<u>Wayland Real Asset Planning Committee</u>
December 11, 2015 – 9:00 AM
APPROVED – 12/30/15

<u>Present</u>: Anette Lewis (presiding); Tom Abdella and Gretchen Schuler.

<u>Also Present</u>: Nan Balmer, Brendan Decker, Brian Keveny, Sarkis Sarkisian.

<u>Public Comment</u>.   None.

<u>Minutes</u>   The minutes for November 12, 2015 and December 3, 2015 were approved as amended at the end of the meeting.

<u>Update of WRAP progress: Potential Outline of Topics for Report of WRAP.</u> Anette Lewis discussed the outline dated 10.30.15 to give staff members in attendance an idea of the types of information that the WRAP Committee will need in order to present a report on its findings to Town Meeting. She listed the criteria relating to buildings/structures and those related to municipally owned land. The information will assist the Committee in knowing which parcels the town owns and considering what the best use for each would be. Ms. Lewis explained that it is important to tie the building data to the GIS. Brendan Decker, GIS Specialist, explained that he is looking into programs that will tie the GIS to MUNIS. Brian Keveny, Finance Director, then explained that MUNIS is an operating system that the IT department should be overseeing; however presently there is not a staff person in IT with the skill set to oversee this operating system as they have been focused on hardware rather than software. Thus the job falls to Mr. Keveny since he uses MUNIS for financial side of town data, where in fact he is not conversant in other applications of MUNIS so has to stop and learn more about the operating system in order to help other departments use applications relevant to their departments.

Next, Ms. Lewis discussed demographics as part of the report. Sarkis Sarkisian, Planning Director, asked if we had received the water study which he will send to Ms. Lewis and put on WRAP webpage. In preparing the section of report on Siting Strategy the Committee is looking at other studies that developed criteria for analyzing sites such as the Salt Shed report and the DPW report. In mentioning the "Criteria for establishing Priorities and Sequencing" section of the report, Ms. Lewis explained that the Committee is looking for measurable characteristics to make it objective. Included in sequencing is the debt policy of the FinCom. Can the town sustain the debt for major projects at the same time? Mr. Keveny noted that debt comes off the ledger as new debt is added and the FinCom tries to maintain a 10% level of debt to overall budget. He spoke of a finance report that the FinCom will be discussing next week. Ms. Lewis asked if the report tells of what or how much debt can be added over time. It was noted that WRAP needs a debt model to put in projects to determine whether the town can handle the level of debt.

The conversation turned to the value of a Capital Planning Committee that could focus on developing a longer-range plan and how to pay and how to borrow for capital projects. Several agreed that the town would benefit from more discipline on long term processes. Presently the FinCom will make decisions on 2017 but not on future budgets. We need that long term vision. Nan Balmer, Town Administrator, said that she believes that the town needs a plan and would like to bring in a representative from Local Services Division of Department of Revenue to help with such a plan. Additional discussion led to a strong recommendation for a Capital Planning Committee to be established by Town Meeting. It was noted that WRAP grew out of a recommendation for a capital planning committee.

Ms. Balmer asked for a copy of the draft outline to add to the Board of Selectmen's packet to prep them for the discussion of WRAP progress on the Board's agenda for Monday December 14th. Ms.

Lewis will represent WRAP at that meeting. It has been clear that the BOS is anticipating recommendations from WRAP on where to locate two projects that will be before the town – the Library and a Council on Aging/ Community Center.

On this topic Tom Abdella stated that the larger issue is how can these projects be accomplished together. He stated that it is pretty clear that residents want a library (addition or new) and a community center/COA; yet it seems that they have not sat down and talked to one another to understand overlap of programming and planning. It was recommended that WRAP may be able to engage multiple groups to have this conversation including Library trustees, COA Board, community center advisory committee and Recreation Commission with the topic being a Building considered as a need for all four.

