| Adobe Document | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Document Name | AprReport112002 | Subject | April 11th 2002 Strategic Planning Board Report | Date | Thu 04/11/2002 |
| Directory | Strategic Planning Board | Type | Reports | Category | Strategic Planning Board |

**Strategic planning board report 4-11-02**

# REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD ON APRIL 11, 2002

## I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Strategic Planning Board Meeting was called to order by Chair Lesly Smith at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, April 11, 2002, in the Town Council Chambers. On roll call the following Board Members were found to be present: Chair Lesly Smith, Board Members William Cooley, Alec Flamm, and William Watchman, Jr. Vice-Chair Bruce McAllister arrived at 11:00 a.m. Also present for all or a portion of the meeting were: Town Manager Peter Elwell, Finance Director Jane Skittone, Assistant Finance Director Cheryl Somers, Public Works Director Al Dusey, and Deputy Town Clerk Susan Eichhorn.

## II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance

## III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was approved through motion of Board Member Cooley, seconded by Board Member Flamm. On roll call the motion carried unanimously.

## IV. APPROVAL OF REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD ON MARCH 14, 2002

The Report of the Strategic Planning Board Meeting held on March 14, 2002, was distributed for review and for approval at the next meeting of the Strategic Planning Board.

V. REVIEW OF TOWN INFRASTRUCTURE AND BASIC SERVICES

## REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD ON APRIL 11, 2002

John Fernsler, Wallace, Roberts & Todd, LLC, addressed the Board, remarking that the Environmental Scan would involve the review of voluminous data and information. The primary purpose of the Scan was to narrow the field of issues that the Strategic Planning Board would deliberate. He suggested four categories of issues:

- Issues that were not being addressed at present
- Issues that were currently being addressed, but not to a sufficient degree
- Issues that were currently being addressed in an appropriate fashion, and that would require some additional monitoring.
- Issues being adequately addressed, and which required no further consideration from the Strategic Planning Board, and which could be removed from the radar screen.

He explained that after the presentation of information today, the Board would need to carefully consider the creation of the categorized list.

Public Works Director began his presentation with discussion of the report he had submitted to the Board for its review, including the history of the drainage system, the improvements that had been made to date, and the proposed drainage plan for the next six years, which would total $39,583,000, subject to the review and affirmation of the Town Council.

Town Manager Elwell advised that a Special Town Council Meeting would be held on April 29, 2002 for discussion of the drainage project, focusing on questions related to intensity of construction, and whether the full program, as recommended by the consultants, was necessary in order to protect homes from first floor flooding. He noted that an alternative approach would also be presented for consideration, with the intent to reduce costs and disruptions, which still achieving the essential goal of protecting homes from flooding.

In response to Board Member Cooley, Mr. Dusey replied that the pumps had hour meters that indicated that the pumps had been operational; currently a system was being installed that monitored the pumps that would record when a pump went on and off. He explained that the pump stations had been in operation during the recent Thanksgiving storm, however, they could not handle the amount of water. The D-4 station at Miraflores had one pump out of service at the time, and the power unit that powered that station was under maintenance at the time; another pump had been out at the D-7 station at that time. Since that time additional pumps had been purchased to put back into the system if there was a pump failure. All of the pump stations now had back up power, with the exception of D-16 and D-18 which were in the process of getting back up power.

In response to Board Member Flamm, Town Manager Elwell explained that development had contributed to the drainage problem, however, that was not the only factor involved. Mr. Dusey explained that the run-off coefficient used in the 1973 plan had been found to be inappropriate as well. Town Manager Elwell commented that the aspect of development and erroneous runoff factors and the degree to which each contributed to the drainage problem was an extremely complex issue, and suggested that growth management could be discussed at a future Strategic Planning Board meeting when members of the Building Department were present.

In response to Board Member Watchman regarding the flooding experienced on Miraflores, Mr. Dusey explained that the pump and the emergency pump were interconnected, and had been disconnected for maintenance. He noted that the telemetry system was currently being installed and would be completed within a month or two. He explained that at the time of the flooding, staff had gone to the station and identified that three of the four pumps were fully operational and working; the new telemetry system would record when the pump would go on and off, note the staging, etc.

