

JAMES MULLEN, Chair
SHEILA IRVIN, Vice-Chair
GALE LABELLE, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

**Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Committee**

Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 12:30 PM

2nd Floor Conference Room, BRPC Office, 1 Fenn Street, Pittsfield, MA 01201

Committee Members

Kristine Hazzard AB Roger Bolton X Heather Boulger AB Marya LaRoche (Alt) X Kevin O'Donnell X
Keith Girouard X Mike Nuwallie X Laury Epstein AB Mike Supranowicz X Lauri Klefos X
Michael Hoffman X Christine Ludwiszewski X Eleanore Velez X Deanna Ruffer X
Ann Dobrowolski (Alt) X Helena Fruscio X Tim Geller AB Robert Wilson AB Brenda Burdick X
Mark Berman AB

BRPC Staff

Nathaniel Karns X Thomas Matuszko X Daniel Sexton X Mark Maloy X

Public

Allison Johnson X

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

At 12:30 PM on May 17, 2011 a meeting of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Strategy Committee was convened. Mr. Matuszko explained that he would be the moderator for this meeting and that the meeting was being recorded in accordance with the Open Meeting law. Mr. Matuszko then asked if there was anyone present whom wished to record the meeting as well. Seeing none the meeting began.

2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Matuszko asked for approval of the meeting minutes from the April 12, 2011 meeting of the CEDS Strategy Committee.

Mr. O'Donnell made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Ms. LaRoche. Mr. Matuszko then asked for unanimous consent, seeing no objections the motion passed.

3. Public Comments (Non-Agenda Items)

Mr. Matuszko then explained that this was a public meeting being held by Berkshire Regional Planning Commission. Noticing that there was a member of the public present; Mr. Matuszko asked if there was anyone whom wished to speak on any non-agenda items? The person introduced himself as Mr. Stuart Chase, President and CEO of 1Berkshires Strategic Alliance, Inc. Mr. Matuszko welcomed Mr. Chase. Recognizing that Mr. Chase will be representing 1Berkshires and more specifically the interests of the Berkshire Chamber of Commerce, Berkshire Visitors Bureau and Berkshire Creative, Mr. Matuszko asked the Committee if they would consider Mr. Chase as a member of the committee. The Committee agreed. Seeing no other members of the public, Mr. Matuszko then moved the discussion to the next agenda item.

4. Discussion of Public Comments

To start the discussion, Mr. Matuszko explained that staff had conducted a 30-day public comment period in accordance with the Economic Development Administration (EDA) regulations. To ensure awareness of the comment period, he explained that a public notice was posted in the Berkshire Eagle newspaper (April 16th), letters were mailed (communities, individuals, project proponents and organizations) and staff presented at a few meetings to discuss the draft report (BRPC full-commission and Pittsfield Economic Revitalization Corporation). In total, BRPC received 17 responses to the request for comments. To allow Committee members enough time to review those comments, staff distributed the comments in two packets to the Committee on Friday, May 13th and Monday, May 16th. Mr. Matuszko noted that many of the responses were supportive of the report and its content, specifically the inclusion of the Wired West project proposal as a high regional priority.

To address the submitted comments, Mr. Matuszko explained staff took comments that were purely editorial or were deemed to be editorial by staff (i.e. changing or insertion of a word here and there) and made those changes. Mr. Matuszko further noted that Mr. Bolton had made a number of editorial comments, some related to the data, which staff went ahead and addressed those edits. Suggested comments that were deemed substantive (i.e. the striking of a paragraph or suggestion that add new projects), staff determined action by the Committee would be necessary to approve the changes. It was then suggested, by Mr. Matuszko, that the Committee spend the bulk of today's meeting discussion the more substantive comments and figuring out how to address them; with the hope that the plan could be accepted by the Committee and moved to the BRPC full-commission for action. Mr. Matuszko then asked whether Committee members agreed with this plan. Seeing no objections, Mr. Matuszko began discussing the first substantive comment; comments will be presented/discussed in order of receipt.

