

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Tuesday, August 2, 2022
1:00 p.m. – Rye Town Hall**

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

I. Call to Order

Chair Wright called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and led the pledge of allegiance.

II. Review draft of RFP

Chair Wright noted that he spoke with Julie LaBranche last week. They agreed on what she was going to write up, which has been provided to the Committee. He would like to review the draft RFP. He would also like to make sure that everyone is clear on the Committee's process with providing input to the whole planning board. He continued there have been some nominations by planning board members for people to be on the steering committee. There have also been some self-identified people who have shown interest.

Planning Administrator Reed commented that she also spoke with Julie LaBranche. Ms. LaBranche said that she felt after the last LRP meeting that her job was on hold. She felt that this Committee directed her to stop all work until the steering committee was formed. She apologized for the lateness of the draft, but she really felt her job was on hold. Planning Administrator Reed continued that Ms. LaBranche didn't think the Committee should stop the RFP. She also didn't think the steering committee should be writing the RFP. She would like feedback from the Committee on the project overview section of the RFP. Ms. LaBranche also feels like the contract and the work that she was originally hired for has shifted. She would like to be finished with this Committee in September/October. Ms. LaBranche will be submitting a list of business references for her work to the Committee.

Chair Wright commented that he does not feel like the contract has shifted. He asked if Ms. LaBranche has given any specifics about what she felt has changed.

Administrator Reed replied that she has not. Ms. LaBranche just does not want this to drag out until December or January.

Member Losik commented that she feels like the RFP can still move forward. Referring to Ms. LaBranche's contract, Member Losik noted that task 1 is complete. In regards to task 2, the information was received on the day of the planning board meeting on July 12th.

Member Garcia asked the duration of the original contract.

Chair Wright replied October 31st.

Member Losik pointed out it may be longer because the contract states “*to prepare and attend a budget committee meeting and select board meeting to review RFP and budget.*” The Committee wanted that step in the contract to help facilitate the process, which is a key process. The Committee felt this was important for driving this process to a successful outcome. Referring to the contract, Member Losik noted that part of today’s conversation is going to be about task 3.

Chair Wright commented that his phone call last week prompted Ms. LaBranche to include task 3 (a-e) into what she provided this morning to the Committee. That’s pending and the Committee will have to judge whether or not that task is complete. The draft RFP is what’s in front of the Committee.

Member Losik pointed out that tasks 1 through 4 were planned to be completed by September 1st. Post September 1st is task 5.

Chair Wright stated that in his mind, she’s given work that answers task 3, which needs to be reviewed. Task 4 would be the current draft subject to at least one more iteration. He would say that the Committee still needs Ms. LaBranche to do task 5.

Member Losik commented or the timeframe needs to be amended.

Chair Wright noted that Julie LaBranche just sent him a text. She said that the references were for consultants to respond to the RFP, not for herself.

The Committee reviewed the draft RFP.

Member Losik stated that she went back to the last LRP meeting and referenced what the Committee had generally concluded as items that would be brought into the RFP. Number 1, Community Outreach, correlates to “*the consultant will review the community and municipal survey data and evaluate whether there’s enough data.*” Referring to number 2, she noted that the members are appointed to the Long Range Planning Committee for a year. LRP stays in place and there is discussion about a Master Plan Steering Committee. She thinks the MPSC should also be in #2, as well as the LRP.

There was a brief discussion on what to call the subcommittee for the Master Plan project. It was agreed to call the subcommittee the Master Plan Steering Committee. The Planning Board, Long Range Planning Committee and Master Plan Steering Committee will be collectively known as the Master Plan Project Team.

Referring to the Town of Wolfeboro, Member Losik noted that they really did a lot of their work in master plan subcommittees. There might be an area that requires a subcommittee of the Master Plan Steering Committee; for example, land use.

Administrator Reed commented this might come out after the consultant is hired. She doesn't think it should be part of the RFP.

Member Losik noted that it should be in the construct of the language.

