

**Town of Wayland  
Economic Development Committee  
October 10, 2012  
Meeting Minutes**

**Attendance:**

Rebecca Stanizzi	Chair
George Uveges	Member
Nick Willard	Member
Sam Potter	Member
Dave Watkins	Member

**Guests:**

Linda Segal	Guest
Ed Hannan	Guest
Betty Salzberg	Guest
Andy Irwin	Guest
Mary Antes	Guest

**Selectmen:**

John Bladon	BOS
Steven Correia	BOS
Edward J. Collins	BOS
Douglas J. Leard	BOS

---

Rebecca Stanizzi called the meeting of the Economic Development Committee (EDC) to order at 7:00 pm at the Council on Aging's Office with the following Agenda:

- Presentation to Board of Selectmen: Thursday October 10

Mr. Potter first presented the findings of the Environmental Study An executive summary was distributed and reviewed (attached).

Ms. Stanizzi then presented the findings related to the Market Study. An executive summary was distributed and reviewed (attached).

Questions and Answers from the Selectmen and Wayland Citizens:

Q1. What will the development look like?

Answer: The development will be similar to Traditions in building scale, 3 to 4 stories in height, and 216 units (where Traditions has 2 buildings and 100 units, this project will likely be 4 buildings for 216 units).

Q2. If we create 216 units would Wayland's 40B issue be solved?

Answer: 216 units would get the town to the 10% affordability threshold it needs to achieve to preclude 40B projects (the 10% of course has to be continued to be maintained)

Q3. How would the over 55 age restriction be enforced?

Answer: The Town would put deed restrictions, and/or zoning restrictions, on the land so that it's permanent.

Q4. Will there be a preference for affordable units to be given to Wayland Residents first?

Answer: Yes

Q5. How will seniors living in the development get around?

Answer: For those who can drive (recall this is an independent senior housing project, not assisted living or high-level-of-care facility), Town Center is nearby, just across the River. For those who may not want or be able to drive, with a critical mass of 216 units, it's likely that a shuttle service could be provided. The Town would also likely look to tie the project in with existing MWRTA routes. Of course, EDC also would like to try to link the project to the upcoming bike path across Rt 20, for safer pedestrian access to Town Center and for exercise/recreation.

Q6. Who is the local competition for this project for independent senior rental housing?

Answer: On Route 20 there are several alternatives for independent seniors, most typically non-age restricted housing in Sudbury and Marlborough, or out at Routes 128 or 495. There is no significant competition currently available within Wayland.

Q7. Have we done a legal assessment on the Sudbury Issue, i.e. the termination of the joint septage facility agreement?

Answer: Yes

Q8. After Town Meeting Approval, how long would it take for the project to actually be built?

Answer: The following timeline is a rough estimate:

- 90-120 days to line up Buyer
- 90-120 days for entitlement review
- Shovel ready within 60 days after review (given Town Meeting April 2013, roughly by end 2013, early 2014)

Q9. Is the sale intended to be contingent on permitting or environmental or other conditions?

Answer: The intent is to sell the property with as few contingencies as possible, hence why EDC is completing much of the due diligence that a developer would typically do, to provide a comprehensive RFP (Request for Proposal) to minimize contingencies for the Town as Seller.

Q10. What are the origins of the soil stockpiles and what are the protocols used for testing?

Answer: Protocols for testing are designed for where the soil came from; the soil stockpiles have been determined to have generally originated in Wayland, therefore this protocol will be used.

Q11. How will a potential Buyer test the dirt pile and assume the responsibility for cleanup?

Answer: Phase I & II preliminary testing should provide the Buyer comfort that there is not a large liability within the dirt piles; however, without comprehensive testing all the way to the bottom of the pile (not financially practical), a Buyer may insist on indemnification from the Town. Recall this liability is the Town's anyway; however, the goal would be to minimize exposure for the Town within the purchase price. At the time of the sale, the Town, like any private seller, would likely set aside some portion of the sales proceeds until the pile identification is completed and the liability is closed. The exposure is expected in the low six figures -- this is not expected to be a large seven-figure exposure, based on the testing to date and the known history of the piles and the site.

Q12. What is the environmental liability for Wayland vs. Sudbury?

Answer: The issue is dependent upon where the problem emanates from. Environmental issues emanating from Sudbury landfill would be Sudbury; issues emanating from Wayland's land would be Wayland; any issues emanating from Wayland and Sudbury's joint use of the septage facility would be joint.

Q13. Is the arsenic from Sudbury?

Answer: Arsenic has been reported at Sudbury landfill monitoring points, and so it is expected on our site, since we're downgradient toward the River. (Therefore, it was not tested, since if it were identified, it could be a reportable condition to DEP.) An audience member noted that arsenic is also present along riverbeds, so it may be naturally occurring as well. So either or both could be the case. However, at the end of the day, since the presence of arsenic only precludes siting a drinking well on site, which we do not plan to do, then its presence is moot.

Q14. Will any 3-BR family housing be included within the project?

Answer: The market study specifically recommends smaller units, i.e. 1 and 2 bedroom units, since these create the most value per square foot, but also for the simple reason that this housing type (rental apartments) is for people who may not be able to afford home ownership, or don't want to be saddled with ownership costs, so they are price sensitive. So in the market-rate units, it doesn't make sense to have 3-bedroom units, since if a family with children can afford \$3000/mo rent, they would probably look for a small starter home with a yard instead. However, this question may make sense in the affordable units (if 25% are non-age restricted, and 25% of these are affordable), to perhaps set aside a couple of the 2BR units as 3BR, since the rents will be capped? EDC will keep this in mind during planning.

