



TOWN OF RAYMOND

Planning Board Agenda

May 25, 2023

7 p.m. - Raymond High School
Media Center - 45 Harriman Hill

Public Announcement

*If this meeting is canceled or postponed for any reason the information can be found on our website, posted at Town Hall, Facebook Notification, and RCTV. **

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Public Meeting-

WORK SESSION – NO APPLICATIONS TO BE DISCUSSED.

Discussion by Planning Board members of various topics pertaining to rules/regulations ETC.

3. Public Comment

4. Approval of Minutes

- 05/04/2023 (provided 05/18/2023 packets)
- 05/11/2023

5. Other Business

- ◆ Staff Updates-
- ◆ Board Member Updates
- ◆ Any other business brought before the board-

* Note: If you require personal assistance for audio, visual or other special aid, please contact the Selectmen's Office at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. If this meeting is postponed for any reason, it will be held at a time TBD.



TOWN OF RAYMOND

Planning Board Agenda

May 25, 2023

7 p.m. - Raymond High School
Media Center - 45 Harriman Hill

6. Adjournment (NO LATER THAN 10:00 P.M.)

Planning Board 2023 Submittal and Meeting Dates

Submittal Deadline for Completed Application & Materials	Planning Board Meeting Dates (1st & 3rd Thursdays of the Month)
ADDED MEETING	May 25, 2023 Work Session/no applications
May 04, 2023	June 01, 2023 2022-009 Jewett Warehouse
ADDED MEETING	June 8, 2023 2022-013 Severino Excavation
May 18, 2023	June 15, 2023 2022-015 White Rock LLA & 2022-008 Onyx Warehouse
June 01, 2023	July 06, 2023
June 15, 2023	July 20, 2023
July 06, 2023	August 03, 2023
July 20, 2023	August 17, 2023
August 03, 2023	September 07, 2023
August 17, 2023	September 21, 2023
September 07, 2023	October 05, 2023
September 21, 2023	October 19, 2023
October 05, 2023	November 02, 2023
October 19, 2023	November 16, 2023
November 02, 2023	December 07, 2023
November 16, 2023	December 21, 2023

* Note: If you require personal assistance for audio, visual or other special aid, please contact the Selectmen's Office at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. If this meeting is postponed for any reason, it will be held at a time TBD.

1 Planning Board Minutes
2 May 11, 2023 @ 7:00 PM
3 Media Center Raymond High School
4 45 Harriman Hill Road, Raymond, NH 03077
5

6 Planning Board Members Present:

7 Patricia Bridgeo
8 Jim McLeod
9 Gretchen Gott
10 Dee Luszcz
11 Dan Roy (Alternate)
12 Bob McDonald
13 Dave Rice
14

15 Planning Board Members Absent:

16
17 Staff Present:
18 Madeleine Dilonno - Circuit Rider Planner, RPC
19
20

21 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Recited by all in attendance.
22

23 **Meeting called to order:**

24 The meeting started at approximately 7:00 pm.
25

26 **Roll Call:**

27 Gretchen Gott, Maddie Dilonno, Rockingham Planning Commission, Daniel Roy
28 Alternate, Jim McLeod, Dee Luszcz, Dave Rice, Bob McDonald, Tricia Bridgeo.
29

30 Mrs. Luszcz announced that the Select Board has not chosen their ex officio member.
31

32 **Public Hearing –**

33 Application # 2022-008 - Onyx Warehouse/Industrial Drive: A SITE PLAN application is
34 being submitted by Wayne Morrill of Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. on behalf of ONYX
35 Partners LTD. They are proposing to construct a 550,025 S.F. industrial distribution
36 warehouse with associated loading docks, truck parking, and employee vehicle parking.
37 Property is located on Industrial Drive and Raymond Tax Map 22 / Lots 44,45,46, & 47
38 and Raymond Tax Map 28-3/Lot 120-1. This public hearing is to discuss the findings of
39 an environmental study provided by Steven Lamb of GZA with the applicants and the
40 Planning Board.
41

42 Anton Melchionda, Eric Poulin from Jones and Beach, Todd Greenwood from Enviro
43 North American Consulting and John Kondziolka from Gradient Corp introduced
44 themselves.

45 Mr. McLeod said that there has been new information that has come out since they set
46 this meeting up.

47 Anton Melchionda stated that what is important to ONYX is what is important to the
48 Board. Conversations have come up about environmental conditions on the site and
49 what that means to the impact of how they are going to create a drainage structure.
50 There were certain preexisting conditions that they were all discussing. They would like
51 to hear from GZA to understand what was there and what was found.

