

RHODE ISLAND STATEWIDE PLANNING PROGRAM
Rhode Island State Planning Council

Thursday, January 14, 2016
RIDOA, Conference Room A
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

APPROVED MINUTES

I. Attendance

1. Members Present

Mr. Michael DiBiase, Chair	Director, Rhode Island Department of Administration
Mr. Jared Rhodes, Acting Secretary	Acting Associate Director, Division of Planning
Mr. Robert Azar	Representing Bonnie Nickerson Director, Providence Department of Planning and Development
Mr. Steven Boudreau	Representing Nicole Alexander-Scott, Director Rhode Island Department of Health
Ms. Jeanne Boyle	President's Designee, Rhode Island League of Cities and Towns
Ms. Meredith Brady	Representing Peter Alviti, Rhode Island Department of Transportation
Ms. Janet Coit	Director, Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management
Mr. L. Vincent Murray	Rhode Island League of Cities & Towns, Government Official Representative
Ms. Lillian Picchione	Representing Mr. Raymond Studley, Rhode Island Public Transit Authority
Ms. Amy Rainone	Representing Barbara Fields, Executive Director, Rhode Island Housing
Mr. M. James Riordan	Public Member
Mr. Peder Schaefer	Representing Daniel Beardsley, Rhode Island League of Cities and Towns
Mr. Girard Visconti	Large Business Representative
Mr. Jeff Willis	Representing Grover Fugate, Executive Director, Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council
Mr. Scott Wolf	Environmental Advocate

2. Members Absent

Ms. Jeanne Cola	Non Profit Community Development Representative
Mr. Roy Coulombe	Public Member
Ms. Marion Gold	Commissioner, Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources
Mr. Marcus Mitchell	Small Business Representative
Mr. Thomas Mullaney	Rhode Island Department of Administration, Budget Office
Ms. Sandy O'Connor	Governor's Designee
Mr. Stefan Pryor	Secretary of Commerce
Ms. Lisa Vura-Weis, Vice-Chair	Deputy Chief, Office of the Governor

3. Staff Present

Ms. Kimberly Crabill	RI Statewide Planning Program
Mr. Kevin Nelson	RI Statewide Planning Program
Ms. Karen Scott	RI Statewide Planning Program
Ms. Chelsea Siefert	RI Statewide Planning Program

4. Guests Present

Mr. Carlos Machado	Federal Highway Administration
Ms. Kathryn Trapani	Quonset Development Corporation
Mr. Steve King	Quonset Development Corporation

II. Agenda Items

1. Call to Order

Chairman DiBiase called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

2. Approval of December 17, 2015 Meeting Minutes – for action

Chairman DiBiase asked for a motion to approve the minutes of December 17, 2015. Ms. Brady moved to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Coit. There being no discussion, the following members voted aye: Azar, Boudreau, Boyle, Brady, Coit, Murray, Picchione, Rainone, Riordan, Visconti, and Willis. Chairman DiBiase and Mr. Rhodes abstained. Mr. Wolf was not present at this time. Not voting – Peder Schaefer. There were no nay votes.

6. FY 17- 25 TIP, Development Process Update - for discussion

Chairman DiBiase took this item out of order and introduced Karen Scott who provided an update on where the State Planning Council (SPC)/Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) stood in the overall FY 17-25 TIP Development Process. Notable highlights were as follows:

- 37 of 39 municipalities have responded to the solicitation
- 15 non-municipal organization applications were received
- There were 50 changes in scope and 325 new projects proposed
- The estimated cost for the new projects was over \$880 million
- DOT will review and analyze the bridge, pavement, traffic, and drainage projects
- Sub-Committees from the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) will review bike, pedestrian, recreational trails, transit, and legacy enhancement projects
- 4 public workshops are to be held the week of January 11, 2016 to provide applicants an opportunity to advocate for their projects
- March 10, 2016 will be the next action request from the SPC

Instances where the Council members engaged in discussion were as follows:

Mr. Schaefer asked if the municipalities' current TIP approved projects would get crowded out by the proposed Road and Bridge Program. In response, Ms. Scott explained the municipal ranking and prioritization process as well as the process that the SPC and Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) will be using in making funding recommendations.