Potential Change #1

Mr. Matuszko explained that in addition to the editorial suggestions, Mr. Bolton had proposed a number of changes to *Chapter 6 Performance Measures*. He mentioned that this section was intended to lay out a structure for how the CEDS process would evaluate its implementation and success moving forward. In the Handout Packet, Mr. Matuszko explained that staff had developed some possible suggested language to initiate the discussion of the proposed changes. Mr. Bolton's suggested changes and the Committee's comments on each suggestion were:

- *On the first measure, I would include wording about the quality of the jobs, meaning wage level and other dimensions.*

Mr. Matuszko briefly discussed the proposed suggestion and how staff interpreted the change, as well as staff's proposed language addressing the change. Mr. Bolton added that any jobs are better than no jobs. He further explained that he didn't intend to abandoned the use of "number of jobs created" as a performance measure. He merely wanted to add some regarding the quality of those jobs. Mr. Bolton then provided some revised language to be considered by the Committee, which stated: "How many jobs have been created and retained? How many of those jobs have been high quality in the sense of wage levels, working conditions, etc." Another Committee member asked staff how easy it would be to gather information pertaining to quality of jobs? Mr. Matuszko thought that staff should be able to collect this data. He also mentioned, in the broader sense that data collection is going to be an ongoing hurdle for staff. Over the next year staff will be working to identify and gather quality data from different sources. **Mr. Matuszko asked for any additional comments. Seeing none, staff will revise the first performance measure according to Mr. Bolton's latest suggestion.**

- *On the third measure, I would add "nonprofit organizations." They can be significant employers. The Berkshires are an attractive place for new national/regional organizations concerned with the arts, environmental protection, retiree populations, etc. Then change "industry sectors" to "economic sectors."*

Mr. Matuszko briefly mentioned the proposed suggestion and how staff interpreted the change, as well as staff's proposed language addressing the change. A Committee member asked Mr. Bolton whether he envisioned "foundations" to be considered as a non-profit. Mr. Bolton said, "Yes." There was a brief discussion of the difference between non-profit and tax-exemption. To clarify, Mr. Bolton explained that he wanted the non-profits identified because they employ a great number of people, so it would be important to recognize them. Another Committee member explained that they saw the term "non-profit" as a very broad catchall and that this was really a data issue that would be fleshed out in the coming year. Mr. Matuszko agreed that the term "non-profit" was very broad; therefore, staff would have more leeway to collect data. Mr. Matuszko asked whether there were any additional comments. A Committee member asked whether we are measuring the number of businesses that are closing or merging. To clarify, the Committee member explained that the true measure of success is the number of businesses that stay in business. Mr. Matuszko thought that suggestion would fit better as another performance

measure. The Committee member suggested that the third measure just be reworded to read, "What is the number of business and non-profit organization startups, mergers and closures since the implementation of the CEDS." **Mr. Matuszko asked the rest of the Committee if they agreed with the suggested language. Seeing no objections, staff will revise the third performance measure as suggested.** To address the last part of this suggested change, Mr. Matuszko explained that the word "industry" was to be replaced with "economic." **Mr. Matuszko asked the Committee if they agreed with the change. Seeing no objections, the language will be revised according to Mr. Bolton's suggested language.**

- *Finally, eventually we would want to include a measure of the growth of the startups.*

Mr. Matuszko explained that staff felt the measuring of startups was already incorporated into the third measure, therefore, staff made no suggested changes. After re-reading the language, Mr. Bolton agreed that the language was acceptable.

Potential Change #2

Mr. Matuszko explained that the suggested change had been made by William Mulholland, a Pittsfield Economic Revitalization Corporation (PERC) committee member, at their April 15th meeting. The suggested change and the Committee's comments on the suggestion were:

- *William Mulholland suggested including the Compact for Higher Education goal that all citizens in Berkshire County achieve 16 years of education or training. That was a collective goal to get that workforce to be developed here and stay here. The younger kids are having bachelor degree which is important for their future and it will add a lot of clout as part of our work goals.*