52 Steve Lamb, Principal at GZA and Jim Wieck consultant with GZA, introduced
53 themselves. Mr. Lamb explained that they have some history at the site having done
54 some Brownfields investigations 20 years ago. It is a Brownfield site under the State's
55 review, where the proposed development is somewhat on the periphery of a lot of the
56 historic activities of leather tanning, and such were performed. There is very limited data
57 on the portion of the property that ONYX is developing on. They reviewed it in
58 consideration of how the redevelopment could impact the surface water and
59 groundwater regimen, and how it could impact known or unknown conditions of a
60 Brownfields site. In looking at the historic data and the proposed development; a
61 significant aspect was the amount of stormwater it would create. ONYX has modified
62 the drainage plan in a positive way. GZA recommended the installation of ground water
63 monitoring wells, the calculation of hydraulic conductivity, so that ONYX could
64 demonstrate as part of the application the quantitative aspects of the water balance.
65 Because it is a Brownfield site and because there is a potential for contamination
66 conditions on the property GZA though it would be prudent to collect groundwater
67 samples in areas where they are discharging stormwater flows. They are concerned
68 with the mobilization of sediment or the contaminated soil that may be impacted by the
69 historic wastewater operation.

70 Mr. McLeod said that the report will be available to read the recommendations that are
71 in the letter. On page 4 of the GZA Technical Review letter it says *The Town has public*
72 *water supply wells to the west of the Onyx property that could be sensitive to*
73 *mobilization of potential contamination.* That is why the Board has always been
74 concerned about this.

75 Mr. McDonald stated on page 5 of the GZA Technical Review letter could they define
76 **stormwater infiltration galleries.**

77 Mr. Lamb explained that there are a number of terms that are used for general
78 infiltration into the ground and that is a term that they are using for all of those features.

79 Mr. Lamb continued to say they have received revised stormwater drainage plans and it
80 concentrated on the western part of the property away from the historic lagoon. GZA

81 thought this was positive. They still have concerns about the capacity of these systems
82 and how they perform in different storm events. They still stand by the
83 recommendations that they made in their letter. They did find that the redesign was an
84 improvement that would lessen the potential for mobilization. The challenge for GZA is
85 the lack of data in the area of the proposed development.

86 Mrs. Luszczyk to summarize said that the letter that GZA submitted still stands. (See
87 attached)

88 Eric Poulin said a lot of the data GZA is looking for he can provide, and he is happy to
89 provide some additional information on the systems.

90 Mr. Greenwood said that testing was done on March 16, 2023.

91 Mrs. Luszczyk asked the applicant with their own study did they find contamination and
92 Mr. Rice asked what chemicals are in the ground as well.

93 Mr. Greenwood said he does not think that they can answer that at this point because
94 they have given the study to DES for their review. They did find impacts, but they are
95 not ready to say there is contamination until they hear from DES. It was submitted to
96 DES on April 14, 2023.

97 Mr. Melchionda asked the Board wants as opposed to what DES mandates them to do?

98 Mrs. Luszczyk commented that she knows that is at the State level and the Town has
99 regulations and as a Planning Board obligations to when contamination is found we
100 shall not move forward. So, the Board does have to have all of the questions answered
101 before they can move in the direction they want us to go in.

102 Ms. Bridgeo asked Mr. Melchionda if they have ever built a development on a Town's
103 wellhead, The Town's aquifer, and a Federally protected river?

104 Mr. Melchionda said the answer is yes to every one of them independently.

105 Doug Richardson introduced himself of ONYX Partners. He said it is a run-on sentence
106 and to break it down into 3 parts. The site here is not on a well or well radius protection.
107 They do have a well protection district that just touches the southern part of the parcel.
108 104 acres. It is nowhere near the tannery. It is nowhere near the development of the
109 warehouse building. Mr. Richardson further stated in Concord New Hampshire the
110 largest tannery in New Hampshire was cleaned up, it had chromium, and dirty soils
111 adjacent to the river, it now has a medical office building and 48 apartment units right on
112 the contamination.

113 Mr. Melchionda asked what is important to the Board so that they understand what is
114 here, what they do about it and for everyone in the town to understand whether it is him
115 as a developer or someone else building a building anywhere in the town, He wants

116 good information, to understand what is in the soil, and to understand what is going to
117 be done to make sure what was there before is improved if that is possible at a
118 minimum is not made worse by the development. We are looking for guidance so that
119 we can accomplish that.