Chair Wright agreed. Any consultant that is hired needs to know the scope. The scope might be working with different subcommittees.

Member Garcia noted that #3 refers to working groups.

It was agreed that #2 should read: **Planning Board, Long Range Planning Committee, and Master Plan Steering Committee/working groups, collectively known as the Master Plan Project Team.**

Referring to #4, Member Losik pointed out there's reference about the sources of information. Last month, Ms. LaBranche stated that she could put together, with the help of Administrator Reed, a list of documents to be referenced by the consultants.

Chair Wright asked if the references should be spelled out in the RFP.

Member Losik replied that she doesn't know where it needs to go. The LRP Committee and the Master Plan Steering Committee should understand what documents they're asking for. She thinks putting it in the RFP would help. Not to limit it, but it will definitely help when going through the budget process.

It was agreed that #4 should list the principal elements for information; such as, Natural Resource Inventory, and build-out analysis. It was also agreed this could be an attachment.

Referring to #5, Final Draft Plan, Member Losik noted that last month, Ms. LaBranche stated that the way to frame the RFP is to say that 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. There is already the executive summary mentioned in the RFP. The vision chapter should be included. The implementation plan is already noted. Member Losik pointed out that in 'Goals and Vision' it's stated that the vision statement needs work. In the Final Draft Plan there should be a vision statement.

It was agreed to add 'Vision Chapter' under Final Draft Plan.

Referring to the minutes of the last LRP meeting, Member Losik noted that one of the things Ms. LaBranche said was "*maybe the process moving forward with creating an RFP is to delve into the survey data a bit*". Ms. LaBranche said that she could pull out some of the major points of the survey. Member Losik pointed out that they kind of saw some of that in the Town of Bolton's work. They had taken similar sets and used quite a bit of that information. She goes back to some of the things that were discussed that are on the website from the work that was done in the whole first year. She doesn't know that it's not appropriate to pull out some of the major points of the survey and include them in the RFP to help the consultant frame the starting

point. Member Losik pointed out there are things in the SWOT that happen in almost every category. There are definite pieces that are clearly items that will be a big part of the Master Plan.

Chair Wright asked if this would belong under 'Project Overview'.

Member Losik replied it could. It's really up to Ms. LaBranche and her recommendation.

It was agreed that at the beginning of the RFP it should call out where the Town thinks the issues are and where they've been from the data set. The RFP instructs them to use the data and figure out how much further they need to go.

Chair Wright noted that he was confused by the language "*to prepare a final master plan for adoption and public hearing.*"

Administrator Reed explained that the Master Plan does not go on the warrant. The Planning Board approves the Master Plan, which is done in a public hearing.

Chair Wright noted that he feels 'Comparable Projects' (C) and 'References' (I) should be under 'Qualifications' (C).

The Commission agreed.

Member Garcia stated that when she went through the Bolton plan, she highlighted items that should be in this document. She asked if she could send this to Administrator Reed for Ms. LaBranche's review.

Administrator Reed confirmed.

Member Garcia commented that the Bolton RFP was really too much. However, if they get half of what is in their RFP, they are really going to have a great master plan.

Member Losik agreed. From a qualitative aspect, it covered everything and it put them in a position to drive the best outcome.

Member Garcia stated that in order to make sure it's comprehensive, they have to be sure that the consultants utilize all the studies that were done before. She pointed out they may even need to do new studies. Otherwise, the studies that have been done are a waste. The Town has done those and paid for them.

Speaking to Member Garcia, Chair Wright asked if she is saying that she wants to ensure that they didn't overlook prior work that has been done by the Town. To him, that is called out in D.1, Community Outreach. He commented they may want to say something about it not being limited to 2021. He pointed out there are other things that have happened; such as, the NRI.

Member Losik suggested “*and the other documents to be referenced*” which are listed in the ‘Project Overview’ section.