EDC will reach out to other community boards, committees and groups in the coming weeks to report on the findings. EDC requested that if the Selectmen have any questions or comments that they may hear from people around Town, then to please forward them to EDC, we would be happy to provide or research answers.

To that end, EDC mentioned two questions that have been raised in other settings, since Selectmen may be asked the questions in passing around Town, and EDC suggests the following feedback:

Q15. Why would anyone want to live there? Won't Route 20 be too loud?

Answer: Sound attenuation (noise insulation) will likely be built into the buildings, especially in those closest to Route 20, to generally reduce the sound impacts. If someone is noise sensitive, they'll still likely choose a building closer to the woods at the back of the site. At its core, yes these are multi-story apartment buildings, some along a busy road, which may or may not appeal to everyone. If someone has lived on a quiet road with a big backyard for decades, and has the financial wherewithal to stay there, they might not be able to *ever* imagine living at this proposed Route 20 project. However, traveling along Route 20 from Routes 128 to 495 shows a road lined with housing from end to end, so many people do in fact live along Route 20, every day. So just because an individual may not be able to picture *themselves* living there, it doesn't mean that they *have* to live there, we are just providing housing options well within the realm of what's currently available in other towns.

Q16. What happens if the developer comes back and demands that the age restriction be lifted, like Wayland Commons?

A. Wayland Commons is a condo development at Wayland Center which began as 55+ but then needed the age restriction lifted. However, apartments (rentals) are inherently different than condominiums (for-sale housing). Apartment rents meet the market: if the demand goes down, the rents follow, if demand goes up, the rents follow. In a down market, a developer/owner will cut rents low enough to be able to fill the building instead of letting it sit partially empty, and hope to recoup higher rents later. (Or if it doesn't recoup later, the bank may take it back and resell to someone else at a lower basis who will own and maintain it at the lower rents). A condominium can only be sold once, therefore making it much less price elastic – and prone to developers asking for the age restriction to be lifted. So by its nature an apartment project should be able to hold its age restriction, and the Town can and should be firm about it.

The full Phase I and Phase II Report and full Market Study report will be posted on EDC's website shortly, for download and review by anyone who is curious for more detail beyond the executive summaries.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30p.

Meeting notes respectfully submitted by Dave Watkins.



# River's Edge Board of Selectman Presentation

October 10, 2012

## EDC Committee Members



- Rebecca Stanizzi – Chair
- Sam Potter
- Nick Willard
- George Uveges
- Dave Watkins

# ESA LOCUS PLAN



# Firing Range



# Lead Assessment Grid



Site Assessment Summary  
Date: 10/1/2014  
Location: [redacted]  
Project: [redacted]  
Prepared by: [redacted]  
Reviewed by: [redacted]

# Soil Stock Pile





## Soil Stock Pile Composition



## View from Soil Stock Pile





# Market Study



Subject Capture Summary	Market Area	Affordable	Market Rate	Total
<b>Base Case Scenarios</b>				
1. 100% Unrestricted (218 Units)	Combined Mix	1.0%	5.4%	2.4%
	PSMA	4.4%	10.9%	7.3%
	SMA	0.4%	1.3%	0.8%
2. 100% 55+ Age-Restricted (218 units)	Combined Mix	2.2%	12.2%	3.0%
	PSMA	4.4%	19.3%	15.0%
	SMA	0.5%	2.0%	1.0%
<b>Risk Mitigation Strategies/Age-Restricted Program Variations</b>				
A. 100% - 55+ Age-Restricted Program Size - 218 Units	Combined Mix	1.0%	10.1%	4.7%
	PSMA	7.3%	16.8%	11.0%
	SMA	0.5%	2.2%	0.9%
B. 100% - 55+ Age-Restricted Program Size - 180 Units	Combined Mix	1.0%	9.4%	4.4%
	PSMA	7.4%	14.9%	11.0%
	SMA	0.5%	1.2%	0.8%
C. 20% - Unrestricted Program Size - 54 Units	Combined Mix	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
	PSMA	2.3%	5.1%	4.0%
	SMA	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
70% - 55+ Age-Restricted Program Size - 182 Units	Combined Mix	1.0%	9.4%	4.5%
	PSMA	7.4%	14.8%	11.0%
	SMA	0.5%	2.3%	0.8%
D. 20% - 50-54 Age-Restricted Program Size - 54 Units	Combined Mix	0.9%	10.5%	11.1%
	PSMA	12.3%	40.3%	34.0%
	SMA	2.2%	4.5%	3.5%
70% - 55+ Age-Restricted Program Size - 182 Units	Combined Mix	1.0%	9.4%	4.5%
	PSMA	7.4%	14.8%	11.0%
	SMA	0.5%	2.3%	0.8%
<b>Feasibility Metrics - PSMA</b>				
	Market Rate	Total		
	-10%	-10%		
	10%-15%	10%-12%		
	-15%	-15%		

# Next Steps



- Balance of Civil
- ANRAD / Wetlands
- Septic
- Site Plan
- Work with Sudbury
- Legal
- Outreach
- Prepare for TM