

IN BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1984

Present: Chairman Anne W. Donald, Myron J. Fox, and Josiah F. Frost.

The statutory requirements as to notice having been fulfilled, the meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Donald.

Bonding - Stone Tavern Farm

Tonight's tentative meeting with the Town Treasurer concerning bonding relative to the joint acquisition of an Agricultural Preservation Restriction on a portion of the so-called Stone Tavern Farm with the Massachusetts Department of Food & Agriculture, as authorized by Article 31 of the 1984 Annual Town Meeting, was postponed because the documents were not ready for signing.

Municipal Services Via Private Sector

The board reviewed several local newspaper articles on the subject of privatization, noting the national attention on the subject - this month an ICMA conference on privatization was hosted by the University of Cincinnati.

Selectman Fox commented that local discussion on the subject should not be limited to privatization but also to regionalization and user fees.

Selectman Frost emphasized that the Town has studied fire regionalization in the past and it is a constant topic of discussion at area Chiefs' meetings and among local fire departments.

Responding to Chairman Donald, who brought up the subject of leasing, Selectman Frost stated the Town had studied that in the past with the ambulance but found there were no savings by doing so.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson noted that former Selectman William J. Cossart was very interested in leasing, and that the Town did a lot of investigation at that time involving fleet leasing of Town equipment.

The Board directed Mr. Thompson to draft a letter to all department heads and the schools encouraging them to give privatization, user fees, and regionalization attention now, since we are in our budget preparation process; the Selectmen agreed to continue to discuss the subject with individual department heads during their budget hearings.

Accept Bid/1984 Town Report

Following a review of the list of bids received at the November 14 bid opening for the printing of the 1984 Annual Town Report and in accordance with the November 19 recommendation from the Chairman of the 1984 Town Report Committee, it was on motion by Selectman Fox unanimously

VOTED: To accept the bid dated November 1, 1984, from low-bidder, Hi-Tech Graphics of Fitchburg, Massachusetts, for the printing of the 1984 Annual Town Report, at a cost of \$49.50 per page, which includes typesetting of all pages,

galley proofs, paste-up, and perfect binding, in accordance with the Town's specifications.

Responding to the Selectmen, Mr. Thompson noted that the budget of \$6,500 should cover printing the Proceedings if the Town Report does not run over the number of anticipated number of pages; Hi-Tech Graphics was formerly known as Rene Press.

Minutes

It was on motion by Selectman Frost unanimously

VOTED: To approve the Town Fathers Forum transcript of October 22, 1984, as drafted.

Betterment Policy

The Board received a newspaper article from former Chairman of the Finance Committee, James A. Pitts, relative to a betterment policy adopted in the Town of Wayland which initiated the consideration of an article for the 85ATM relative to a betterment policy for private roads in Sudbury. Upon request, the Board received the following communications:

1) from the Town Engineer, dated November 8, 1984, suggesting that Town Counsel review the legality of Wayland's policy, and that no changes be made to Sudbury's current policy on the basis of Wayland's policy; and

2) a legal opinion from Town Counsel's office, dated November 16, stating that the Town can make various improvements/repairs to private ways under current bylaws and authorized by Massachusetts General Laws; further, that some costs, such as reconstruction (to bring private roads to standard for acceptance by the Town) may be assessed as betterments under G.L.ch.80.

The Board agreed not to submit an article for the 85ATM or establish a new policy relative to street betterments and directed Mr. Thompson to relay the information provided by the Town Engineer and Town Counsel to Mr. Pitts and the Planning Board.

Donation - Council on Aging

It was on motion by Selectman Donald unanimously

VOTED: To accept miscellaneous donations totaling \$104, on behalf of the Council on Aging, to be used for van transportation.

Support Police Chief/Stand on Pornography

On recommendation by Chairman Donald, initiated by recent controversial publicity regarding the Police Chief's stand to uphold the law with regard to sale of pornographic material in the Town of Sudbury, it was on motion by Selectman Frost unanimously

VOTED: To support the Police Chief on his current position on enforcing existing laws relative to pornographic videos.