Board Member Watchman maintained that something had changed in the area that caused an abrupt difference in the behavior of flooding; he noted that the Phipps Estate development may have had some influence on the problem, and suggested that it merited further investigation.

Town Manager Elwell noted that, in addition to engineering considerations, there were specific code enforcement questions at Phipps Estate, and there were already some code enforcement actions underway in terms of retaining walls that had not been built in the manner in which they were required. He explained that he and Director of Planning, Building & Zoning Moore would be visiting the area to follow up on the code enforcement questions to ensure that the requirements were being met. He stated that he believed there was no doubt that the Phipps Estate had contributed to the drainage problems on Miraflores, however, there was some question as to how much it had contributed as compared to other factors.

Former Town Manager Bob Doney addressed the Board, offering a historical perspective on the Smith & Gillespie Long Range Public Works Plan that began in 1973. He explained that there had been area wide impacts that had been experienced along the West Palm Beach waterfront; the established runoff coefficients had been established with great engineering knowledge at the time.

Mr. Dusey commented that staff had done a great deal of additional investigation for reasons for the flooding, including checking for blockages, investigating the Phipps Estate development, and even contacting the weather bureau to ascertain rainfall patterns; he explained that it was impossible for the system to handle eight inches of water in four hours, such as had happened in the Thanksgiving storm.

Mr. David Barton commented that new development influenced the drainage problem, as many of the properties were not able to meet the retention requirements; he maintained that two things must happen together: stop the amount of water that was increasingly flooding each year, and relieve the Island of unwanted water through mechanical engineering; without discussion of the two items together it was futile, and too much money was being spent. He maintained that modifying building regulations would not stop the flooding, and urged that over-building be stopped.

Town Manager Elwell noted that the engineering consultants had performed the study assuming that only the first inch of rainfall would be retained on properties that would be developed in the future; with the new Town regulation requiring that the first two inches be retained, there was an additional level of protection in the system designed by the engineers. He noted that there was no doubt that the issue was not purely engineering or purely re-development, and that an integrated approach was being considered, which would be more fully discussed at the Special Town Council Meeting scheduled for April 29, 2002.

Public Works Director Dusey stated that the issue of South Florida Water Management District was major, as they were the permitting agents that allowed water to be discharged into the lake; staff had met with them last week concerning the pump stations and what was needed. He estimated that the permitting/design work would take approximately one year, because of the complexity and magnitude of the project.

Public Works Director Dusey now addressed the Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan, which had been adopted on December 1, 1999. The plan provides for sand filling for six reaches out of the eight identified reaches; Mr. Dusey identified the areas included in each reach and summarized the scope of the project in each reach; that his report furnished to the Board also included the financing plan. He explained that the permitting process was very difficult, however, once it was completed a lot of sand would be put into the system, the reaches would feed each other and would be fairly stable over time. The process was an adaptive management approach with the idea to place the sand one time, and then monitor and react to hot spot areas.

Board Member Flamm commented that he had no desire to go over the project as it had already been approved, however, he suggested that the future capital expenditures for the project be discussed.

Mr. Dusey replied that it would be speculative to try to estimate future expenditures at this time, as there were many situations that could evolve.

Town Manager Elwell commented that the future expenditures were now not known, however, it would certainly be substantially less than the numbers that were in the initial plan; the initial plan was restoring the beaches Town-wide to the maximum extent that permitting would allow; as maintenance was required, the reaches where relatively routine maintenance was anticipated contained substantial public beach area and could also anticipate some public funding.