Ms. Coit asked if the New TIP needed to be complete by the start of the State Fiscal Year or by the Federal Fiscal Year. Ms. Scott stated the Federal Fiscal Year.

Chairman DiBiase spoke to Mr. Schaefer's earlier point emphasizing that the Governor is working very hard through Rhode Works to make more dollars available for implementation. He further stated that fortunately, the Federal Budget has been slightly more generous to us but noted that difficult trade-offs lie ahead. Rhode Island has chosen Municipal Projects over Bridges in the past, consequently some of the tension is going to be between fixing bridges versus other project needs. Sorting through these tensions is what this group is all about, the MPO is set up so that a "single" agency does not make these decisions. We are going to have to work together to try to balance out the various interests.

Mr. Murray commented that this evening's public hearing in South Kingstown is expected to be well attended. He also noted that in the past when the GARVEE vehicle was used it borrowed against the future which diminished the pool going forward. Chairman DiBiase concluded the conversation by noting that the idea is that these are capital investments and ultimately save money by repairing bridges versus rebuilding bridges.

3. Public Comment on Agenda Items – *for discussion*

There was none.

4. Comprehensive Planning Standards – *for action*

Chairman DiBiase introduced Chelsea Siefert who delivered the attached presentation. Discussion was as follows:

Mr. Schaefer asked what the effective date of the standards was. Mr. Rhodes responded that the effective date is 20 days post-State Planning Council adoption and filling with the Secretary of State's Office.

Ms. Boyle asked about the use of draft standards to review the comprehensive plans. Ms. Siefert responded that to date staff has been basing its formal reviews on the current/interim standard, but as a courtesy has also been providing feedback to the municipalities as to how their materials stack up against the proposed standard.

Ms. Boyle next asked if that was the same for a municipality who entered into a letter of agreement. Ms. Siefert responded that for the 13 municipalities who have entered into a letter of agreement they would be reviewed under the current/interim standard for up to one year after adoption of the new standard by the State Planning Council.

Chairman DiBiase then provided some background by reminding the Council that the RI General Laws charge the Division of Planning with developing Standards and Guidelines for preparation of comprehensive plans. He next asked for a motion to adopt the contents contained within the RI Comprehensive Planning Standards Manual as State Planning Council Rule 4 – Part 2 and approve the RI Comprehensive Planning Guidance Handbook Series in accordance with Rule 4.2 of the Rules and Standards of the State Planning Council. Mr. Riordan motioned to approve. The motion was seconded by Mr. Visconti. Instance where the Council entered into discussion were as follows:

Mr. Schaefer stated that the concern that the League of Cities and Towns has heard from smaller communities is that they won't have the staff, or resources needed to comply with the new standards.

He then quoted law 42-35-4 titled Administrative Procedures Act, Sub-section 3 and argued that the effective date of the Standards should be delayed.

In response to Mr. Schaefer's points, Chairman DiBiase asked if the municipalities are under any obligation to meet the standard within the current fiscal year. Ms. Siefert responded that the standards only apply to those who desire a state approval of their plan.

Chairman DiBiase next asked if the new standards would increase costs to cities and towns to comply. Ms. Siefert explained the new requirements and Mr. Rhodes added that they would likely require additional effort. Chairman DiBiase then explained that his understanding is that if there is no requirement for municipalities to actually secure a state approval of their comprehensive plan within a specific period of time, then compliance with the associated standard cannot be considered mandatory under the cited statute, which contemplates costs required to be incurred by a municipality within the current fiscal year.

Mr. Wolf arrived at 9:45 a.m.

Mr. Murray then read the attached comments regarding the concerns of the Town of South Kingstown's Planning Board.

Mr. Schaefer next noted that, in his opinion, the law requires that a fiscal note be done before the proposed standards are adopted as they have the potential to increase municipal costs.

Ms. Boyle noted that as an urban community, they had a different perspective on the municipal impact. She noted that the city of East Providence's sense was that it would not have a large impact or be burdensome on the staff. In fact, the city found that the only area that would be significantly different was the content related to climate change and natural hazards.

Mr. Rhodes thanked Mr. Murray for his comments and echoed Ms. Boyle's comments regarding the impact of the standards.

Ms. Coit encouraged both Ms. Boyle and Mr. Murray to develop local content related to climate change and natural hazards and offered the support of EC4.

