

Wayland Real Asset Planning Committee

August 30, 2016 – 7:30 PM

APPROVED 9-13-16

Present. Tom Abdella (at 8:20), Anette Lewis (presiding), Nicole Riley and Gretchen Schuler.

Also Present. Molly Upton

Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 7:34 PM by Anette Lewis who stated that WRAP would join the Permanent Municipal Building Committee's meeting for the first item on the WRAP agenda. She also stated that Mr. Abdella would join us after 8:00 PM.

PMBC Meeting. Ms. Lewis, Ms. Riley and Ms. Schuler met with members of the PMBC to discuss the Site Selection and Project Decision matrices. Overall the PMBC members thought that the matrices were appropriate and useful. Discussion centered on the flexibility of the scoring matrices. PMBC members requested more flexibility, particularly the ability to change the numbers attributed to each category on the site selection matrix. The PMBC Chair, Jim Riley, suggested adding a block at the bottom of the scoring for notes on the scoring relative to the individual project. It was noted that the site selection scoring should be in the hands of an unbiased committee – one like the PMBC.

Ms. Lewis asked PMBC members to expand on several of the issues sent to WRAP in an email from Ben Keefe. Issues below have discussion points in parentheses:

- A format of one size fits all may not capture the unique aspects of each specific project.
- Weighting factors are very subjective. (On this issue there was a discussion of need for more flexibility in scoring – that sometimes subject does not apply or is irrelevant to project, thus some scoring adjustments may be warranted.)
- Environmental factors are over weighted because they occur in several places. (WRAP members did not think that environmental factors are recurring in site selection matrix – each factor addresses different aspects of a project.)
- Use of minimum criteria rather than pro/cons would be less subjective. (Perhaps the scoring could be changed to accommodate this issue.)
 - Does it meet program needs?
 - Can utilities be brought to site? (It was noted that utilities can always be brought to site – that there must be a way of measuring difficulty and cost.)
- May want to look at through 4 lenses. (WRAP members believe that the first three lenses are within WRAP or successor committee purview but not market or political aspect.)
 - Physical
 - Financial
 - Legal
 - Market/Political

Much of the discussion referred to the library's site selection matrix which is similar to the one prepared by WRAP.

The WRAP meeting reconvened at 8:22 PM with Mr. Abdella joining the meeting at that time. Ms. Lewis read the agenda. There was no public comment.

Evaluation Criteria Matrices. Ms. Lewis summarized the PMBC meeting for Mr. Abdella and a discussion ensued. It was noted that initially the Project Criteria matrix would likely be answered by project proponent, while the Site Selection matrix would probably be scored by WRAP or a successor committee. The WRAP

final report could describe the selection processes as they are now with recommendations of how to improve them. It was noted that the Final Report should recommend that a committee like WRAP should be asking questions about projects before project proponents spend funds and before doing site selection. Evaluation criteria and ranking procedures should also be sent to Planning Board for comment. PMBC has commented and noted that the library already used the process and it was successful. There was some discussion about who asks the questions about program since program is established before project size and scale is determined. Will the WRAP or successor committee ask questions of a project proponent well before site selection?

WRAP Activities and Schedule Chart. Mr. Abdella had made 11x17 copies of WRAP Activities sheet following last edits. A brief discussion led to more edits: add GIS to #4, explain that "same" in #8 – refers back to #7; combine 11 and 12. Ms. Schuler will edit latest version. Ms. Lewis noted that under #12 – Long Range Planning – that Nan Balmer, Town Administrator, Brian Keveny, Finance Director, and Zoe Pierce, Treasurer have begun process of planning and presented the Finance Committee with extensive information about town finances into the future. The 5-year plan has become mandatory according to the FinCom. Now the push is to look at long-range planning 10 to 20 years forward.

Capital Funding Process. Part of the WRAP charge is to come up with a Capital Funding Plan. FinCom will be working on their 5-year Capital Funding Plan in October and November. WRAP has said that it would develop draft of how to set up capital planning with input from Finance Director, Public Buildings Administrator and Town Administrator by September 30th and send to FinCom for feedback. A capital funding plan should look at what is possible. Important information about debt and debt service was part of the budget packet presented by Balmer/Keveny/Pierce to the FinCom at its meeting 8/29/16 – referred to above. Ms. Lewis will ask for it to be posted online.

Demographics. In order to use demographics appropriately, members must define what is important to guide capital planning. It has been noted that the information that is available is not necessarily reliable and the time of year in which data are gathered may not line up with information needed. Assessors' records and water bills may tell the number of structures which is different than the number of households due to the way in which households are counted in the census. (For instance there are 76 households at Traditions as an example and in some instances a physical structure of one house may be counted as more households by the methodology used by the State.) For the purposes of future planning, WRAP should try to outline what we have, how each source is measured and whether the source is valid or not. A recommendation of the final report may be that certain sources be used for certain types of projects for example Metrowest Housing Data for affordable housing, etc. The final report should point out the problem/issues with available demographic data.

Minutes. The minutes of August 17, 2016 were approved as amended by a vote of 4-0-0.

Other. Ms. Lewis reported that, at a recent Board of Selectmen's meeting Ben Keefe, Capital Facilities Director presented projections of capital expenses from 2018 to 2022 on several buildings including Town Building, Library (new and old), COA/CC and Transfer Station with yearly expenses between \$200,000 (2022) and \$15,435,000 (2019). Mr. Abdella will scan and send to members. Ms. Schuler will send list of next properties to research to Ms. Lewis and Ms. Riley. Ms. Lewis will draft Annual Report for WRAP seeking approval at next meeting. It was also noted that Rivers Edge had received two proposals as a result of an RFP. WRAP members discussed and decided that WRAP will not weigh in on that project even though it will involve disposal of town-owned land. Mr. Abdella will not be able to participate in the Buzz interview; therefore Ms. Lewis will accompany Ms. Schuler.

Next Meetings.

September 13, 7:30 P.M.
October 4, 2016, 7:30 PM

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 following a 4-0-0 vote.

Distributed at Meeting

- 1) Draft WRAP Activities through June 30, 2017 (as edited at last meeting on 8/17/16)

Respectfully submitted,
Gretchen G. Schuler