120 Ms. Gott said that ONYX referred to impacts rather than contamination until they hear
121 from DES. What impacts have been found?

122 Mr. Kondziolka said that arsenic and chromium were both detected and can be found on
123 the April 14, 2023, letter. They speciated the sample so there was chromium 6 and
124 chromium 3 for DES to review. PFAS were not detected in surface waters and sediment
125 samples collected from wetland A. PFAS were detected at low levels in lagoon #3.
126 There doesn't seem to be a significant source of PFAS in the area tested. The results
127 were found on pages 6 and 7 of the report.

128 GZA responded to the April 14th study. Mr. Lamb stated that the information seems
129 consistent with some of the historic data that has been collected at the site. The sample
130 location was not in an area that was typically in concern for them. It really wasn't too
131 relevant as to how they were looking at the data and the site impacts. It did appear to be
132 generally consistent with historic data from the area.

133 Ms. Bridgeo asked if some of the blasting might be the cause for some the levels of
134 arsenic in the reports.

135 Mr. Lamb said they didn't look at the blasting, so they don't know, but it can be
136 increased by site activities or manufacturing activities.

137 Mr. Rice asked how much chromium was actually found in the ground.

138 Mr. Kondziolka said that chromium 6 was non detect in the table. On page 11 table 2.
139 Chromium 3 was detected in surface water up to 16 micrograms per liter and in
140 sediment samples up to 61 hundred milligrams per kilogram.

141 Mr. McLeod commented that if you look historically it was just read off of page 6 from
142 the conclusions there is actually a quote from GZA's 2005 SSI notes on arsenic
143 background concentration of 21 mg/kg in sediment and states that "*elevated*
144 *background arsenic concentrations of the magnitude occur in New Hampshire due to*
145 *the occurrence of arsenic in the bedrock.*" Mr. McLeod said that quote continues on to
146 say that the exceedances beyond that are moderately higher than that indicted
147 significant risk to human health and that those metals are likely attributable to the site.
148 The tests that were done in 2003 in lagoon #1 and lagoon #2 never exceeded 6,000
149 mg/kg in chromium 3. So, the level of chromium 3 that is in lagoon #3 now appears to
150 have a higher concentration of contaminant of chromium 3 than lagoon #1 and lagoon
151 #2 did 20 years ago when they were originally tested. For the record 61hundred
152 milligrams per kilogram is 6 times the remediation standard. The Board will have to wait
153 for NHDES to get back to the applicant and then come back before the Board.

154 Mr. McDonald said he would like to see a map contain lagoon #3 and all the testing and
155 the 1 well monitoring well location. He would like to see a map of the entire area and a
156 map for each individual area where it is located.

157 Ms. Gott asked if ONYX looked at the beaver dam below lagoon #3 to see if it was
158 overtopped and how regularly do they do observations of that area.

159 Eric Poulin responded by saying that they do regular SWIP inspections on site. His
160 inspector has not mentioned anything abnormal from a water standpoint, but he could
161 follow up with him.

162 Mrs. Luszczyk asked what would happen if it goes over since it comes from lagoon #3?

163 Eric Poulin said that the inspector's primary function is from an erosion standpoint. If the
164 Town wanted the beaver dam to be removed they could.

165 Mrs. Luszczyk asked what is your experience with PFAS and whether the numbers
166 shouldn't be going up at this late stage should they?

167 Mr. Lamb responded saying there is very limited data, but it does appear that the
168 historical activities of the site contribute to PFAS.

169 Mr. Rice asked with the levels of Chromium 3 in the future how harmful will those be to
170 the people's drinking water in town and downstream?

171 Mr. Lamb said he did not think it would cause a drinking water problem.

172 **Public Comment:**

173 Warren Gibby asked if since they are redirecting more water through the culverts are
174 those culverts going to be able to handle new amounts of water?

175 Eric Poulin explained that in the post condition stormwater flows to the north are
176 reduced and the volume is going down. The reason for the drop is the ponds. They are
177 able to hold onto that water because there is an increase because of the additional
178 impervious and roof but they are able to hold onto it and release it in a controlled
179 fashion.

180 Warren Gibby commented that if you have a dirty sponge and the water hits the top of it
181 the top stuff runs off of it; is that going to kick off all of the stuff out of the sponge and let
182 it go down the streams?