In response to Board Member Watchman regarding the Erosion Control Line (ECL), Mr. Dusey replied that the ECL was established at the time that a beach fill project began, and had to be established regardless of who was paying for the improvements – if the Town paid 100% of any project, it would still be required to establish an ECL. It was not something that could be avoided by not taking State monies. The ECL was a property line between the upland property owner and the State. It was a moving target – as beaches accrete it moves to the east, and as beaches erode it moves to the west. When a beach fill project was done, the ECL was established and then became the property line between private property owners and the State. The ECL was established at a mean high water elevation on the beach, and it was surveyed and recorded. All of the land on the east side of the ECL was public property; all land on the west of it was private. The land on the west side of the ECL was subject to a public easement, according to State rules and regulations, to the same degree that it is currently used by the public – thus, a beach fill project could not be used to exclude people who normally used the beach. There was no basis in State law that requires a municipality to build parking lots, put bathrooms on the beach, etc., – however, if there was not adequate parking and access, there was also not State funding. In the current situation, because of mitigation from damages to the inlet, the State was willing to pay 50% of the costs, <u>first time only</u>, on all of the critically eroded beaches that ran from the north end of the Island down beyond the Ambassador Hotel. The State would pay half the costs, notwithstanding where parking and access now exists. The next time renourishment was needed the amount of money from the State would be based on their current rules and regulations at that time. He explained that currently the State would give maximum funding if there are 100 spaces per mile; if there are bathrooms, funding would be given for a half mile north and south of the public access area; if there are no bathrooms funding would be given for a quarter mile north and south of the public access area. There was no guarantee that the rules would not change ten years from now. If there was no parking and access, there would be no State funding.

Vice-Chair McAllister asked the following hypothetical question: If an individual or the State took the position that although there was no formal parking permitted, but that as a matter of practice there was a significant amount of access on the north end in Reach 2, would they be able to enforce the access that was believed to exist, rather than the formal minimal access that actually exists?

Mr. Dusey replied negatively – he explained that there were many public access points in the north end, with no parking available to the public – the State would not give credit for anything in this instance. He explained that the north end beach was used by the public, but there the State would not give funding without parking and access.

Vice-Chair McAllister replied that he was less concerned about State funding than the creeping acknowledged public access situation.

Town Manager Elwell commented that what existed today would have to exist into the future, however, there was no requirement that any additional parking or access be provided, unless the Town sought funding.

In response to Board Member Cooley, Mr. Dusey acknowledged that the ocean front property owner would lose the right to accretion when the ECL was drawn.

Chair Smith commented that she had been a beach front property owner for 32 years, and that a very nice group of people regularly used the beach, and there had never been a problem with the public until the Mercedes beached itself, and the beach was discovered. When the beach was dirty she had been told that it was private; when people wanted to use it she had been told that it was public. She stated that she did not think any discussion was going to change the way people used the beach.

Dr. Sten Lilja addressed the Board and noted that he differed with the opinion of Mr. Dusey regarding the establishment of an ECL no matter if there were State funds or not. He stated that Florida Statute 161.141 stated that the ECL must be established when there was an authorized beach restoration project for a minimum of ten years. He maintained that if the Town put sand on the beach at its own cost, there would not be a need to establish an ECL. He stated that if a public beach was established people would challenge parking restrictions, particularly in the north end.

Dr. Sanford Kuvin addressed the Board, stating that he had lived on the northeast tip of the Island for 38 years. He noted that six other beach plans had been presented in the past, and not one of them had been accepted for a variety of reasons. He suggested that a consulting firm, Aubrey Consultants, had provided a dissertation on what was wrong with the Comprehensive Coastal Plan, and urged that the Board Members read the consultant's report. He noted that the Army Corps of Engineers had placed a great deal of sand onto Palm Beach in compensation for the inlet; the Sand Transfer Plant had involved a six-year court case to decide who would own it and pay maintenance, etc., and there was now an enormous amount of accretion of sand that was being pumped onto Palm Beach. Plans were in the process for the upgrading of the Sand Transfer Plant. He recalled that the Town had pumped sand onto the mid-Town beach, and the beach was in very good shape today. That sand had been pumped at the expense of the Town, with no outside help. He stated that it was his opinion that the Town had sold its soul for a few pieces of silver by accepting public money for the first time in the history of the Island.

Ms. Connie Gasque addressed the Board, commenting that the renourishment project would be very closely monitored environmentally, and any off-shore damage would be extremely costly to the Town.

Board Member Cooley maintained that the Town Council had approved a project lasting ten years or more; therefore, an ECL would be required; he suggested that other options should have been considered, however, other options had not been discussed.

In response to Ms. Gasque, Town Manager Elwell stated that as part of the State process, there will be a Florida Environmental Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) hearing on the setting of the ECL with the next few months, and it will be well publicized in advance.

Board Member Watchman expressed concern regarding the divergent opinions given regarding the beach renourishment project.

