

Wayland Real Asset Planning Committee

August 1, 2016 – 7:30 PM

APPROVED 8/17/16

Present. Tom Abdella, Anette Lewis (presiding), Nicole Riley and Gretchen Schuler.

Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 7:34 PM by Anette Lewis who reviewed the agenda. As there was no public comment the meeting proceeded with the agenda.

Minutes. The minutes of July 11, 2016 were approved as amended by a vote of 4-0-0.

Update on PMBC Meeting and Library's Site Selection Process. Ms. Lewis reported that she had sent matrices to Permanent Municipal Building Committee (PMBC) asking for comments from PMBC point of view. She had heard from one member but has requested input from committee. There was discussion of sending site selection and project selection matrices to various boards for input once they are in draft final form.

At the PMBC meeting the Library Board of Trustees presented its site selection criteria for new library project. The criteria list is similar to the one that WRAP has devised. Based on the scoring, the Library proponents will look further at the current Library site at 5 Concord Road and at the 195/207 Main Street site (former Highway Garage). There was no discussion by the PMBC of the attributes of each of those sites. That will occur at the next scheduled PMBC meeting on August 2 when the Library Trustees present architectural space renderings.

At the subsequent Library Forum, the architects showed the siting of a library building at 195/207 Main Street, in the southeast corner of the site up against the slope with the parking on the north side of the building. As presented, restraints to that library location are the old landfill, the location of the driveway (which the architects thought would cost too much to relocate) and the drainage already on 207 Main Street. The architects said that the way in which the present library site at 5 Concord Road could be used would require tearing down the existing addition and building out from there and also adding on to the south side of the existing building. Ms. Lewis noted that she again reiterated the potential of closing/discontinuing the southern part of Concord Road (Route 126) to gain more useable land and providing access to the Library via the little-used Library Lane 50-foot right-of-way. There was no discussion of potential future use of existing library if new library is located at 195/207 Main Street. Mr. Abdella asked if there was any discussion about reducing the scope. Ms. Lewis said that she only heard discussion about need to satisfy state guidelines in order to be eligible for the grant. At the forum, Ms. Lewis also asked about expansion possibilities at either location.

Ms. Schuler asked about scoring. Ms. Lewis reported that 24 people scored the sites and they took the average.

Site Selection and Project Selection Matrix. Tom Abdella has written draft instructions for the Site Selection Criteria Matrix. In presenting the instructions to WRAP members he said his goal was to lay out how many items to look at, how one could score, how one is making an assignment. He noted that at this point most of issues are value judgements except for perhaps environmental. Ms. Riley noted that the matrices could be completed by boards impacted by a specific project in order to get well-rounded knowledge about a specific project and/or site. If not applicable one would be instructed to put N/A for Not Applicable. Members discussed information that should be included in the directions for filling out matrices and noted that not all

projects would look at each item on the selection matrices. The consensus is that project proponents would fill out the project matrix first and then apply to potential sites.

Mr. Abdella will forward a Word file of Site Selection directions and will next work on Project Selection directions. Additional discussion of Site Selection Directions led to conclusion that outside consultant input may be necessary to understand capital expenses of many physical site features. Mr. Abdella suggested that we each try to think about the questions that one would have to answer about each feature under consideration. Mr. Abdella also noted that Physical Site Features should be considered in the context of the project – of how it relates to the given site – thus not considering the site generically. A project proponent should do site selection first and then a committee like WRAP, a capital facilities committee, and/or the Permanent Municipal Building Committee would confirm. In the instructions Mr. Abdella referenced departments and boards that could provide assistance in answering questions in Site Selection Matrix. In most cases since it should be factual material he referenced departments so that one would get the information more rapidly than waiting for a board to meet, consider and vote. Obtaining rapid responses may need some enforcement from the Town Administrator to encourage departments to respond quickly. Under Physical Site Features there should be a question about the potential for future expansion.