Resignation - Growth Advisory Committee

The Board acknowledged receipt of a November 13 letter of resignation from Dr. R. L. Stevens, from the Growth Advisory Committee, effective immediately, submitted because of Dr. Stevens' objections to the course of action the Selectmen "have chosen" on the future growth of Sudbury. The Board directed the Executive Secretary to prepare a draft response to Dr. Stevens for the Board's approval and signature at next week's meeting.

Joint Meeting/SHA

Present: Chairman Linda S. Gregory, Vice-Chairman Cheryl A. Rogers, and Executive Director Jo-Ann Howe, Sudbury Housing Authority (SHA); Col. Paul J. Leahy, Chairman/Council on Aging; and resident Clifford Hughes.

Chairman Donald convened a joint meeting with the SHA at the Authority's request to discuss general direction and methods of procedure relative to future housing projects under the supervision of the SHA.

Chairman Linda S. Gregory stated that the SHA has been looking into congregate housing - shared housing with some common areas for the elderly. She noted that one thing they had found out was that a State-funded congregate housing facility does not have 24-hour supervision.

Vice-Chairman Cheryl A. Rogers added that congregate housing is interim housing for the semi-independent elderly who may not be able to do without support services, i.e., supervisory staff (sometimes on call), live-in cook.

Chairman Donald pointed out that a few years ago Town Meeting defeated an article for congregate housing for the handicapped, and that, in her opinion, it was because the public was not educated on the subject. Later in the evening, Chairman Donald advised that, should the SHA decide to submit an article for the 85ATM, it would be more successful if the proposed location were specified; also, Mr. Thompson stressed the importance of the presentation to Town Meeting in order to have such an article passed.

Mr. Thompson suggested that a way to survey the Town would be through a public advisory opinion question, approved by the Selectmen, and placed on the ballot in the Annual Election.

Ms. Rogers went on to say that, if there were congregate housing in Sudbury, the "frail" (85 years and older) elderly of Sudbury (perhaps from Musketaquid Village) could move into this type of transitional facility rather than into a nursing home. Ms. Rogers stated that currently there are approximately 1,000 elderly people in Sudbury (projections show by 1990 there will be approximately 1,500) who live on a fixed income ranging from \$5,000-\$10,000. Ms. Rogers pointed out that the average home in Sudbury costs approximately \$110,000 which would require a yearly income of approximately \$40,000. She also stated that Sudbury needs single-family housing for low-income families with young children.

Ms. Rogers asked the Board to consider supporting subsidized housing for the elderly because of the high cost (\$1,000-2,000 monthly) of nursing home care. She went on to say that the State Executive Office of Communities and Development (EOCD) feels that congregate housing is a more cost-effective way to house people in this age of reduced revenue.

Ms. Gregory stated that the SHA agrees on the need for congregate housing in Sudbury in planning for Sudbury's future growth in the elderly area. She stated one of the State-required stipulations is that for every four units of congregate housing, the Town must have one unit of low-income housing - a single-family house or multi-family set up. The SHA feels that trying to get low-income housing, without first educating the Town as far as the need was concerned, was not something that could be done overnight. She stated that there is much more need for low-income (defined by the State as \$20,680 for a family of four) family housing; that there are 32 low-income families on a waiting list right here in Sudbury and that the SHA only owns eight houses (with a turnover of approximately every two years). She stated that the State allows only \$65,000 to buy a single-family house and questioned whether the Town could appropriate additional funds to be used in addition to those provided by the State. She added that the State allows \$2,000 per unit proposed toward land purchase.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson suggested that the SHA consult with the Town Planner and reminded them that the Selectmen own the Oliver Land (approximately 13 acres) which abuts other land owned by the SHA - that this would be one way for the Town to help subsidize.