Town Manager Elwell commented that he believed there was a reasonable philosophical debate regarding the impact on property ownership, and the policy decision regarding the ECL, however, regardless of the ownership of the sand, the use of the land, as it exists today, under all of the applicable laws and regulations would not change. The only way it would ever change is if in future cycles the Town sought additional State funding, and was willing to provide additional access/parking in areas where it does not exist today. Implementing the current plan would not change the use of the land.

*************

Finance Director Jane Skittone addressed the Board regarding the funding for capital improvement projects, reviewing the principles for selecting funding sources, capital project financing alternatives, capital financing methods currently used by the Town, and financing alternatives for new capital project proposals. She noted that Mr. Michael Hole, financial advisor from Salomon Smith Barney was available to respond to any questions from the Board.

In response to Board Member Cooley, Mr. Hole advised that a re-financing of the Revenue Bonds had not yet been recommended, as the costs for a whole new bond issue would take away the slight bit of interest costs savings that would be utilized by replacing today's bonds. There would be no cash flow material savings to the Town in today's market by refinancing the bonds. Also, even if there were savings, he noted that he was hesitant to recommend a refinancing at this time, as there were clearly substantial changes to the expenditure schedule of the proceeds from when the bonds were issued; the Tax Code only allowed refinancing once, and the Town may want to reserve the ability to refinance.

In response to Vice-Chair McAllister, Town Manager Elwell advised that staff would provide a report relating to debt per capita data, including a comparison to similar communities - additional information would be provided per $1 million of value, particularly as it related to projects that are being considered.; he explained that the terminology typically used when issuing debt for project is the impact per $1 million of value of a residence.

Mr. Hole explained that those communities with a strong residential tax base generally maintained a low debt per capita. The general obligation route and the non-ad valorem route were both payable from the General Fund. Anytime an issue is paid from the General Fund without a new revenue stream going in, it was always back to the taxpayers in terms of the millage, which was the last component to balance the budget. A special assessment was a new revenue stream - a new tax; it was separate and apart from the millage.

In response to Vice-Chair McAllister, Mr. Hole replied that revenue bonds had project definitions, which were purposely written by bond counsel as open, with an eye to the future, such that the project takes unforeseen changes into consideration. He explained that most likely a more conservative approach would be taken with bonds that were voter approved. He advised that he would pass the request for information on to the bond counsel regarding comparison of financing requiring/not requiring voter approval.

In response to Dr. Lilja concerning the use of bond monies within three years in order to qualify as a tax exempt issue, Mr. Hole explained that the tax code test was a reasonable expectation test, and the law required that the Town must reasonably expect to spend the proceeds within a three-five year window, depending on the nature of the project. If unforeseen circumstances occurred at the end of the three year period, the Town Engineer or consulting engineer would provide a written statement as to the reasons for the delay, and a two-year extension could be granted; even if unforeseen circumstances occurred in the five years that had not been expected at the time of issuance, the tax exempt status would still not be lost.

******************

The Strategic Planning Board Meeting was adjourned for the luncheon recess at 12:55 p.m.

The Strategic Planning Board Meeting of April 11, 2002, was reconvened at 2:08 p.m.

*******************

Public Works Director Al Dusey addressed the portion of his report dealing with the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) - Five Year Plan. He explained that the Town Council approves funding for the first year only on an annual basis, and the other four years remain flexible, based upon the needs of the Town. Other than for special projects, the CIP funding is on a pay-as-you-go basis; an appropriation of approximately $3 million is made annually to cover the capital needs of the Town. He reported that the current five-year CIP for the Town included sanitary sewers, storm sewers, structures, and recreation, with specifics provided in the report he had submitted to the Board. The Coastal Management Plan program was part of the CIP, however, it was a separate fund.

Mr. Dusey also provided a summary of future capital improvement programs for five to ten years in the future, and a memorandum providing additional information about certain Town services with infrastructure needs, as well as other elements of Town infrastructure. He responded to questions from the Board regarding specific aspects of the report.

Discussion took place regarding an interest in the Town acquiring additional green space and additional public recreational facilities for residents on the north end. Underground wiring was discussed, and Mr. Dusey pointed out that there were two parts to under grounding: actually getting the cable underground, and the above ground facilities that would be involved - 12' x 12' pads would be required to bring the facilities above ground in order to get them to properties.