Mr. Willis echoed Ms. Coit's comments and suggested that the new "Stormtools" instrument might be useful in addressing some of the planning requirements. Mr. Rhodes commented that the Stormtools data as well as the mapping that has been produced by Statewide Planning goes a long way in assisting municipalities with meeting the requirements. The challenge for the municipalities now is to relate the mapping to what will actually be affected on the ground.

Mr. Riordan asked if more time is needed for the municipalities to comply and if so how much time that would be. Mr. Rhodes was unsure of the answer to that question but noted that only the General Assembly could change the compliance date as it is specifically written into the state law.

Chairman DiBiase commented that the key point is that there is no actual requirement for municipalities to comply. Speaking to Mr. Murray's comments he stated that he realizes that the comprehensive planning procedures is not optimal as the compliance percentage is low and suggested that a workshop might be a good place to discuss how to fix the system.

There being no further discussion, the following members voted aye: Azar, Boudreau, Boyle, Brady, Coit, Murray, Picchione, Rainone, Riordan, Visconti, Willis, and Wolf. Chairman DiBiase and Mr. Rhodes abstained. Not voting – Peder Schaefer. There were no nay votes.

5. Quonset Business Park Project Review Memorandum of Understanding - for action

Chairman DiBiase introduced Mr. King and Ms. Trapani who delivered the attached presentation.

Chairman DiBiase asked for a motion to approve the Memorandum of Agreement. Mr. Willis made the first motion. The motion was seconded by Ms. Boyle. Under discussion:

Chairman DiBiase commented that this is a terrific example of people getting together and trying to streamline a process and thanked all involved for the hard work that has gone into its development.

Ms. Coit commended Quonset Development Corporation (QDC), Mr. King, and Ms. Trapani and stated that we should all continue becoming more efficient while still protecting the state's environmental goals. Ms. Coit also stated that this could be a great model to consider for the I95 properties.

Mr. Wolf asked how many parcels are left that QDC wants to get pre-permitted that are not currently permitted. Mr. King responded that there could be as many as five.

There being no further discussion, the following members voted aye: Azar, Boudreau, Boyle, Brady, Coit, Murray, Picchione, Rainone, Riordan, Visconti, Willis, and Wolf. Chairman DiBiase and Mr. Rhodes abstained. Not voting – Peder Schaefer. There were no nay votes.

7. Announcements

There were none.

8. Adjourn

Chairman DiBiase asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Coit motioned to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Riordan. There being no discussion, the following members voted aye: Azar, Boudreau, Boyle, Brady, Coit, Murray, Picchione, Rainone, Riordan, Visconti, Willis and Wolf. Chairman DiBiase and Mr. Rhodes abstained. Not voting – Peder Schaefer. There were no nay votes. The meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jared Rhodes
Acting Secretary

L. Vincent Murray, Director of Planning, Town of South Kingstown
January 14, 2016

Comments for the State Planning Council's Consideration of Comprehensive Plan Review Standards:

- The relationship between the Statewide Planning Program and the "line" planning function at the municipal level has improved significantly in the last decade or so.
- The Division is indeed more of a partner today than regulator and has provided improved tools and resources for municipalities. These resources have helped to better integrate the system interaction between the state and local government entities with regard to the ever increasing requirements of State law and the State Guide Plan constituent elements.
- As such kudos are due to acknowledge the leadership of Kevin Flynn, Jared Rhodes, Karen Scott and the staff of the division. The planning community so to speak has come a long way, but in my view and that of our Planning Board we still have a ways to go to have a truly balanced partnership in regards to a well-functioning policy framework between the State and municipalities concerning the comprehensive planning function.
- Comprehensive planning has, over the course of my 30-plus year career as a professional planner (all on the municipal side across four coastal communities), become more complex and, at times, difficult to manage. Actions and requirements of the General Assembly and policies and regulations determined by the State Planning Council have added layers to the "artichoke" that is land use planning in the State of RI.
- While this is not a negative thing, it has increased the responsibilities and work load of local Planning Departments, Planning Boards and local City/Town Councils. Some would observe that these State actions and requirements relating to the local planning function through the Comprehensive Plan have diminished home rule and imposed state mandates on municipalities without providing adequate resources to implement the same. This perspective is a point of friction in the process that is present to varying degrees across the Towns and Cities of the State of RI.
- The comprehensive plan review standards that have been drafted and accompanying 16 guidance handbooks have been a long time in development and represent a complex and no doubt difficult project for the Division staff. I would note that these tools will certainly be of utility to localities in updating and managing our local comprehensive plans.
- However, my community has concerns about the matter before the SPC today, that being action on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Review Standards. These standards were the subject of workshops with the professional planning community and more recently two public hearings conducted in December. The standards embody the 10-year approval timeframe requirements for localities concerning their comprehensive plans and per the RIGL's compliance with such standards is required on or before June 1, 2016 (about four and one half months from now). I