Mr. Matuszko briefly discussed the proposed suggestion. He explained that after considering the change, staff thought it would be appropriate to include language in Chapter 4: The Action Plan for Economic Prosperity under Goal 4 and/or in Chapter 5: Implementation of the Berkshire CEDS under the Berkshire Compact activity. While the intent of staff's proposed language addressed the comment, a Committee member was concerned that different trades may find the language objectionable. Those objections may be focused around the fact that there is more than one path for education after high school, trades, and that it doesn't necessarily take 16-years. A Committee member noted that this is the 1st goal in the *Berkshire Compact for Higher Education* (Compact). Another Committee member mentioned, according to that goal the word "aspirations" is used instead of "achieve." Ms. Ruffer, Pittsfield CDD, clarified that PERC's intent was to reinforce the Compact as an important partner of economic development throughout Berkshire County and to embrace its goals. It was asked whether the language from the Compact's goal be used as an objective. Mr. Matuszko stated that staff could review the Compact's language and incorporate it into an objective. A Committee member was concerned that any language not be at the expense of vocational training and that any emphasis to "16-years" may still be objectionable. Therefore, the Committee member recommended language like, "Citizens of Berkshire County aspire to post-high school." Rather than limiting it to a specific term. **Mr. Matuszko asked whether Committee members were amenable to using language similar to that of the Compact. Seeing no objection, the Committee agreed.** Mr. Matuszko then transitioned the discussion to the incorporation of another "Next Step" in the Berkshire Compact implementation activity. He explained the language would be changed to mirror the Compact. There was some discussion of what language should be used in a new next step. A Committee Member, from their phone, read the goals from the Compact. After hearing the goals, a Committee member noted that any language used should be derived from the Compact. Another Committee member asked why language couldn't just be incorporated that states the CEDS is encouraging and/or supportive of the Compact. Another Committee member asked for clarification as to where such language would be incorporated. The Committee member stated that the general and broad statement could be used as an objective and then the goals used as next steps in the Implementation section. To ensure everyone understood what was being proposed, Mr. Sexton explained that the suggestion is to add an objective that states, "Encourage and support the goals of the Berkshire Compact for Higher Education" and then incorporate the goals of the Compact as next steps in the Implementation section. **Since a different proposal addressing the Comment from PERC was suggested, Mr. Matuszko asked whether the Committee was acceptable of the latest alternative. Seeing no objections, staff will add a broad objective under Goal 4 discussing the support for the Compact and then revise the next steps under the Berkshire Compact implementation activity to mirror the Compacts goals.**

Potential Change #3

Mr. Matuszko then began to discuss the suggested changes that were submitted by the City of Pittsfield and the possible methods to addressing those changes. The suggested changes and the Committee's comments on the potential changes were:

- *Add a Limited Access Connector Highway project (Massachusetts Turnpike through Pittsfield and north to North Adams)*

Mr. Matuszko briefly explained where staff thought the inclusion of such a project may fit within the Project Priority List. A Committee member, questioned whether the inclusion of a Limited Access Connector Highway project was a deviation to the Regional Highway Access Improvement project proposal? Mr. Sexton explained that staff understood the incorporation of the Limited Access Highway as a separate project. This project is another way to address the regional access issue discussed under the Regional Highway Access Improvement project proposal. A Committee member noted that he had taken it for granted that there was still work being done on a Limited Access Connector Highway (Bypass). The Association of the Berkshire Chamber of Commerce was initially organized, 15-20 years ago, to support the development of the Bypass. The Committee member assumed that it was always important and didn't understand why BRPC was identifying the Bypass as a project. According to the Committee member, the Bypass is an essential component to spurring economic development in the central and northern portions of the County. There has to be a way to place this project on the list. Another Committee member mentioned that transportation and access is the number one reason, according to them, why site locators don't consider Pittsfield, Adams, North Adams and other communities north of the Massachusetts Turnpike as holding development potential. Not to acknowledge the Bypass project in the plan and not to list it as a regionally important project simply because politically there isn't support for the project or not enough money is a disservice to the plan and the region, according to the Committee member. A Committee member asked whether the listing of the Bypass project is simply an issue of not having a project proposal submitted to review and evaluate? If that was the case, the Committee member asked how we were embracing other plans and ideas to ensure we didn't miss anything in this plan. Mr. Matuszko clarified by explaining that the Regional Highway Access Improvement project proposal was a catchall of projects from the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that would address the region's north-south access issues. The Limited Access Highway was not called out, because it is not mentioned in the RTP. Mr. Matuszko then explained that there were a couple of options available to address this comment: (1) the Limited Access Highway project could be identified as an independent project proposal; (2) the limited access highway concept project could be incorporated into the broader Regional Highway Access Improvement project proposal; or (3) not add the project.

After hearing the Committee's conversation, Mr. Karns explained that BRPC has been the only entity in the region, to his knowledge, that has been actively pursuing or pushing for a north-south limited access highway for the past 15 years. During those years, BRPC has received limited regional support for this effort. If it is felt that a north-south limited access highway is a critical need for the region, then there needs to be substantial support seen from communities and organizations in the region before BRPC is willing to support and/or push for such a project at the state and federal levels. As it stands today, this project has and will not be included in the RTP that BRPC is preparing. As discussed in the RTP, BRPC has been working under the context (over the past 8 years) that the state is not willing to consider a north-south limited access highway; therefore, it was decided to build capacity within the existing system to meet the needs of the region.

A Committee member then mentioned that while it may seem insurmountable, specifically for one organization, to pursue this project; the least painless and maybe the most important venue to acknowledging the need for this project is to have it listed within this plan. Mr. Karns mentioned that while that may be the case, there are other planning documents where this project should be mentioned or letter of support should be written. A Committee member asked if there was a downside to include this project. Mr. Matuszko said, "No." Another Committee member said we should be cautious in truncating a larger process or when there are additional steps necessary for this project to come to fruition, especially when there are limited resources and capital in play. Mr. Karns reinforced that an earlier section in the CEDS report emphasizes that regional access is a strategic weakness. That being said, a project such as this which is presumably meant to address that strategic regional weakness would best fit within the Projects Representing the Greatest Needs Regionally project list. While it is certainly an infrastructure project, it truly embodies a "regional" project.

Ms. Klefos made a motion that the Limited Access Connector Highway project be added as a new project under the Projects Representing the Greatest Needs Regionally project list. To clarify the motion, Mr. Sexton asked Ms. Klefos whether the motion was to have a separate standalone project or if it should be incorporated in the Regional Highway Access Improvement project proposal under the Projects Representing the Greatest Needs Regionally project list. Ms. Klefos said, "It should be kept as a standalone project, yes." **The motion was then seconded by Ms. Burdick. Mr. Matuszko asked if there was any other discussion.** A Committee member preferred the project be placed under the Projects Representing the Greatest Needs Regionally project list, but to have the third item read, "Regional Highway Access Improvements, including a limited access highway serving central and northern Berkshire County." **Ms. Klefos accepted the amendment. Mr. Matuszko asked for any other discussion or comments. Seeing none, he asked for unanimous consent. There were no objections or abstentions.**

- *Add the McKay Street Pedestrian Improvements and Parking Garage Reconstruction*

Seeing a Committee member had a comment on this proposed change, Mr. Matuszko handed the floor to the Committee member. That member suggested that the McKay Street Pedestrian Improvements and Parking Garage Reconstruction be moved under the Central Sub-Region of Projects that Enhance the Region: Physical Development Category. The Committee member also suggested that the West Street Water Line Upgrade project should also be moved to this category. Mr. Matuszko mentioned that a lot of the projects could fit under different categories; however, staff thought is most appropriately fit as an infrastructure project. A number of other Committee members agreed with staff that this project was truly an infrastructure project and should remain in the infrastructure list.

To redirect the discussion, Mr. Matuszko asked the Committee whether they want to include the project in the project priority list or not. He noted that the project didn't rank high during the initial evaluation and again was not moved on to the list after the project proponent solicitation. A Committee member noted that after further discussion and consideration of the projects impact he thought the project should be placed on the priority list. Another Committee member mentioned that after more thought he considered the individuals living outside of Pittsfield whom uses this facility for attending work and/or shop in the stores downtown. In some ways it acts as an incubator business. Mr. Matuszko asked if there were any comments against placing the project on the list. A Committee member asked whether there could or would be any backlash from other project proponents that weren't able to move there project to the list after additional discussion. Mr. Matuszko explained that every project proponent received a solicitation requesting comments on the draft report. He also noted that the public comment period was intended to allow everyone an opportunity to comment and to gather new information/perspectives that would improve the report. Mr. Matuszko asked if there was a motion for the suggested change.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to add the McKay Street Pedestrian Improvements and Parking Garage Reconstruction project on the Project Priority List under the Projects that Enhance the Region: Physical and Technology Infrastructure Category. The motion was seconded by Ms. Velez. Mr. Matuszko asked if there was any additional discussion. Seeing none, he asked for unanimous consent. Seeing no objections or abstentions the motion passed.