183 Eric Poulin explained that there are a number of things that occur before water gets into
184 the pond itself. They call them pretreatment systems and those are designed to get the
185 sediment out of the stormwater before they are putting the water back into the ground.

186 Warren Gibby asked if the State checks to see if the maintenance is being done or is it
187 left up to the Town?

188 Eric Poulin said there is a certain level of State review and there are periodic
189 inspections especially during construction. Some of the biggest threats to these systems
190 are at the very beginning. A lot of times the Towns will do their own inspections.

191 Kathy McDonald commented that the reason the townspeople are concerned about this
192 particular project is we have already had some dealings with other developments being
193 built near Brownfield sites where the water flow going through bedrock actually changed
194 direction a new development had to be serviced by a new water system. They had to
195 run the new waterline up Blueberry Hill. That is why we are very concerned about water
196 flow, contamination, and new developments. To run the new water line was a cost of
197 over 4 million dollars.

198 **Public Hearing:**

199 Mrs. Luszcz commented that it is clear that GZA is standing behind their study and
200 indicated that they definitely want more monitoring wells.

201 Mr. McLeod read the recommendations that GZA made from page 5 of the Technical
202 Review Summary Letter dated April 6, 2023.

203 *Due to the limited environmental data for the portion of the proposed property to be*
204 *developed, and the presence and potential presence of contamination in off-site*
205 *locations associated with the former tannery operation, as well as uncertainty with*
206 *regard to the alteration of surface water and groundwater dynamics associated with the*
207 *proposed development, GZA recommends additional hydrogeologic investigations and*
208 *analysis be conducted to evaluate anticipated changes to groundwater and surface*
209 *water flow and potential impacts to contaminated media with the implementation of new*
210 *stormwater infiltration systems at the Onyx property. Based on GZA's review of*
211 *historical information, and the current stormwater management design plans, we*
212 *recommend the following:*

- 213 1. Advance at least one soil boring within the footprint of each proposed stormwater
214 infiltration gallery and infiltration pond.
- 215 a. Field screen soil samples from the boring(s) using a photoionization detector.
- 216 b. Collect soil sample(s) for analysis of volatile organic chemicals (VOCs) and
217 Resource and Recovery Act (RCRA) metals.
- 218 c. Collect soil sample(s) for grain size distribution and hydraulic conductivity
219 estimation.

220 Mr. Greenwood commented on the first recommendation saying that the existing
221 conditions are an aggregate quarry and is not sure they are going to find enough soil to
222 field screen where there suggest spots are.

223 Eric Poulin said that the soil they are going to be using is on site, but it is the soil that is
224 to the east.

225 Mr. Melchionda asked the Board how do they fulfill the request of the Board based on
226 the fact the whole area is solid bedrock.

227 Mr. McLeod stated that if they are in agreement with the recommendations that they
228 have the actual plan will have to come later. We thought that you thought that these
229 recommendations were required at all. If they don't have an issue with them being
230 required then they don't really need to go through the list.

231 Mrs. Luszc said that they know the site and know where there is still soil not bedrock
232 you have some great experts that can take from the recommendation and test the soils
233 especially in those concentrated sites. Without GZA having to expand on that any
234 further.

235 Mr. Wieck explained that the focus of their work is really trying to understand the effects
236 of the infiltration of stormwater on ground water flow and transport and to that end we're
237 also concerned about the effects of the infiltration on the direction of movement of
238 groundwater. And so our recommendations at assumed that there would be saturated
239 soils there, which there may or may not be. So, we don't, we wouldn't be focusing
240 necessarily on trying to evaluate the quality of the soil throughout the site. And in any
241 remnant pockets necessarily. There could be ones that were appropriate to based on
242 the discussion we've had earlier about this flow of surface water, but more concerned
243 about understanding the quality of the groundwater in this movement. And so with these
244 changes that we understand, are different conditions now that we understand, you
245 know, we would want to revisit our recommendation relative to modern walls, not
246 necessarily that, that we would change our recommendation to have them we think they
247 are important, but the locations of the wells might be different, I think for us to be able to
248 offer any helpful recommendations regarding that we would want us to look at the
249 calculations that were brought up earlier this evening as being available. And look at the
250 site conditions as well, if it was the board's desire that GZA provide any further
251 comment on those, but I did just want to make sure that everyone here understood that
252 our approach was not to the goal was not to characterize all the soils of the site, such
253 that you will now seek out remnant soil pockets and test them.

254 Mr. McLeod said this really goes to number 2. Which is:

255 2. Complete the soil boring(s) as a groundwater monitoring well extending 10 ft.
256 below the water table.