would also observe that the public hearings on these standards (held on December 7, 2015) were sparsely attended and of very short duration. This general lack of attendance does not connote consensus on the matter.

- At an earlier workshop held with planners last summer there were concerns raised broadly about the complexity of complying with the various required element areas and the looming June 1, 2016 compliance date. These thematic areas of concern were also presented in the brief public hearings held last December.
- With regard to the June 1, 2016 compliance date I would note the following: presently 25 communities (65%) have comp plans that are expired or have been denied; 8 (20%) have plans that are approved but will expire next June 1st. Only 6 (15%) have plans that have approval status on a ten year basis. It is far more likely than not that the percentage of non-compliance will increase with the arrival of June 1st. This circumstance raises broad issues relating to the efficacy of the current system as well as concerns going forward.
- The South Kingstown Planning Board provided written commentary (letter dated December 9, 2015) outlining its concerns with the draft standards. Major themes in this correspondence related to the continued erosion of home rule, the seemingly inflexible nature of the standards themselves, the lack of reciprocal responsibilities for state agencies to comply with the mandated standards applicable to municipalities, concerns about the increasing complexity of the "system" and the abilities of smaller communities to comply with (and pay for) these plan update requirements in the compressed time frame, density issues for suburban and rural communities relating to the requirements of Land Use 2025, the absence of recognizing the "common thread" interrelationships between the different elements of the plan and conflicts that may arise as a result, the housing element requirements which continue to place the yoke of responsibility on Cities and Towns without a recognition of the lack of State and Federal resources to achieve affordable housing outcomes and lastly the difficulties of addressing new issues required for the ten year approval; such as climate change and sea level rise on a municipal level without full partnership with the State and federal entities.
- The response to our correspondence was viewed as somewhat dismissive of the concerns and thoughts articulated and resulted in no amendments or modification of the standards being proposed or considered. The closing paragraph in our correspondence read in part as follows: "Notwithstanding some of the issues and concerns we cite above we are of the view that the Comprehensive Planning Standards Manual represents a significant improvement over the "old Handbook 16" and will be of great utility to the cities and towns in our State. It is our hope that these comments are of value in finalizing the manual." The South Kingstown Planning Board was much disappointed in this regard.
- In closing it is my opinion that more needs to be done in this area to provide a true partnership document and requirements that address these comprehensive plan needs in a reasonable, flexible and workable manner. There is no particular disagreement with the general content and policy requirements for updating our local comp plans but the pending system is not viewed as being fully consistent with municipal perspective across our State. In our view the legislature should reconsider the timeframe issue and additional dialogue between the division,

professional planners and local Planning Boards should ensue to refine and lend flexibility to the standards proposed.

- An opportunity in this regard presents itself at the forthcoming League of Cities and Towns Annual Convention on January 28th in Warwick (Crowne Plaza Hotel) workshop entitled: "RI State and Municipal Planning: Achieving Our Mutual Goals" at 9:45 a.m. I would urge all involved in planning at the state and local level to attend and participate in the discussion. Perhaps a plan of action may emerge to improve our collective situation via legislative proposal or other means.
- These comments are not intended to derail today's consideration but are provided to offer our local perspectives on the matter at hand. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Comprehensive Plan Standards & Guidance Handbook Series

A decorative graphic consisting of three overlapping wavy lines in shades of blue, green, and white, positioned at the bottom right of the page.