- *A comment regarding the overall use of the document stating, "...the resulting document has limited value and should not be used for any purpose other than meeting the pre-requisite for accessing Economic Development Administration grant programs."*

Mr. Matuszko then began to discuss the third comment submitted by the City of Pittsfield. He mentioned that staff didn't develop any suggested language to address the comment, because staff was unaware of how to resolve the issue. To clarify her language, Ms. Ruffer explained that the City and the Committee, in certain instances, has had anxieties about how the project solicitation process went. Specifically, there were concerns of whether this document could or would take on a life of its own in terms of the projects and be used inappropriately for or against projects as they go through funding requests at any level and from any sources. Ms. Ruffer mentioned that if there were language incorporated into the plan, potentially in the Project Priority List section, articulating this as a learning process and that the Committee had in fact identified concerns about the manner in which projects were solicited, the relationship this had to the evaluation process, and mentioning a commitment to evolve and refine the process through annual updates. Such a statement would reflect the work conducted by this Committee. It would also provide information to any state agency that may review/use this document as part of a project application for funding. Mr. Matuszko asked Ms. Ruffer if her intent was to further define and refine how the project solicitation process happened. Another Committee member agreed with Ms. Ruffer; however, she had some concerns that such a statement may raise red flags as to the validity of the process. The Committee member felt more comfortable incorporating language speaking to how the results of the project solicitation process where not what the Committee expected. The Committee member noted that there shouldn't be language added that somehow places the blame of the project solicitation process on the Committee, it was up to independent organizations to submit proposals. Another Committee member agreed and added further that it wasn't the solicitation process specifically, but that the information submitted by project proponents was not complete. Ms. Ruffer added that the evaluation process was another issue that bogged down the Committee. A number of other Committee members noted that this was, in many ways, an initial process and that it could be refined in the subsequent years. A Committee member mentioned that language should not be incorporated that would hurt any individual or organization in their pursuit of EDA funding and to not give any individual the opportunity to use the document as a weapon. Mr. Karns mentioned that while the process may have had its challenges and issues, he expects that there will be new issues and concerns during the next go-around. He then asked the Committee to review the project list and identify any significant gaps or major projects that were missing from the project priority list.

After hearing all the discussion, a Committee member suggested that some language or a paragraph be drafted, in the positive, explaining that that this was a learning process for the Committee and in many ways the County as a whole. While the results may have been unexpected, the Committee is dedicated to refining and improving the process as it moves forward. Mr. Matuszko agreed noted that that could be done. He noted that the language should identify some of the issues we ran into and some limitation of the process, while not impugning the process. Mr. Matuszko then asked Ms. Ruffer, to clarify, that the City's concerns focused on the evaluation process and how that lead to the prioritization of projects. While those may be the primary points from the City, a number of Committee members made recommendations that the language of such a statement should be keep broad and speak to the fact that this is an ongoing process that will have annual updates to improve this process in the future. A Committee member noted that the language should also speak to or be sensitive to the State's impressions of this report. **Mr. Matuszko asked if there were any Committee members that were against including a brief statement speaking to the discussed above. Seeing none, Mr. Matuszko then asked whether the Committee wished to review the language before it is incorporated into the report. The Committee said, "yes."**

Potential Change #4

Mr. Matuszko then began to discuss the suggested changes that were submitted by MassDevelopment and the possible methods to addressing those changes. The suggested changes and the Committee's comments on the potential changes were:

- *Add Massachusetts Office of Business Development as a partner under the Business Development Assistance measure*
- *Add MassDevelopment as a partner under the Berkshire Brownfields Program measure*

A Committee member clarified the first proposed change, in that MassDevelopment had requested that Massachusetts Office of Business Development be added as a partner under the Business Development Assistance measure. Mr. Sexton stated, "Yes." Briefly, the Committee discussed what name should be used to identify MassDevelopment. **Mr. Matuszko asked the Committee if there were any objections to the additions. Seeing none, Mr. Matuszko said staff would make the changes.**

Potential Change #5

Mr. Matuszko then began to discuss the suggested changes that were submitted by the Berkshire Chamber of Commerce and the possible methods to addressing those changes. The suggested changes and the Committee's comments on the potential changes were:

- *Consider eliminating the example of the river from this section*

To clarify the comment, Mr. Matuszko asked if Mr. Supranowicz would be willing to speak to the suggested change. Mr. Supranowicz explained that the Chamber didn't feel there was any specific analysis conducted by the Committee to identify contaminated sites; therefore some language, such as the word "labeled," should be added to recognize that the site were being identified as contaminated based on outside information (i.e. EPA, DEP, etc..). Furthermore, since the Housatonic River is a hot issue with supporters on both side, the Chamber felt it was best to eliminate the reference. Mr. Matuszko noted that the river reference was discussed previously and deemed important to incorporate. He noted, however, that the Committee has the ability to change that. Mr. Karns noted that it is important to recognize contaminated sites. He then provided the Committee with a couple examples (i.e. Lee's Mills). Mr. Supranowicz asked, "Who has listed those sites as contaminated?" Mr. Karns said, "the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection." Based on that information, Mr. Supranowicz suggested that language be added to clarify that. Mr. Sexton suggested that the mentioning of the assessment may help to educate and direct the read as to how and why sites are labeled as contaminated. Mr. Karns agreed that the use of the river reference was really necessary, but reinforced that it is important to recognize the presence of contaminated sites in the region as a regional weakness. A Committee member asked whether "identified" could be used as opposed to "labeled." Mr. Matuszko suggested that language such as "per the Environmental Protection Agency, Massachusetts and other agencies" be added after the word "contaminated." **Mr. Matuszko asked whether the Committee agreed to the addition of Mr. Matuszko's suggested language, use the word "labeled" and the reference to the river be deleted. The Committee agreed.**

- *A limited access highway would truly be the most positive economic growth mechanism for many regions in the county, including the William Stanley Business Park with its rail access. The report may benefit by not including language that indicates this project is not feasible, unless there is objective published data that suggests otherwise.*

Mr. Matuszko asked Mr. Supranowicz whether he felt this comment had been addressed as a result of

incorporating the North-South Limited Access Connector Highway project into the Project Priority List. Mr. Supranowicz said, "yes." (There was no further discussion on this comment.)

- *Is it possible that naming locations for projects that merit county benefits could have adverse effects by such naming? Will a sports complex project in a community other than the named one in the report be considered for funding on an equal basis as one named? If not, the committee should reconsider the naming on any such projects in the report.*

To clarify the comment, Mr. Supranowicz explained that the Chambers was concerned about how the identification and association of a specific project with a location may preclude other persons or organizations from pursuing the funding for a similar type of project, he used the indoor soccer facility as an example. Mr. Matuszko explained that location of a project was used as part of the process used to identify priority projects. Mr. Supranowicz agreed. However, he also noted that this was part of the problem with the evaluation process, because Committee members were unsure whether they were to be ranking the projects that were submitted or trying to identify the significant economic development projects regionally. A Committee member mentioned that regardless of the location many of the projects on the Project Priority List will have a regional impact. A Committee member suggested that the location be eliminated from the name (i.e. changing Berkshire Mall/Civic Center/Hotel to Civic Center/Hotel), but that the location is maintained in the project narrative. **Mr. Matuszko asked whether the Committee agreed with the suggestion. Seeing no objections, Mr. Matuszko stated that staff would make the change.**

Potential Change #6

Mr. Matuszko then began to discuss the suggested change submitted by the Sheffield Land Trust and the possible methods to addressing those changes. The suggested changes and the Committee's comments on the potential changes were:

- Add "agriculture" or "agricultural" to "The Vision for the Berkshires" statement, such as:

The Committee briefly discussed how the word be included. It was suggested that the word "agriculture" be used, but that "and" be changed to a ",". **Mr. Matuszko asked whether the Committee was agreeable to the change. Seeing no objections, Mr. Matuszko stated that staff would make the change.**

5. Next Steps

Mr. Matuszko explained that the edits discussed today would be made and then staff would forward the plan to the BRPC full-commission for adoption at the June 20th meeting. In according with the EDA's regulations, however, this plan must be first approved by the CEDS Strategy Committee before the Commission adopts it. With that said, Mr. Matuszko asked the Committee if there was a motion to approve the plan, as amended.

Ms. LaRoche made a motion to approve the plan as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ludwizewski. Mr. Matuszko asked if there was any additional discussion. Seeing none, Mr. Matuszko asked for any objections or abstentions. Seeing none, the motion was unanimously passed.

6. Next Meeting/Steps (Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 12:30pm)

Since the Committee approved the 2011 Berkshire CEDS, as amended, Mr. Matuszko explained that the previously scheduled meeting for Tuesday, May 24th would not be necessary. He did note, however, that if the BRPC full-commission has the ability to remand the plan back to the committee for changes.

7. Other Items?

No items were raised.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

Documents distributed at the meeting included:

- Meeting Agenda
- Draft Minutes from the April 12, 2011 CEDS Strategy Committee meeting
- A Handout Packet containing possible suggested language from staff to address the comments received