board of appeals or building inspectors.

THE ROLE OF THE BUILDING INSPECTOR

By definition, the Building Inspector is considered a local land use board for the purposes of the DRI determination. When the Building Inspector determines that a use or structure proposed in a building permit application has the potential for regional impact and no other local land use board has previously made such a determination, the Building Inspector shall notify the governing body (Board of Selectmen, City Council). The Building Inspector must also notify the RPC and affected municipalities by certified mail. The RPC and the affected municipalities must be given 30 days to submit comments to the governing body and the Building Inspector prior to the issuance of the building permit.

DETERMINING THE POTENTIAL FOR REGIONAL IMPACT

A local land use board determines the potential for regional impact. (RSA 36:56)

According to RSA 36:55, development of regional impact means any proposal before a local land use board which in the determination of such local land use board could reasonably be expected to impact on a neighboring municipality, because of factors such as, but not limited to, the following:

- I. Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock.
- II. Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community.
- III. Transportation networks.
- IV. Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles.
- V. Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries.
- VI. Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CHECKLIST

The Lakes Region Planning Commission recommends including consideration of Developments of Regional Impact in each land use board's Rules of Procedure to help insure that the potential for regional impact is reviewed with each application received by the board. Rules of Procedure can be amended by each land use board by following the process outlined in RSA 676:1.

LRPC also recommends that each land use board utilize a checklist to assist the board in making determinations about developments of regional impact. A suggested checklist is provided below:

Checklist for Determining Developments of Regional Impact

Statutory Authority: refer to RSA 36:54-58

Findings of YES on one or more of the items below indicates the need for a local land use board to determine that the development proposal results in possible regional impacts.

1. **School Impacts:** Will the development create significant new student population affecting a regional school district? Yes___ No ___
2. **Traffic Generation:** Will the development cause an increase in traffic that will diminish the capacity or safety of the road system in the adjacent municipality or potentially affect regional traffic patterns?
Yes ___No ___
3. **Building Size:** Will proposed buildings or number of dwelling units impact neighborhoods or areas in a neighboring municipality? Yes___ No ___
4. **Visual Impacts:** Will the development create visual impacts to neighboring municipalities such as light pollution or glare, visibility of structures, adverse impacts on scenic vistas?
Yes___ No ___
5. **Pollution:** Does the development propose the operation of a facility or business that would generate excessive air pollution, wastewater discharge, noise or hazardous waste transport?
Yes ___ No ___
6. **Surface or Groundwater Impacts:**
Will the development occur on or adjacent to known aquifers or surface waters that transcend municipal boundaries? Yes _____ No _____

Will the development require a major impact wetland permit from NH DES?
Yes ___ No ___

Does the project involve permitting for a large groundwater withdrawal?
Yes ___ No ___

Will the development cause negative impacts to another municipality's municipal water supply? Yes ___ No ___

7. **Conservation Lands:** Does the development abut existing conservation lands or existing farmland such that coordination between municipalities could lead to the creation or preservation of greenways, wildlife habitat areas or prevent fragmentation of forests, farms or other conservation lands? Yes___ No ___
8. **Economic Impacts:** Does the development propose the creation of business or industry that would significantly impact regional economic development? Yes ___ No ___
9. **Emergency Response:** Does the proposal create a significant increased demand for emergency services response (including mutual aid) from neighboring municipalities? Yes___ No ___
10. **Historic or Cultural Resources:** Will the proposed development have negative impacts on historic or cultural resources that may have significance regionally? Yes___ No ___
11. **Other:** Does the development create other regional impacts not listed above? Yes___ No ___

Describe:
