

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Tuesday, July 5, 2022
1:00 p.m. – Rye Town Hall**

***Present:* Chair Rob Wright, Kathryn Garcia, Patricia Losik, Planning Administrator Kim Reed, Land Use Board Assistant Kara Campbell and Julie LaBranche, JVL Planning Consultant**

I. Call to Order

Chair Wright called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. and led the pledge of allegiance.

II. Review scope of service for the RFP drafts from Julie LaBranche

Julie LaBranche gave a brief overview of the work of the Long Range Planning Committee (LRP) over the past year.

Chair Wright noted that at this time, the target is to make sure the LRP Committee is meeting deadlines for its own internal processes. The Budget Committee needs to have a placeholder for the budget. LRP is going to get that number to them within the next ten days, as they now have enough information to form what that should be. He noted the first deadline is for the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). After that, the Committee needs to make a case to the Budget Committee to be included as a line item in the budget. The Committee will need to make an argument that they understand what they want to do, what the costs will be and why it needs to be done.

Referring to Julie LaBranche's email of July 5th, Chair Wright read question #1: ***Will the RFP definitively request a Theme Based approach using the public input from 2021 or leave it up to the consultant to propose an approach?*** He commented that he thought they have answered this question a few times.

Ms. LaBranche replied that she thought there was a lot of dialogue on the table about this; theme based versus chapter based. She explained that even a theme-based approach can have a bit of a hybrid component to it. A theme-based approach can be totally theme based, but could also include some of the older chapters.

Chair Wright stated that what he picked up from the Committee's conversation was that the notion of having a theme-based approach would make the master plan more easily engageable by the average user. People could open it up and say they understand what's being said and what the objectives are. In that way, themes made sense to him. That's why the Committee got to the point to say it should be something that is engageable. The plan would clearly be stated up front

as themes. Below that is the details of how to go about doing it. The theme base is the what and why. The rest of it is the how.

Member Losik agreed. She pointed out that the Committee voted for a theme-based. The Committee kept coming back to that in discussions. She noted that Planning Administrator Reed found a very ardent RFP for the Town of Bolton, MA, dated March 24, 2022. Bolton is a very similar size community to Rye. On page 8 of their RFP, the outline for project overview and scope of work and deliverables, they had done a town wide survey ahead of this and they had developed a draft vision statement, prior to putting the RFP together, similar to the work of LRP. Her takeaway is this is very similar to LRP's draft framework, where they said these are the components that are important. Bolton is saying that their master plan should address what it has to statutorily, but then the master plan should address other items important to them. Maintain a semi-rural character; fostering community connections; supporting diverse housing choices; providing equitable services; protecting the environment and natural resources; and striving toward a resilient and sustainable community, are things that Rye would want to be talking about. Bolton's RFP gets into their core values, which she thinks would translate Rye's themes.

In regards to the question of theme versus chapter, Member Losik stated they want to be careful if they want to stay theme based, it can't be limiting. It should reflect the work that has been done thus far, but it shouldn't exclude the other pieces of work that might drive their questions.

Referring to page 10 of the Bolton RFP, documents to be referenced, Member Garcia commented that she certainly hopes this happens with Rye's master plan for all the research and studies that have already been done. Regarding the theme-based versus chapter-based plan, she asked if a chapter-based would be easier to update.

Chair Wright stated this was the argument that was made when they had this discussion. There was a commentary that all the work doesn't need to be replaced. Going with a theme-based, all the work would need to be replaced, which he disagrees with. He noted that he took it that theme-based and chapter based had definitive meanings. The notion was that there is something that outlines the functions of who they are and what they do. The other is an aspirational target of what they want to be and things they want to change. In his mind, the top themes that are important to the community have been stated loudly and clearly. The rank of priority is going to differ depending on who is asked. He would say that one job of a consultant would be to figure out the rank of priority based on a sample size. The rest would be to dovetail in the existing work with the larger notion of making it more accessible from a readability and ease of engagement perspective. He commented this is why he thought the Committee said they want to have themes. The answer to the consultant ought to be "I don't care what you call it. Here's what we are going after"; which is, engagement, accessibility with a notion to what's important, and filling in between the why's with the how's.

Ms. LaBranche stated that she thought at their last meeting they had landed at creating a more portable and accessible document. It would need an executive summary, vision chapter, an implementation plan, and an appendix which would be the preexisting chapters. The consultant would go through the chapters to update the data.

Chair Wright stated that he is hearing theme versus chapter aren't mutually exclusive.

Ms. LaBranche commented they aren't. She pointed out that they could have a bunch of larger themes and there could be smaller themes nested under the bigger themes.

Referring to Bolton's RFP, Member Losik stated that structurally, this is not a bad direction for Rye. She noted that the Committee has a lot of information from all the work they did last year. She clarified that the summaries they have posted to the website include the summaries of the public workshop but also the high-level survey data. Referring to the Amherst initiative, she stated that the community is saying they want something that is workable. They want an implementation chapter. They want something that can drive action and people can understand. Going through what the Master Plan Steering Committee is saying, they like the idea of including graphs and pictures, and is user friendly. Some of the firms that bid for Amherst have a newer approach including graphs and pictures. They were talking about it being easy to look at in an actionable plan of visual and graphic nature. They are talking the theme approach. She noted that Amherst had over 1800 survey respondents. In reading through the master plan minutes of Amherst, it can be seen that they are doing a lot of what this Committee has been doing. They gathered information. They decided on a theme approach and are moving in that direction. A lot of what she is reading in the records of municipalities, is similar to the work the Committee did last year.

Ms. LaBranche stated that she can put together, with Administrator Reed's help, a list of documents to be referenced by the consultants.

Chair Wright asked if they will be pigeonholing themselves by asking for a theme-based master plan to be created. What the Committee wants is for it to be simple to use and all the things they are talking about. However, they don't want to be short changed.

Ms. LaBranche commented that maybe the process moving forward with creating the RFP is to delve into the survey data a bit. She can pull out some of the major points of the survey.

Member Losik stated that what has been given to the Committee with the key pieces might be enough to do a good RFP.

Ms. LaBranche stated that a consultant can go through the summarizes of the workshop. They can take out the major items of interest that come out of the community survey and the municipal survey. Also, consideration may be given to emergent issues that may or may not have come up during the workshops. Referring back to question 1 of her email, Ms. LaBranche noted that her proposal was to do an executive summary, a vision chapter with goals and objectives and an implementation plan, and then append all the other documents; survey data and workshop summaries. The consultant could go through each of the other chapters and make some necessary tweaks.

Chair Wright stated that he thinks they should say to the consultants who respond that the Committee has done this research and what came from that is the decision to utilize a theme-

based approach in the development of the Master Plan Vision Chapter because it lends itself to better and more engagement and more accurately describes the aspirations of the Town of Rye.

Member Losik stated that she has a different view. The Committee has gotten to themes, five big buckets. Yes, they want the consultant to look at the chapters. However, she strongly feels there are pieces of those chapters that are current enough to become part of those themes, which will be up to the consultant. Otherwise, there will be a 300-page document. When reading through the current master plan, it can be seen the time that the chapters came from and narrative can also be seen. Some of the content is a bit dated and a little subjective. That has to go away because this is the big “knitting party” of all the diverse ideas.

Ms. LaBranche commented that the older chapters should be archived, so people can go back to review.

Chair Wright asked if there are going to be code words in the RFP that trip it to go to one consulting firm or another. He noted that he agrees with Member Losik. He doesn't want to lose anything that was good or carry unnecessary baggage of something that is not good.

Ms. LaBranche stated that the way to frame the RFP is to say the Town wants a theme-based approach and here are the major parts of the plan; executive summary, flushed out vision chapter, and an implementation plan.

Member Losik pointed out that they have enough in their work with the themes and the data to direct them.

The Committee agreed.

Ms. LaBranche pointed out the themes were so broad that it was just public opinion. A lot of people may have been digging into their own lives. There are a lot of emergent issues; such as, energy costs, health considerations and things that didn't come up in the workshop at all. She thinks the consultant could bring forward some of those emergent issues and have focus groups or workshops to talk about those.

Member Garcia clarified that the consultant would be doing more information gathering. She liked what was just said about what didn't emerge needs to still be flushed out.

Referring to question #1 of her email, Ms. LaBranche stated that she is hearing theme-based approach and using the data from the community survey and the workshops, along with any additional suggestions from the consultant to address emerging issues and bringing in information from the older chapters that's still relevant.

The Committee agreed.

Administrator Reed read question #2 from the email: ***Will the RFP specifically require data summaries of the community and municipal survey? (Noting that the public workshop data was already summarized).***

Ms. LaBranche asked if this will be a task under the RFP; the consultant will summarize this information.

Chair Wright stated that the consultant ought to be able to establish if they have enough data to write the plan. He would hope the answer would be no that more is needed. It would be up to them to decide which parts would need additional massaging and additional input. To him it gets to question 3 about whether there will be a master plan committee that would be driving the interaction with the consultant. He views it to be a very interactive process with the consultant.

Ms. LaBranche agreed.

Referring to question #2, Member Garcia asked why the consultant would summarize the data. She asked if it would be more important if they reviewed it.

Chair Wright stated that he doesn't see any need for the consultants to re-summarize it.

Ms. LaBranche suggested they review the information and pull out the major things that came out of it.

Member Losik stated that it's a responsibility of this Committee and the Master Plan Steering Committee that the consultant should be tasked at looking at that raw data. It should just be known how that is going to be done because it has to be known how much that's going to cost. There are all kinds of ways to get through the qualitative and quantitative analysis of all those responses. She doesn't think the consultant would have done their job without doing that work.

Chair Wright suggested the consultant will review and comment on the existing input data.

Referring to question #2 of the email, Ms. LaBranche summarized that the consultant will review the community and municipal survey data and evaluate whether there is enough data.

Member Losik noted that they also should include analysis as necessary.

Question #3: ***Will a Master Plan Committee be formed and who will appoint its members?***

Chair Wright asked if Master Plan Committee and Ad-Hoc Master Plan Steering Committee are being used in the same context.

Administrator Reed confirmed.

Ms. LaBranche stated that she wouldn't necessarily call it a steering committee. That word has the connotation of being a little overhanded.

Referring to the Master Plan Committee, Member Losik stated that she's kind of "foggy" about when that would happen. Ms. LaBranche made a mention at the last meeting, when furthering the Committee's understanding about the RFP, that she doubted the consultants would be inclined to reply without knowing the funds were secured yet. Member Losik commented that

she's trying to get her head around that. Bolton went out with their RFP and they didn't know if they had the money because their town meeting didn't happen until May. The RFP is dated March. Amherst started their surveys in 2020. They extended their survey into 2021. They went out for bid and they actually met with three consultants on March 29th and March 30th. They made the decision for Resilience Planning and Design at their April meeting. There was encumbrance in June 2021 for a little over \$40,000 for their master plan. A year later, the bid not to exceed was roughly \$90,000. She pointed out that Amherst obviously didn't have the money. Her question is when these things should go out. Are they seeing that the reality is that if there's a good RFP the consultants are willing to come in?

Ms. LaBranche stated that her suggestion would be to not release the RFP until it's past the Budget Committee and on the warrant. That would bring it to a January timeframe.

Chair Wright noted that the timeline shows the CIP budget date as July 15th, which was amended to July 12th. RFP draft timeline was September 12th. The Budget Committee will meet late in the year. The purpose of having the RFP draft is to provide a defensible reason for how much money is needed and why.

Member Losik asked when they should send the RFP out. She noted that her concern is the budget process. The Committee needs to have enough current information so they can answer questions about what the consultant's range is going to be. She knows that Ms. LaBranche was going to put together a compilation of regional master plans and how much they cost. If the Committee has that data, she would say that's a workable discussion with the Budget Committee. The LRP Committee is going to need some support for what their request is in the budget process and how it relates to what they're trying to achieve.

Chair Wright stated that at the last meeting Ms. LaBranche made a comment that it's typical to include a budgetary number in the RFP. He commented this goes against every perceptive negotiating that he's every entertained.

Ms. LaBranche explained that a number that's reasonable is chosen. With the research that's passed on and the other information that she can provide, there is a "sweet spot" for master plan updates for the type that Rye wants to do.

Chair Wright asked what that amount would be.

Ms. LaBranche replied \$75,000.

Chair Wright clarified that they would go to the Budget Committee and ask this to be authorized for \$75,000. They would go through the process of refining and defending that right now, but they wouldn't have specific responses to an RFP. The Budget Committee is meeting in December. What was said two meetings ago was that the process would be to get it on the warrant, which is end of December/early January. If the Town votes on it and approves it, then the RFP would be released.

Ms. LaBranche noted the RFP should be ready to be released immediately after town meeting in March.

Chair Wright commented that he is hearing an alternate possibility of expediting the RFP and releasing it without it being approved by the Budget Committee.

Member Losik explained that she is very “foggy” about what she’s seeing other communities doing. She doesn’t think she has enough data to go through the Budget Committee process.

Ms. LaBranche asked if Bolton’s RFP had a dollar amount associated with it.

Member Losik replied no.

Member Garcia commented that she thought Member Losik was asking how to defend the budget request, which is huge. If the budget doesn’t pass, there will be no master plan process.

Member Losik agreed the budget process is critical. This process has been under the microscope with communities that are much larger; Exeter, Bedford and Stratham. She feels that one of the responsibilities of this Committee is to pick out three or four and really understand how that process went about and how much it cost. The number being discussed is \$75,000., but Amherst just had there’s approved for \$90,000. The Budget Committee is going to ask why LRP is saying \$75,000.

Ms. LaBranche stated this is the dollar amount she is seeing most often in the last six months.

Administrator Reed pointed out that the chapter for climate change was part of a grant. However, the Town paid \$18,000 or \$20,000 for the other three chapters.

Member Losik stated that she can’t answer any questions about a master plan steering committee until she has a better feel for what data is going to be used and harvested for the budget process.

Administrator Reed commented that she doesn’t think they would pick a master plan committee until after a consultant has been hired.

Ms. LaBranche commented or when the money is approved.

Member Losik replied she is not sure she agrees. In looking at other communities, the master plan committee is actively involved in the RFP process.

Ms. LaBranche noted that this Committee is acting as the master plan committee right now.

Member Losik stated LRP is not widely represented. This Committee is a subcommittee of the Planning Board. When she sees the process in other communities, the master plan steering committee becomes responsible for the engagement. The terms of the engagement are in the RFP.

Chair Wright pointed out that the Planning Board is responsible. The Planning Board will vote on the actual master plan. Does this mean that members of the LRP are underrepresenting the views and wishes of the community? Do the Planning Board Members, as having been elected representatives, represent the totality of the Town?

Member Losik replied that she thinks it's different. In looking at communities' master plan steering committees, they're beyond representing. There might be the chair of the planning board, the town planner, and other people outside of the planning board driving the process.

Chair Wright clarified this would be a much larger group.

Member Losik commented that they have grappled with how much larger. Some people will have the time to devote to a master plan steering committee and some people won't. She pointed out that they haven't even talked about who would be part of that committee. She continued there's enough in an RFP, in terms of how it guides the engagement, that she would feel very much more comfortable if that was part of the master plan steering committee.

Ms. LaBranche noted that the components of the RFP is coming from the workshop data, community survey data, and municipal survey data. It's not like the community hasn't been represented at all.

Member Losik stated they are also saying who should be the consultant and who they should reach out to.

Ms. LaBranche explained when it gets to that point, the Planning Board will have a public hearing that's advertised. People can review the proposals that are submitted. There's a public information process that goes behind that.

Member Losik stated she strongly feels it's needed in order to have a successful process, at some point between now and when an RFP is put to bed. To go through budget, they really need to have a good understanding.

Chair Wright asked if the process, by virtue of what it is and how it operates, needs to have a more broadly represented group than this table? If that is part of the process, and if that process necessitates having that engagement prior to getting to the Budget Committee, then that ought to be definitionally the Committee's first priority right now.

Member Losik stated that the concept of a master plan steering committee was brought up in the vision work. It was decided a couple of times that it wasn't time to do that. It wasn't even known if they were going to go in the direction of a master plan, but now they know.

Chair Wright asked when the right time would be for a steering committee.

Member Losik replied she does not know, so this is why she brought it up. Ms. LaBranche had a very good question in her email about whether a master plan committee will be formed and who the members would be.

Chair Wright commented if the master plan steering committee is part and parcel of the development of the RFP, it should happen now. The process of establishing that committee should happen forthwith.

Member Losik stated they could add to the Committee and have someone in that seat by the August meeting.

Ms. LaBranche pointed out they need to advertise for people. They need to come in to meet with the LRP for interviews. The Planning Board needs to approve the members. She doesn't know how this can be done by August.

Chair Wright commented that the Planning Board is responsible. His understanding is that the chair of the Planning Board can make the decision to bring it to a vote of the Board. He asked if forming the master plan steering committee could be put on the Board's next agenda.

Administrator Reed commented that she always thought the steering committee would be after the RFP was put out to bid. Her question would be whether the other communities who had master plan steering committees had long range planning committees. Did they have a subcommittee within the planning board like what Rye has? Were they creating a master plan committee because they didn't have a long range planning committee?

Member Losik pointed out it's not about the committee. It's about the voices on the committee. It's about how it can be a better process. How can it be a process that is going to be reflective of that which is not narrow?

Ms. LaBranche explained that an RFP is broad enough that it's not a sole prescriptive. Once it moves forward out of the RFP process and a consultant is selected, the master plan steering committee will then take over and guide the consultant. That is their main role. She doesn't think the minutia that's going to be in the four-page RFP is worth forming a committee for.

Member Losik commented that she doesn't think it's going to be a four-page RFP. It might not be as detailed as Bolton's, but it might go towards that RFP. However, the Committee has just been talking about how a solid RFP is going to be more helpful to the process for the outcome for Rye.

Ms. LaBranche noted that the process has to be divided. The RFP is a broad-brush stroke of the things to be done, the deliverables and tasks, the timeframe and budget. Once the master plan convenes with the consultant, the work plan is refined and that is when the details come in.

Member Losik noted that the steering committee voices should be part of the RFP process.

Member Garcia agreed.

Chair Wright stated that he doesn't disagree. However, he doesn't think they can say it is important and not say that if it's needed for the Budget Committee that it needs to happen as the top priority.

Member Losik commented she thinks it is a priority. There are people in the community that are very actively involved and would bring positives to the process. It would help get it through the budget process.

Member Garcia asked what the process would be.

Member Losik explained the Planning Board would have to agree to open the activity of the master plan steering committee and then it would be discussed. There may be people that members of the Planning Board know who are representative of what they are looking for.

Chair Wright noted that this body (LRP) was formed as a subcommittee of the Planning Board. His understanding is that the steering committee included some other people who are not on the Planning Board who would be invited in to be advisors. The question then came to when would this be done. Now the question is how will this be done.

Ms. LaBranche commented that the problem with doing a committee in a very hasty way is that there will be people who just have time on their hands and are looking for something to do, which is not really representative.

Chair Wright stated that he wants to walk out of this meeting with a notion of when this will be done. It's not going to happen without deciding if they want it to happen, which he believes they have decided they do, and when it should happen. Member Losik had a very good point that if it is done sooner, there will be a better work product and more effective communication with the Budget Committee in "selling the plan". If the Committee has agreed in concept that the steering committee is necessary, the question is when and how. He's hearing that according to the process they are going through, if the steering committee should be larger and part of the RFP process, and if they want to have an RFP to present in September, they need to get it done now.

Ms. LaBranche stated that her recommendation is to not form the master plan steering committee right now, but put the RFP out for public comment. People can provide comment on the RFP and participate.

Member Losik noted that they don't have an RFP for comment. She thinks they are a ways away from having an RFP for comment. She certainly would like to look at more detail. The compilation of regional master plans and costs goes into what they're looking at and would help to determine what additional pieces might go into an RFP. She thinks the RFP will be done by the September 12th meeting. It was also said that October might be a possibility, but they were trying to give Administrator Reed the best possibility forward, in terms of preparation for the Budget Committee.

Chair Wright pointed out that they've all agreed there should be a steering committee. That leaves who, how and when? When, seems to be bubbling up to the surface as the most important priority. If those people are going to be involved in the RFP process, there is a very short window of time for them to even begin to be involved. That suggests to him that it needs to be done immediately.

Member Losik stated if the Planning Board agrees, it will be a group of people with a good level of skills. They are going to be able to digest the information. They are going to have some fundamental input that is not from the Planning Board side.

Chair Wright asked if she thinks the timing is such that if they acted now, keen well-chosen people for the steering committee would have enough time to get up to speed to fit into the timeline.

Member Losik commented it's a process. If she was being invited to a master plan steering committee and she had not worked on the RFP, she would not go on the committee.

Chair Wright clarified the notion is that the steering committee should be in place before the RFP is developed and finalized.

Member Losik commented before the RFP is finalized.

Member Garcia agreed.

Chair Wright also agreed.

Land Use Assistant Kara Campbell asked if this can be put on the Planning Board agenda for the next meeting.

Chair Wright summarized that the Planning Board has to decide if they establish a steering committee, what the process is for doing that and the timing.

Administrator Reed noted that the agenda for the Planning Board meeting can be amended up to the time of the meeting. She asked if this is going to be the steering committee that is carried through.

Member Losik commented this would be a discussion for the Planning Board. Her recommendation would be that it is the steering committee that would be taken through the whole process.

Chair Wright stated that he believes the Planning Board has to come to the decision whether this subcommittee (LRP) continues to exist or is dissolved in favor of a steering committee.

Member Losik pointed out that the Long Range Planning Committee can exist. The master plan steering committee has a separate function.

Administrator Reed asked if the three members of the Long Range Planning Committee would be members of the steering committee.

Chair Wright replied that this is a decision that would have to be answered by the Planning Board.

Member Losik agreed.

Member Garcia commented that she would volunteer because of the continuity.

Chair Wright agreed.

There was some discussion about the agenda for the July 12th Planning Board Meeting. There was also some discussion about possible members for the steering committee and the process for finding members. Administrator Reed asked the Committee to email her a list of possible parameters for the steering committee for her to type up for the Planning Board's packets; such as, how many members and how often the steering committee will meet.

Administrator Reed noted that it was said there would be a budget number, which will only be an estimate, for the CIP. This estimate will be brought to the Planning Board. Ms. LaBranche put together a number and it's only an estimate. It's not the end number, as it can go up or down. It can be modified. She noted that this is in the Planning Board packets because they have to start talking about numbers for the CIP.

Member Losik stated that she has a concern about the number. She asked if they can use a range for the CIP.

Administrator Reed confirmed that they can use a range, as the Conservation Commission does this all the time. They do this to get the project in for the deadline and then it gets massaged as the CIP is worked out.

There was some discussion about what the number for the CIP should be and whether that number includes the build-out analysis. The Committee agreed that the number to bring to the Planning Board for the CIP should be a range.

Ms. LaBranche suggested that the Committee ask for what they really expect it will cost. If they feel a build-out analysis is really important to the master planning process, which she suspects would be very helpful for the consultant to have that information, she would put it into the master plan budget as a whole. She pointed out that the master plan budget could be approved without the build-out analysis being approved by the voters. That wouldn't be very efficient or productive.

Chair Wright pointed out that the number on the table is \$75,000. He asked the Committee their thoughts.

Administrator Reed noted that FB Environmental said that a build-out analysis could be between \$10,000 to \$15,000 with \$22,000 being on the high side. She also noted that Ms. LaBranche recommended budgeting it into the master plan because one could be approved and not the other.

Chair Wright commented he thinks this it's a planning board decision as to whether it should all be one budget.

The Committee discussed what the cost range should be to present to the Planning Board.

Member Losik stated that in her opinion, they don't have enough information to put a number forward. The board members are going to want to know what a good theme-based plan feels like and what it is costing. Right now, she doesn't feel confident.

Ms. LaBranche noted that Plaistow's theme-based plan was \$60,000 a couple of years ago. Atkinson is just now selecting their consultant. Their RFP was five pages long and it didn't go into a lot of detail. The proposals they received were not really detailed.

Member Losik stated that she thinks LRP should have five or six different data points to collectively come up with a range. She goes back to a compilation of regional master plans and what they cost. A compilation is several data points. They might not need ten. However, she doesn't feel that as a committee member or planning board chair that she can convey a representative number.

Ms. LaBranche commented that she can expand on the list and get it to the Committee. She will also include links to the plans, as there are a wide range of the quality of plans.

I. Approval of Minutes – June 3, 2022

Motion by Patricia Losik to approve the minutes of June 3, 2022. Seconded by Kathryn Garcia. All in favor.

II. Next Steps

Chair Wright summarized:

- For the Planning Board Meeting on July 12th:
 - Concise recommendation price range for CIP and why.
 - LRP believes they are at a point to constitute a steering committee and would like the Planning Board to have that discussion.
 - Committee to send Kim and Kara parameters for the steering committee to be discussed at the Planning Board meeting.
- Next LRP Meeting – August 2nd, 1:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Motion by Rob Wright to adjourn at 3:00 p.m. Seconded by Kathryn Garcia. All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted, Dyana Ledger