Town Manager Elwell clarified that there was a fact that had been established that the run-off coefficient that was used for the Smith & Gillespie drainage study was a textbook number, as opposed to a surveyed, field determined number; it was a fact that the number being used in the current study was based on actual field surveys, which gave a greater level of comfort regarding the accuracy of the study. He clarified that there was no finger-pointing at anyone who was dealing with the problem in the 1970's, as the problem had then been dealt with in a different context. He maintained that a combination of factors had contributed to the current drainage problem – an intensity in development and the impact of an undersized system.

Town Manager Elwell announced that Ned Barnes of the Palm Beach Civic Association had submitted a report regarding the placement of utility lines underground, and had indicated that an individual copy would be provided to each member of the Board. He noted that he would also add a copy to the library of materials available for the use of the Board.

Mr. Fernsler suggested a method of coming to closure on the items discussed today. He explained that the value and effectiveness of any strategic plan was proportional to its degree of focus – a strategic plan that tried to do too many things would be less effective. He suggested that today the Board decide what should be on the radar screen for the strategic plan for later consideration when the actual planning process took place. He suggested that as each environmental scan meeting concluded, a running matrix be used to identify the issues discussed, with a checklist to indicate whether it has been retained on the radar screen. He identified a set of criteria for deciding what should/should not be on the radar screen:

> Is it possible for the Town to change its direction on an issue? If it was not reasonable to expect the Town administration to change direction on a subject, it would probably not be a strategic issue.
>
> Do we agree with the basic premises underlying each issue? There were many discussions concerning technique and engineering methods, and staff/consultant expertise would have to be accepted.
>
> Were alternative measures given adequate consideration?

He explained that the environmental scan shifted a myriad of issues, and what remained at the bottom of the sifter were those issues that would be the topics that would be tackled in the strategic plan to develop a strategy for those issues. Any items left off of the radar screen could appear in the strategic plan as having been reviewed and examined, with the Board agreeing that the issue was being handled appropriately.

Mr. Fernsler commented that the drainage issue involved two factors: a change in the coefficient, and a change in policy or level of service standard. The Town Council had raised its level of service expectation for storm drainage to adopt the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) recommended standard of a 100-year, three-day storm as being the criteria. He noted that criteria was applied for new development; he questioned if it was appropriate to apply a drainage level service standard in a built out barrier island. It was much more burdensome for a community that was largely built out to retrofit to those higher standards, than for a new community. He also suggested that the level of service standards of peer built-out coastal communities be investigated. The stated purpose of the drainage project was to protect, to the extent reasonably possible, the first floor of residences during a 100-year, three-day storm. It would need to be determined whether the flooding problem was a threat to the broad public health safety welfare, or the narrow public health safety welfare.

Mayor Smith commented that the strategic plan would not be recommended for at least another year, and by that time some portion of the drainage plan would be started – she questioned the point of the Strategic Planning Board going too much into the drainage situation, which may be moot by the time the strategic planning report was recommended to the Town Council.

Vice-Chair McAllister commented that planning was being done in a changing environment; one way to look at the drainage or beach decisions was that plans were in place, however, adaptive management was also in place. The initial decisions would remain, and the changeable circumstances would be in the purview of the Strategic Planning Board, not to counter them or change what the Town Council had decided.

Mr. Fernsler agreed that drainage was an ongoing issue that would remain on the radar screen, but that did not mean that the immediate improvements would be altered. There were other issues, such as how to go about addressing such situations in the future, and were there alternative mitigating methods that might be put into place to preclude future situations. He used the example of permits for outfall into Lake Worth – with the stress that Lake Worth was under, and fluctuations in regulatory mandates, it would not be outside of the realm of reason to expect much more onerous environmental regulations in the future with regard to the quantity and quality of storm drainage. The question was what could be done now to anticipate and mitigate those potential constraints before they even appear.

Mr. Fernsler suggested that consensus be reached that the immediate public works initiative to retrofit the north end would be off of the radar screen.

After discussion, the members of the Board affirmed that they reached consensus on the drainage plans for the north end, however, long term drainage issues would stay on the radar screen. Consensus was also affirmed by the Board regarding the current beach restoration program that had been planned, designed, and funded; longer range, broader perspectives beach issues would remain as topics of discussion.