WRAP to Staff – Staff to WRAP. The largest missing piece is information on facilities most of which is not in the data base and will be provided by Ben Keefe, Facilities Director. There was a brief discussion about the role of Town Administrator and policies affecting town-owned properties as well as the management of data. Ms. Balmer pointed out that the position of Town Administrator is not structured to give the TA the authority to make policy decisions that would affect issues of use of town owned parcels and buildings. Ms. Lewis noted that in her view the purpose of changing to a TA form of leadership was to have the TA take care of management issues and the BOS to focus on policy.

Mr. Decker stated that he is chipping away at verifying information about each town-owned property and entering into GIS data base. He plans to finish up in the new year. Recently Ms. Schuler sent him a list of key properties on which he will work first. They are properties that are not Conservation, larger than a few acres and either of interest or with buildings that may be in flux.

Ms. Lewis asked Mr. Sarkisian to organize the webpage by document types so that the three items related to Growth Policy of the 1990s be under one heading – perhaps Prior Studies, that the reports to WRAP from town boards and commissions be filed together, etc. It was also determined that Ms. Schuler will send items to Mr. Sarkisian for the website after the Committee members have had an opportunity to review them.

Mr. Sarkisian asked that someone on WRAP report to the Planning Board. Since the WRAP chair, Colleen Sheehan, is on the PB, she will report.

At this point most of staff members left and the three WRAP members continued their discussion on the following issues:

Decision Criteria Matrix. Mr. Abdella took the Draft Capital Improvements Decision Criteria Matrix that Ms. Lewis had prepared for last meeting, consolidated the information tried to apply the matrix to the library project. All three members present agreed that the results did not show any clear recommendation.

Each criterion and factors of the criterion were discussed to try to understand what types of answers the Committee expects and what that information will tell about each project. When discussing public perception members wondered if people select a community for its community resources – for instance do we need a community center in order to be of interest to newcomers. Would real estate brokers know whether services make a community desirable and contribute to the real estate value?   Is the real question: whether a project would have a positive impact on real estate values or how do municipal resources affect real estate values? A factor to consider is: Are there alternatives – for instance new construction/renovation – would the cost of each contribute to deciding which way to lean?

Mr. Abdella suggested that the matrix should be broken into four pages: the first would have three columns: Criteria/Factors/Weight: the next would be Projects; the third would be siting criteria for parcels; the fourth would be the key or instructions – what is meant by each column and row.

Mr. Abdella also suggested a scoring mechanism that was then tried by him, Ms. Lewis and Ms. Schuler. It included:

	Criteria	Factors	Weight
1.	Public Health & Safety	*Project addresses an immediate hazard or public health/safety need	4 x (*)
2.	Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements	*Project required by compliance with regs. *Project required by court order	3 x (*)
3.	Stated Community Goals	*Project conforms to adopted plan *Asset Preservation *Required to maintain standard *More efficient /improved standard	2 x (*)
4.	Public Perception of Need	*Sustained change in demographic *Improve sustainability of environment	1 x (*)

In discussing the Library it was asked whether the trustees could give us: renovation footprint and square footage and parking for that square footage.

It was also noted that part of the thought process should be to build for future growth – for instance the library addition of 1987-88 did not take into account the possibility of future growth by adding sufficient infrastructure for a future second story. The alternatives to the project that the Committee will consider are things such as site alternatives, project alternatives, programming alternatives, whether the programs are available elsewhere.

FinCom will appoint a new member to WRAP. Mr. Abdella stated that he thought it is unlikely that a member of FinCom will be the appointee and that they are likely to look to residents. He believes that someone who is a good strategic thinker would be appropriate.

Next Meetings

December 17th (Thurs.) 7:30 PM
Week of December 28 ?
Week of January 4th Meeting with Library/COA/COACC/Recreation

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 PM following a 3-0-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Gretchen G. Schuler

Materials Received at Meeting
1) Draft #2 Capital Improvements – Decision Criteria Matrix (12-11-15, Abdella)