257 a. Collect groundwater sample(s) from each monitoring well for analysis of
258 VOCs, RCRA metals, and PFAS.

259 b. Perform hydraulic conductivity testing at each newly installed monitoring
260 well.

261 Even if there is no soil there they are looking for a monitoring well.

262 Mr. Greenwood said they will probably bedrock wells because he doesn't think there will
263 be enough saturation and soil for an overburden well.

264 3. Perform hydrogeologic analysis.

265 a. Develop a groundwater contour plan.

266 b. Estimate hydraulic conductivity of subsurface soils.

267 c. Develop soil boring logs.

268 d. Develop a site conceptual model of subsurface conditions.

269 4. Perform numerical groundwater modeling, which should include simulations of:

270 a. Predevelopment baseline conditions.

271 b. Modelled stormwater infiltration conditions with proposed infiltration
272 galleries.

273 c. Numerical groundwater mounding assessment.

274 i. Water table mounding.

275 ii. pre-and post-construction simulated groundwater contours.

276 Mr. Lamb said that that recommendation kind of put some context with what were the
277 challenges here because the site post conditions are going to be a lot different than they
278 are now. And so, you have to come up with a way to simulate what the conditions are
279 out there that do not exist now and then add the addition of the stormwater system. So,
280 if you're going to add 10 feet of soil over this entire site to accommodate the infiltration
281 of water, then you need to do that estimate hydraulic conductivity and simulate your
282 groundwater flow condition in the conditions that result from stormwater infiltration. And
283 like we didn't anticipate that scenario, when we were preparing this memo.

284 5. Provide technical and engineering details to support the design of the
285 stormwater infiltration galleries. The analyses will provide engineering estimates
286 of the water balance for stormwater for each system detailing the amount of

287 infiltration versus surface water leaving the ONYX property. The analyses should
288 estimate the groundwater mounding beneath each stormwater system.

289 6. Provide key elements of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan that will
290 guide earthwork activities across the ONYX property in anticipation of
291 encountering contaminated media if the investigation information indicates
292 contamination conditions.

293 Mr. Rice asked if this site was always Down to bedrock?

294 Mr. Greenwood responded saying that ONYX bought the property with an existing
295 quarry.

296 Mr. Rice asked if the soil was tested before it was trucked off the property?

297 Mr. Melchionda said they would find out from Hartman.

298 Mr. McLeod asked if there is any other testing that the Board hasn't been made aware
299 of if they could have that information when it is available to them.

300 7. Provide a plan that describes how the existing monitoring well network will be
301 protected during site development.

302 Poll: Would the board like to go on a site walk when GZA is present?

- 303 • Ms. Bridgeo: I don't have an answer.
- 304 • Mr. McDonald: I think the plan that GZA needs to look at the data and develop
305 the next step and at that point I would love to go on a site walk.
- 306 • Mr. Rice: I am in agreement with that as well.
- 307 • Mrs. Luszcz: I am in agreement.
- 308 • Mr. McLeod: I am in agreement, but I am concerned about the applicant has
309 indicated that they would like them to go on site. They have indicted that they
310 would like to go on site but how is that negotiated fee wise.
- 311 • Mr. Roy: I am in agreement with what I have heard.
- 312 • Ms. Gott: A site walk please.

313 Mr. McLeod asked Mr. Lamb when they were negotiating with the town for to do this
314 work for the Board. Was there any clause for you to be able to continue if there was
315 more or does this need to be renegotiated?

316 Mr. Lamb said we've pretty much exhausted our budget for what the work we put in so
317 far. And so, we would propose another level of effort and have you consider that.

318 Mrs. Luszcz said obviously they would need to send a proposal to the Town to review
319 the new data and a site walk from there.

320 **Approval Of Minutes:**

321 **Motion:**

322 **Mr. McLeod made a motion to table the minutes from April 20, 2023, to May**
323 **18, 2023. Mr. Rice seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken.**

- 324 • **Ms. Gott – Yes**
325 • **Mr. McLeod – Yes**
326 • **Mrs. Luszcz – Yes**
327 • **Mr. Rice – Yes**
328 • **Mr. McDonald – Yes**
329 • **Ms. Bridgeo – Yes**

330 **The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0**
331 **abstentions.**

332 **Other Business:**

333 **Staff Updates:**

334 Maddie Dilonno reminded the Board that it needs to schedule legal training.

335 Mrs. Luszcz recommended May 25, 2023, at 6pm, for legal training for 1 hour.

336

337 Ms. Gott said she would prefer no limit on the time with legal.

338

339 **Board Member Updates:**

340

341 Ms. Gott said at the last meeting she had said that there was an abutter that was
342 missing. The mail receipt that was in her packet is incorrect. The missing abutter is
343 ONWAY LAKE ASSOCIATION not ONWAY LAKE CONDOMINUMS.