Mr. Fernsler commented that he had not noted anything in particular under the discussion of other capital improvements and basic services, however, he had noted some peripheral issues that could be added to the radar screen: 1) underground utilities; 2) parks, green space, and recreation including land acquisition for parks as a growth management strategy; 3) consideration of more advanced development standards.

Town Manager Elwell suggested that the question of land regulations that relate to the drainage issue would fit neatly underneath the long term drainage issue umbrella, and did not need to be something separate under its own.

The Board complimented Mr. Dusey on a very thorough report.

In response to Board Member Flamm, Town Manager Elwell advised that a traffic consultant had been hired by the Town; the first assignment to the firm would be to conduct the traffic and parking study, which was not well defined at this point. The Town Council would hear advice in the next few months on the scope of the traffic study. When the Strategic Planning Board reviewed traffic and parking it could identify additional information that was needed in order for it to make recommendations to the Town Council. Those recommendations to the Town Council would aid in formulating the scope of work for the study.

## VI. SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE ISSUE-SPECIFIC SESSIONS WITH TOWN STAFF

Town Manager Elwell proposed the following schedule to the Board:

May 16, 2002 - growth management

June 12, 2002 - traffic and parking, along with general demographic trends on and off-Island, an intergovernmental relationships.

July 11, 2002 (Mr. Elwell will advise of any change in the date) - security and emergency services, with the possibility of blending in some miscellaneous items.

August - no meeting planned

September 12, 2002 - financial planning, also any remaining miscellaneous items

October 10, 2002 - items as needed to finish.

VII. ANY OTHER MATTERS

Chair Smith referred to the memorandum from Board Member Watchman, which he had submitted to the Board regarding proposed ground rules for assigning priorities to capital expenditure projects.

Board Member Watchman commented that his first point in the memorandum was that it was understood that there was a contract between the taxpayer and the government, and there were certain things that were not optional, such as paying taxes, and there was no debating them. The second point he had made was that Town government must ensure the effective availability of these services, and ensure that infrastructure systems were adequate. He noted the flooding/drainage problem should not have had to be discovered, and that staff should have been aware of the threat. The third point was that priority be given to the things that were necessary to achieve the vision statement.

Chair Smith referred to the memorandum submitted to the Board by Board Member Flamm, dated April 1, 2002, regarding a policy discussion for the Strategic Planning Board.

Board Member Flamm commented that his memorandum was prompted by the letter of Board Member Cooley to the Palm Beach Daily News on March 24, 2002, the subject of which was the beach renourishment program. He stated that it was his belief that Mr. Cooley had not identified himself to the newspaper as a member of the Strategic Planning Board, however, the newspaper had identified him as a member. That had prompted questions from residents regarding the participation in the Community Forums regarding their input, and that now the Board was taking a position that was either slow or trying to derail the project. He stated that his concern was that Board members make it very clear that statements were being made as individuals, rather than as members of the Strategic Planning Board so that the credibility of the Board was not compromised.

Chair Smith commented that anyone who had followed the career of Mr. Cooley knew that his position regarding the beach renourishment program had been consistent for a number of years, and that he was not speaking for the Strategic Planning Board.

It was agreed that Strategic Planning Board members would make it clear when written remarks were submitted to the public that they were speaking as individuals, rather than as members of the Board.

VIII. NEXT MEETING: THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2002, AT 10:00 A.M., IN THE TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

It was determined that the Strategic Planning Board meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 13, 2002, would be re-scheduled for **Wednesday, June 12, 2002** @ 10:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers.

**REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD ON APRIL 11, 2002**



IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting of the Strategic Planning Board was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

___________________________________
Chair
Lesly Smith

Prepared by:
Susan Eichhorn
Deputy Town Clerk
E:\STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD\REPORTS\20020411 REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD.WPD

**Future Scheduled Meetings:**
May 16, 2002 @ 10:00 a.m. - Town Council Chambers
June 12, 2002 @ 10:00 a.m. - Town Council Chambers
July 11, 2002 @ 10:00 a.m. (tentative) - Town Council Chambers
August 2002 - meeting will not be held
September 12, 2002 @ 10:00 a.m. - Town Council Chambers
October 10, 2002 @ 10:00 a.m. - Town Council Chambers