RI
SPP

OCTOBER 2015

NOVEMBER 2015

DECEMBER 2015

8th

5th 7th

7th 13th

Authorization of Public Hearing by State Planning Council

RI Office of Regulatory Reform Review Completed

Public Notice Posted in Providence Journal

Public Hearings

Comment Period Closed



PUBLIC HEARING REPORT | DECEMBER 2015

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE RULES AND STANDARDS OF THE STATE PLANNING COUNCIL



SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Proposed Amendment

The State Planning Council has under consideration an amendment to Rule 4 – Part 2 of the Rules and Standards of the State Planning Council, entitled, “Comprehensive Plan Review Standards.” In accordance with the General Laws, subsections 45-22.2-10(b), the Division of Planning is to develop standards to assist municipalities in the incorporation of state goals and policies into comprehensive plans, and to assist the Division in the review of comprehensive plans. Draft Rule 4 – Part 2 satisfies this requirement.

The standards are accompanied by the RI Comprehensive Planning Guidance Handbook Series, comprised of sixteen (16) separate handbooks that are intended to assist communities in preparing plans that will fulfill each standard. Each handbook provides helpful guidance on fulfilling the standards, including data sources, as well as general information on including the required topics within a comprehensive plan.

Public Hearings and Comment Period

Pursuant to the provisions of section 29-3.1-4.1(b)(3) and 29-3.1-4(b)(7)(ii) of the General Laws of Rhode Island, and in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act Chapter 42-35 of the General Laws, the State Planning Council gave notice of its intent to amend its Rules and Standards and gave notice of its intent to hold a public hearing to afford interested parties the opportunity to provide public comment. Notice of the two public hearings and opportunity to comment on the draft plan were provided in English and Spanish through advertisement in the Providence Journal on November 9, 2015, posting on the Secretary of State website, posting on the Statewide Planning Program’s website, a direct mailing to the over 380 planning and transportation contacts in the Statewide Planning Program’s database, and inclusion in the Statewide Planning Program’s December newsletter, which was sent to interested parties on December 1, 2015. Both the English and Spanish hearing notices posted in the Providence Journal have been included within Appendix A.

All persons were invited to present their views on the proposed amendments in person at the public hearings, through a representative, or by filing a written statement with the Secretary of the State Planning Council

through a representative, or by filing a written statement with the Secretary of the State Planning Council. All persons were invited to present their views on the proposed amendments in person at the public hearings, through a representative, or by filing a written statement with the Secretary of the State Planning Council. Both the English and Spanish hearing notices posted in the Providence Journal have been included within Appendix A.

13. Planning for Land Use

page 21

13.5 Illustrate future land use and residential density categories on a Future Land Use Map [...] while meeting the following requirements:

13.5f The FLUM must be consistent with Figure 21-02(1) of Land Use 2025: Rhode Island's State Land Use Policies and Plan, by applying the following minimum and/or maximum residential densities, or, ~~in the limited instances~~—where the municipality feels that consistency may not be appropriate, giving a narrative that describes why the minimum and/or maximum residential density is not warranted [...]

1. General Standards

page 3

1.1 There shall be a single version of the comprehensive plan, including all amendments, appendices and supplements, which is fully updated and re-adopted at least once every 10 years.

4. Planning for Historic and Cultural Resources

page 6

4.2 Assess issues related to historic and cultural resources by including the following:

4.2a A ~~list and description~~ discussion of the significant historic and cultural resource areas, types and or sites that exist within the community;

5. Planning for Housing

page 7

5.1 Provide an overview of the existing housing context by including the following data points:

- 5.1c.** Year-round and seasonal, single-family and multi-family housing units, both the number and as a percentage of total housing units;
- 5.1d** ~~Single family, multi-family,~~ Owner-occupied and rental units, both the number and as a percentage of occupied housing units;

5. Planning for Housing

page 7

5.1 Provide an overview of the existing housing context by including the following data points:

5.1g The current ~~median~~-average home sale price, and the general trend in home sales prices over the past 10 or more years;

8. Planning for Services and Facilities

page 12

8.2 Identify existing significant public infrastructure and facilities on a map, by showing and clearly labeling the following, if present within the municipality:

8.2c ~~Wastewater pump stations and wastewater~~ treatment plants.

13A. Designating a Local Growth Center page 23

13B. Maintaining a Local Growth Center page 24

13A.1 and 13B.1 Include a map of the growth center, illustrating:

13A.1b and 13B.1b The future land ~~uses that are to be targeted for the~~
~~various areas~~ use designations within the growth center.