344

345 Ms. Gott also commented that she had not received notice that there was supposed to
346 be a non-meeting at 6:15pm tonight. That was cancelled.

347

348 Mr. Roy said he was not noticed either.

349

350 Mrs. Luszcz told Mr. Roy he would not have been noticed because he is an alternate.

351

352 Mrs. Luszcz said that the June 8, 2023, meeting will have Severino which is their final
353 hearing, and the ONYX Excavation is on for May 18, 2023, so they will actually be
354 beating the June deadline for this year. They are still waiting to hear from staff whether
355 it is a 2-year or 5-year permit. These are the only two applications and they will both be
356 heard on time. Mega X is ancillary to the construction of the project, so it is not
357 considered an excavation site.

358 Mr. McLeod said he is not sure where they left the Water Planning Committee as far as
359 appointments. They have two openings on the committee that need to be filled.

360
361 Ms. Gott stated that there has been a problem in the past for not having meetings at
362 times that people are normally available. Sunday morning is not a normal time to have
363 committee meetings.

364
365 Mr. McLeod said it was properly noticed and he had reached out to NH Municipal
366 Association to ask if it was appropriate to hold a meeting outside of town property and
367 there is no issue with it provided that it has full access to the public.

368
369 The request for the Water Committee Members was tabled.

370
371 Mrs. Luszcz said You will notice on the next agenda. We've briefly talked at the
372 beginning of the meeting how I'm trying to also for the public's reference, instead of just
373 putting, let's say Onyx warehouse on the agenda, we're indicating the application
374 number that goes with that. And it's also on the front. So, you have the application
375 number and name in the public hearing portion. And on your calendar. Also, what I've
376 done is, I've know I've been losing track of some of these applications being continued
377 time and time again, your next agenda will show an application and how many times
378 and what dates it's been continued. Because I think it's really important for the public
379 also to see, we only read the abutters on the first hearing. So that second hearing looks
380 like a first hearing and we're not reading abutters people think we're not reading
381 abutters. So, I think it's just a good notation.

382
383 Ms. Gott made a request to indicate how long you are planning on spending on each
384 thing as an organizational tool.

385
386 Mr. McDonald said he attended the first Cemetery Committee last Wednesday. He said
387 there needs to be n alternate appointed in case he can't attend. It meets one a month.

388
389 Ms. Bridgeo said she went to RPC last night and the discussion was on land Trust's
390 from Manchester ADU's, and Harmony Homes discussed what they did for their homes
391 in Dover and Durham. I can put together maybe a quick synopsis, I need to bring it over
392 to the Select Board as well, they should hear about that, but it's more than 30 seconds.
393 And it was a lot of information about different ways they're trying to do. Well, it's not
394 called Workforce Housing, they call it Affordable Housing. The second thing that I
395 would like to bring up is we need to really put on our schedule to have when we're going
396 to be going over rules and procedures, get that site plan update, I would like a hard
397 copy of it. I would like to also get on the schedule, even if it's tentatively the master plan,
398 CIP, impact fees, and the other one that we need to really put on there. And we need to
399 discuss now is growth management and relationship to water.

400
401 Mr. McLeod said that next Tuesday, May 16, 2023, is the training for PFAS groundwater
402 source protection. Mr. McLeod said he would send the information via email.

403

404 **Adjournment:**

405

406 **Motion:**

407 **Mr. McLeod made a motion to adjourn the meeting.**

408 **Ms. Bridgeo seconded the motion.**

409 **A vote was made.**

410

• **Ms. Gott – Yes**

411

• **Mr. McLeod – Yes**

412

• **Mrs. Luszcz – Yes**

413

• **Mr. Rice – Yes**

414

• **Mr. McDonald – Yes**

415

• **Ms. Bridgeo – Yes**

416 **The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0**
417 **abstentions.**

418 Mrs. Luszcz adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00pm.

419

420 The video of this meeting is to be preserved as part of the permanent and official
421 record.

422

423 Respectfully submitted,

424

425 Jill A. Vadeboncoeur

426

427 **Attachments:**

428 None.

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441