Ms. Rogers stated the SHA would like to see something adjacent to Musketaquid Village, i.e., the Oliver Land; that construction and operating costs of any affordable housing would be paid for by the State, but that the SHA did not have any land available at this time/did not own any land. Ms. Rogers stated that affordable housing is on a 4:1 basis - four units of elderly housing to one unit of low-income housing.

Mr. Thompson mentioned the Longfellow Glen subsidized housing complex.

Ms. Rogers stated that the Metropolitan Association of Planning Council suggested that 10% of all housing in a particular town should be low-income or affordable; that, with the SHA's 72 subsidized units (64 at Musketaquid Village and 8 scattered site) and Longfellow Glen's 120 units, the State could withhold discretionary funding if it did not feel the Town has made an effort to provide affordable housing.

Mr. Thompson agreed and pointed out that the only reason McNeil Associates received the grant to build Longfellow Glen was because Sudbury was eligible for discretionary funding by being a member of the State housing plan called A.H.O.P.

Ms. Rogers stated that mortgages for Longfellow Glen are financed by MHFA; rentals are subsidized under Section 8 (Federal subsidies under HUD, as opposed to State). Mr. Thompson stated that Longfellow Glen is all Section 8.

With regard to Musketaquid Village, Ms. Gregory stated that an unusual situation exists right now in that there is no waiting list. All agreed the main reason is because of available Longfellow Glen housing in Sudbury.

Mr. Thompson noted that Col. Leahy has been instrumental in helping people obtain residency at Longfellow Glen under Section 8, adding that there is no asset limitation at Longfellow Glen. Mr. Thompson mentioned that the Selectmen could contact State representatives on this issue (asset limitations on Musketaquid Village and none on Longfellow Glen).

Col. Leahy stated his personal preference for low-income elderly apartments, such as Musketaquid Village or Longfellow Glen, rather than congregate housing, basically for the reason of loss of privacy in congregate housing, but also because he felt through congregate housing the elderly would lose their independence which they strive to retain.

Responding to Mr. Thompson, Ms. Rogers stated that when the SHA began investigating housing options, they learned that the State had passed a one hundred ninety-six million dollar bill with an emphasis on congregate housing.

Responding to Selectman Frost, Ms. Rogers stated that the EOCB recognizes the fact that low-income family housing is less acceptable to most communities and has made a requirement that for every four units of congregate, elderly housing, there should be one unit of low-income family housing. The Town would not be credited for the number of units at Longfellow Glen on a new application. She stated that the consensus of the sub-committee of the SHA, which is looking into housing alternatives, is that Chapter 705 would be the most appropriate for Sudbury - the single family, scattered site, but reiterated that the State will only give the Town \$65,000 to purchase a house.

Selectman Frost pointed out that, although he had no problem with congregate housing, he did not feel the SHA should become involved in a situation where they would have the responsibility of, for example, a 6-8 unit low-income facility, where they might not have the control of the occupants as an agency like McNeil does. Ms. Rogers reiterated that the sub-committee prefers scattered site to be the most appropriate for Sudbury.

Ms. Rogers commented that, although the SHA is concentrating on the Sudbury preference, there is a state-wide need for housing for the elderly; she noted that one of Governor Dukakis' priorities is housing for the elderly.

Selectman Frost commented that some efforts should be made toward encouraging the State to increase that \$65,000 figure to something more realistic, since, if the State wants cities and towns to stay within Proposition 2 1/2 limitations, it cannot expect cities and towns to subsidize housing.

At the conclusion of discussion, Chairman Donald thanked the SHA for their attendance this evening, noting the joint meeting scheduled next week with the Selectmen for the purpose of interviewing candidates and filling the vacancy on the SHA.

Walkway/Portion Peakham Road

Present: Bette Sidlo, 7 Newton Road; Gilbert Wright, 266 Peakham Road; Robert J. Cusack, 237 Peakham Road; David Felsing, 11 Colburn Circle; and Gail-Ann Simon, 40 Meadowbrook Circle.