Access to utilities needs to be further clarified to understand costs of available capacity. More information would be necessary such as distance to utilities that impacts cost. In discussion of cost of utilities it was pointed out that #6 (Access to Utilities) should not have cost in it – the cost should be part of #9 (Cost of Site Development). Mr. Abdella will add in Instructions to #9 that cost of utilities should be considered there. Ms. Lewis discussed permitting costs and mentioned that Wayland's Zoning Bylaw was amended in 2011 to move Site Plan Approval to the Building Commissioner only for Library and Museums as well as schools, daycare and religious uses (Dover Amendment uses).

In looking at Library scoring sheet, Ms. Schuler asked if anyone knew how library considered costs such as “higher than” or “lower than.” She wondered higher than what? On the scoring matrix the cost of construction at the existing Library site is higher than the other two. How was this determined? It was noted that the scoring may be done more than once – to be repeated after more information is known.

Members then looked at WRAP scoring matrix and the Library's scoring sheet together to understand whether all are asking for same information. The Library site matrix had a category for parking and ability to have future expansion. It was determined that WRAP should add parking to its matrix. In addition the Library Scoring Matrix had a category titled “Community Sentiment /Considerations” under which they had architectural significance. WRAP matrix does not have community sentiment as a category as it is too subjective. WRAP determined not to add architectural significance because it already is captured in Environmental impact language “Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity” and generally “architectural significance would only apply to a site with an existing building.”

Site Consideration Sheets. Ms. Schuler said that she did not ask for the revised sheets to be posted on the website until members had reviewed the additions. It was recommended that Parcel #s be added to each sheet. Also she will move Zone II information further up list near facts about site – before Updated Septic information.

Demographics. Both Ms. Lewis and Mr. Abdella have explored why the Annual Report demographics differ substantially from the state and US census demographics. Mr. Abdella explained that one reason is that voters who move out of town are kept on rolls through two elections unless they have re-enrolled in a new town. There is no knowledge as to how

households are counted. The Town needs to determine which information to use when writing reports and applying for grants. The official record needs to be understood.

WRAP Activities – Schedule. Nicole Riley printed out the WRAP activities with dates and blocks filled in for details of when various parts of overall WRAP activities will be completed. There was a brief discussion about Item #3 “Determine Properties with Deed Restrictions for Further Review.” Since there is no budget for WRAP, to date Ms. Lewis has been exploring the deeds to determine whether there are restrictions; however it will be difficult to make recommendations in final report if deed restriction issues are unresolved. There may be certain parcels that must be analyzed now before we finalize the report. Ms. Lewis and Ms. Riley will look at list and try to do some of review between them. For those that are complex there may be a necessity to ask for legal assistance before the WRAP report is completed. Ms. Riley will email the chart to Ms. Schuler who will add two categories “apply criteria” and “recommend future use of town land/buildings” and add dates to chart. It is anticipated that the GIS inventory of parcels should be completed by end of October. (There is no information about building construction and updates in GIS data base. Ms. Lewis has asked Ben Keefe, Capital Facilities Director, to provide this information.) Mr. Abdella copied the spreadsheet of Parcel Discrepancies that need to be dealt with by surveyor’s and assessor’s offices. Ms. Schuler will follow up on that list. All of the loose ends may have to be in notes in the form of recommendations at the end of the Final Report. Timelines for several of the tasks will be moved up.

Follow Up. Ms. Lewis will follow up with PMBC and FinCom. Ms. Riley will follow up with Mr. Sarkisian about the webpage. The links at the bottom of the page are random that could be better placed under related topics. Ms. Riley asked if it would be possible to change to most recent information first – at the top of the webpage rather than at the bottom. If this is an easy enough task she will ask Mr. Sarkisian to reverse.

Tasks for Next Meeting.

Outline for Final Report.
Review Map of Town Owned Property.

Next Meetings.

August 17, 7:30 PM
August 30, 7:30 PM

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 following a 4-0-0 vote.

Distributed at Meeting

- 1) Library Site Criteria (Library Trustees at PMBC Meeting, A. Lewis, July 17, 2016)
- 2) Site Selection Matrix – Scoring Instructions
- 3) WRAP Activities through June 30, 2017 (filled in by Nicole Riley, 8/1/16)
- 4) Town of Wayland – Parcel Discrepancies – Excel Sheet (GIS, July 12, 2016)

Respectfully submitted,
Gretchen G. Schuler