1. Adopt the standards contained within the RI Comprehensive Planning Standards Manual as State Planning Council Rule 4 – Part 2; and
2. Approve the RI Comprehensive Planning Guidance Handbook Series in accordance with Rule 4.2 of the Rules and Standards of the State Planning Council.

Streamlining the ERF & SERF

Environmental Review Form and
Socio Economic Review Form

RI Statewide Planning
Program and Quonset
Development Corporation

Presentation to
Technical Committee
January 8, 2016

RHODE ISLAND
DIVISION OF
PLANNING



QUONSET
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Background

- ❖ Settlement Agreement of 1979 resulted from lawsuit brought against the federal government by environmental groups.* Adopts Protective Controls and Development Restrictions for Quonset to be enforced by RIDEM and CRMC.
- ❖ Review Agreement of 1979 between RI Port Authority (now QDC), RIDEM, CRMC, and State Planning Council (SPC) requires review of projects at Quonset for environmental impact and consistency with State Guide Plan.
- ❖ The vehicle for this review is the Environmental Review Form and Socio Economic Review Form (ERF & SERF) for land development projects. Project notifications go to members of the State Planning Council.

*Conservation Law Foundation, Ecology Action for Rhode Island, Save the Bay, Audubon Society for Rhode Island, and Aquidneck Island Ecology.

- ❖ More sophisticated environmental and coastal regulations (air, fresh and saltwater wetlands, stormwater, solid waste, hazmat, etc.)
- ❖ Comprehensive Planning Act requires municipalities to have comp plans that are consistent with State Guide Plan
- ❖ QDC has a Master Plan consistent with NK Plan
- ❖ Updated State Guide Plan elements
- ❖ QDC Board has 4 members appointed by neighboring communities
- ❖ Dozens of ERF and SERF's have been reviewed and approved

❖ QDC and Town Agreements

- Unified Development Regulations including RIDEM Stormwater Regulations
- NK amended its Comp Plan and Zoning to adopt regulations and joint review process
- Development review and variance process that includes Town participation
- NK is currently updating its Comprehensive Plan
- QDC is updating our Master Plan (with SPP on TRC)

❖ Site Readiness Program

- Pre-design and pre-permitting by RIDEM and CRMC of virtually all developable parcels consistent with Unified Development Regulations
- 90 day plan review process gives Quonset Business Park a competitive advantage over other business parks in New England

- ❖ QDC and Statewide Planning have worked over many months on this agreement
- ❖ Legal review by DOA counsel, QDC counsel, and Conservation Law Foundation – they concur that this MOA is consistent with Review Agreement
- ❖ Review and comment by Settlement Agreement parties (CLF, Save the Bay, Audubon, Ecology Action)
 - CLF concern about major water users – added a provision for more review time
 - STB concern about parcels that are not pre-permitted – clarified that the normal 45 day review process applies to those parcels
- ❖ Review by RIDEM and CRMC – their permitting authority is not in any way diminished

Proposed Unified ERF and SERF Agreement

- ❖ QDC will complete and submit a single ERF & SERF to SPC for the pre-permitted parcels in the Site Readiness Program
- ❖ SPC to review for consistency with State Guide Plan to serve as a “pre-approval”
- ❖ As parcels are developed, QDC to submit abbreviated form to SPC with details of the company/project
- ❖ SPC to review within 7 business days (30 business days for “major water users”)
- ❖ A finding of inconsistency would trigger reversion back to long ERF & SERF
- ❖ Quonset Master Plan revision to include participation and review by Town and Statewide Planning to ensure consistency

- ❖ Provides certainty and predictability of the development process
- ❖ Complies with Review Agreement
- ❖ All agencies maintain authority
- ❖ Environment is protected
- ❖ Consistent with Regulatory Reform efforts
- ❖ Builds on success of Site Readiness Plan
- ❖ More jobs and investment for Rhode Island
- ❖ Improved standing in the business community

Why now?

- ❖ The Park is 3/4 developed and land use districts are well established.
- ❖ The agencies have developed very strong working relationships.
- ❖ This aligns with the administration's push for jobs and economic development.

Thank you.