Referring to the minutes of the last meeting, Member Losik read: “*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 emergent issues, and bringing in information from the older chapters that’s still relevant.*” Referring to E of the draft RFP, Member Losik read: “*The consultant shall propose a ‘theme-based’ Master Plan approach including updates to the existing Master Plan Chapters that will be included as Appendices to the new Plan.*” Member Losik stated that she doesn’t want there to be any confusion on the consultant’s part or anybody else they are talking to along the way of getting this approved. She wants to be clear about what they want. Her view is that they are not going to have updates to master plan chapters, but they may bring them in. All those chapters, at some point along the way, should be appendices, as Ms. LaBranche has said. Any relevant language should come into the theme-based plan.

Member Wright agreed. The chapters essentially become excerpted and pointed at as reference material. He noted that Ms. LaBranche texted him and said that the list of technical references will include state, federal, regional, local and town studies, including the 2021 outreach results.

Note: *Julie LaBranche joined the meeting by phone.*

Ms. LaBranche asked if the Committee would like to list the themes that came out of 2021 in the ‘Overview’ section.

The Committee confirmed.

Chair Wright pointed out the dominant themes that came out as being repetitive in the Power Point presentation from February.

Ms. LaBranche commented that community, land use and development were the big themes to focus on.

Chair Wright pointed out they want to express the notion that they are not limiting it to those themes. These are things that were discovered to be top of mind with the community right now.

Referring to Section D.5, Ms. LaBranche noted that she added Vision Chapter. She wonders if they should add some of the topics that floated to the top under ‘Project Overview’ and say that it’s not limited to these.

It was also agreed to add “draft vision statement.”

Ms. LaBranche stated that she will go over the ‘Project Overview’ section to add some things. It will give an overview of the work over the past year. It will present the themes, some of the major topics that came out and the vision statement. It will say where they have been and how they want to move forward. She noted that the ‘Project Overview’ should really set the stage.

Chair Wright commented that what came out of today's discussion is that they want to offer concrete examples. Speaking to Administrator Reed, he asked if it is likely that they can get an engagement for the build-out analysis sooner rather than later. He asked if they would have that data so it can be included.

Administrator Reed stated that if they hire FB to hit the ground running and start April 1st, it shouldn't take two years. It should only take four to six months. By December 2023, the Town should have the build-out analysis and a consultant who will roll this into the Master Plan. From April to December, the consultant for the Master Plan will be looking at the past data, the current master plan, working with the Steering Committee and having outreach, and formulating how to write it. If they can do that and FB can focus on just the build-out analysis, she thinks it will be better served separately.

Ms. LaBranche agreed. She pointed out that the build-out analysis requires a distinct skill set. Some firms do them and some don't. If the Town has someone in mind that can start as soon as the funding is approved, that would be great. She pointed out that the Housing Needs Assessment should be done by the end of this year, which would be another huge piece of information that the Town can use.

Speaking to Ms. LaBranche, Chair Wright pointed out that the Committee requested, and the contract called for, preparing and attending meetings with the Budget Committee and the Board of Selectmen. He asked if she is still prepared to do that.

Ms. LaBranche noted that the contract is from June 1st to December 31st. She clarified that she is hoping to wrap up the RFP portion by September/October. She will then prepare for the budget meetings for whenever they happen.

III. Determine process for Steering Committee member selection

Administrator Reed explained that the process for the member selection for the Steering Committee involves recommending names of people to the Planning Board. The Board will say "yes" or "no". They will direct her to write a request inviting these people to join the Steering Committee. She noted that Chair Wright put together a spreadsheet of names that has been submitted to LRP. On August 9th, this list will be given to the full Planning Board for consideration.

Chair Wright commented that if one of the LRP members proposes someone, they ought to be prepared to tell the Planning Board why.

Administrator Reed continued that after the August 9th meeting, she will take the list and write letters asking them to let her know if they would like to join the subcommittee. At the September 6th meeting, the Long Range Planning Committee will have a final list to review.

There was discussion about making sure there is diversity in the members of the MPSC.

Motion by Patricia Losik to adjourn at 2:18 p.m. Seconded by Kathryn Garcia. All in favor.