

## Wayland Long-Range Planning – Town-Owned Land

October 24, 2014 – 9:00 AM

Present: Colleen Sheehan, presiding; Mary Antes, Kent Greenawalt, Frank Krasin, Anette Lewis, Mike Lowery, Gretchen Schuler. Also attending: Sarkis Sarkisian, Town Planner; Alf Berry, Surveyor; Brendan Decker, GIS Coordinator; Leisha Simon, IT Director/Schools; Lynne Lipcon, Library Trustee; Sherre Greenbaum, ConCom Chair; Bill Sterling, Council on Aging Board.

Colleen gave a brief background of this working group. In July the FinCom started a long range planning process and asked a group of people to look at how to plan (process) for town-owned property. In mid-October, the BOS asked the PB to consider a similar process. And there was a petitioners' article (that did not pass) in 2008 to establish a committee that would take on a similar task. This working group will report to FinCom and the PB will report to the BOS on establishing such a committee.

The first part of meeting was devoted to discussing the utility of the GIS tools. Brendan Decker explained the GIS tables tied to Parcel IDs with various existing layers for many topics desired in a town-owned property listing such as aquifer zones, zoning, acreage, etc. It is trickier to show such relationships as adjacency to other lands. Mike pointed out that there are layers from other sources such as MassGIS, which has layers from DEP and National Heritage and Endangered Species Act, et.al. At the moment the local GIS shows all or none of town-owned land – one cannot isolate (for instance) all land controlled by DPW. There was a brief discussion about how to handle “errors’ in data. Brendan must rely on Assessors for information in order to make any changes to maps. Thus this group should send a memo to Assessors (copy to Surveyor/GIS) with a list of presumed inconsistencies or errors. Alf Berry offered to this working group a short “show and tell” in order to inform us about the capabilities of the GIS.

Next the group heard from Leisha Simon about a Document Management program that she is administering for the town. The long range vision is to convert all resources in filing cabinets – plans, decisions, etc. – to digital format with accessibility on website through a query process. She encouraged us to look at Westford’s system where data is available to the public. Anette pointed out that the town had begun to invest in a system for coordinating all land use information; however it was not compatible with MUNIS (a digital financial system for municipalities). Leisha is exploring the needs for land use document management.

The discussion turned to the Tools and Considerations that a Capital Facilities Committee would use in evaluating projects. Frank suggested separating tools and factors according to types of projects. There was some discussion about this topic and it was decided that a permanent committee may want to address that; however our role was simply to lay the ground work.

### Additions to Tools list:

- Surveys
- Charrettes

### Additions to Considerations list:

- Other available funds
- Existing uses of a property
- Confluence of town goals
- Proximity to user base
- Existing distribution of like facilities
- Community/neighborhood consideration
- Public perception of the needs.

There was discussion about the role of compromise in determining solutions for projects in which there would be negotiations leading to resolutions. Also there was some discussion about the usefulness and reliability of surveys.

Lynne Lipcon explained that there often are conflicting objectives and goals – for instance the Library must do certain tasks to fulfill requirements of the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (such as a survey) that may be different than the way in which a community wishes to engage the public.

Next there was discussion about who carries out investigations for information – for instance if recommendations for a particular parcel require more information – who is responsible for gathering that information and who pays for the study – a case in point would be the future use of the present DPW site once the new one is online. Who would do (and pay for) the environmental studies of the old site? These are issues to be considered and reviewed by the appointed committee.

A task of a Capital Facilities Committee – or should it be a Long Range Planning Committee for Facilities? – is to help lead the town through needs assessment and then help to marry a project with availability and suitability of locations. It would be an analysis and communication vehicle for projects.

Before the meeting concluded the remaining attendees focused on who would serve on this committee and how. Each person stated their preference:

- Gretchen – Town Meeting adopted – independent – 5 to 7 members – with mixed appointments (some by TM, some by BOS, maybe some by PB)
- Anette – Town Meeting adopted – independent – 3 to 7 members – not sure on who appoints.
- Mike – Town Meeting adopted – 7 appointees (representatives) one each of BOS, PB, School, Rec, DPW, Housing, ConCom.
- Colleen – Town Meeting adopted – 3 to 5 members acting in collaboration with PB (elected board) and reporting to TM.

Others did not weigh in due to the hour. This discussion will continue at next meeting.

**NEXT MEETING .** No meetings scheduled beyond this date. Adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gretchen G. Schuler