Chairman Donald convened a meeting with area residents at their request concerning a petition for installation of a walkway on a portion of Peakham Road from Horse Pond Road to the railroad crossing near Robert Best Road.

Mrs. Bette Sidlo gave the Board a communication dated November 19, 1984, requesting approval from the Selectmen for the proponents of the walkway to gather facts/statistics from the Police Department which might support the need for a walkway along Peakham Road. The Board directed Mr. Thompson to follow that request up with the Chief of Police.

The Board was also in receipt of a communication dated November 8, 1984, from Bette Sidlo and Gilbert Wright enclosing a copy of the Peakham Road Walkway Article Petition for the 85ATM, backup material which documents both the current need and the historical background of this walkway issue (which Mrs. Sidlo paraphrased), and requesting the Selectmen to support the proposed article.

Mrs. Sidlo stated that the walkway article had not officially been submitted but that the proponents are looking for support from Town officials/boards, so that it can be presented in a favorable way to Town Meeting. She later added that the response to the petition from area residents was almost unanimous.

Mr. Gilbert Wright said that, in addition to asking for support, he would like the Selectmen to consider encouraging the Planning Board to reconsider taking a leadership position in a walkway program for the Town. He stated that the Long Range Capital Expenditures Committee had a 1979-85 plan for setting aside money each year for a walkway program - that \$80,000 was set aside in 1980, and \$100,000 in 1981. He wondered if the Planning Board felt there was a lack of interest on the part of residents for this type of program to continue.

Chairman Donald commented as to why the walkway program could have been discontinued based on disapproval of the original premise that walkways would save on school busses; also, she commented that walkway monies were probably transferred to roads where easements from abutters had already been obtained, i.e., Mossman/Morse Roads.

Following comments from those present, Selectman Fox stated he had no doubt about the need; the only question is the availability of money and setting priorities based on that money, i.e., police/fire protection versus walkways. He explained that one of the problems the Town faces is that the bonding exemption from Proposition 2½ limitations for the Stone Tavern Farm failed to pass (November 6 ballot question) which means the Town will have \$72,000 less under our Proposition 2½ budget. Selectman Fox commented that in early years when the Town favored the walkway program (which included the walkway on that portion of Peakham Road defined tonight) the Town did not have the restraints of 2½. Selectman Fox advised the proponents to be prepared to respond to Town Meeting regarding their willingness to give up their land for

the walkway because he was sure that question would come up along with the question of (amount of) support.

Selectman Fox continued to say that, if we find we can appropriate money in April to build a walkway, he would want an opinion from the Town Engineer listing in order of priorities all areas in Town which could use a walkway in terms of number of children using the roads, the narrowness of the road, how winding the road is, the traffic situation, etc.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson stated that Raymond Road abutters are submitting a petition article for the 85ATM for a walkway. He suggested this group meet with them to discuss their mutual concerns for walkways, and pointed out that a petition article requires only ten signatures.

Selectman Fox stated that he did not feel the Selectmen would be prepared to vote on this until 1) they know what the whole budget looks like for FY86, and 2) the Town Engineer confirmed where a walkway would serve the greatest need. Selectman Fox added that he is a great advocate of the walkway program but reiterated it is a money problem. Selectman Frost expressed his concurrence with Selectman Fox's comments, as well as, for the need of the walkway on Peakham Road.

Mr. Wright gave his opinion in three areas: 1) that the proponents of the article work with various Town boards and committees; 2) that they are not interested in getting into a battle of one neighborhood against another, and 3) that through the leadership position of the Selectmen and the Planning Board, perhaps co-ordinated with the Highway Surveyor, priorities can be set by the Town.

Mr. Thompson reiterated his suggestion that the two neighborhood groups meet before Town Meeting in the spirit of co-operation.

At the conclusion of discussion, it was on motion by Selectman Fox unanimously

VOTED: To refer the matter to the Town Engineer and the Town Planner, asking them to give priority to looking at what the old Master Plan walkway program was, whether that has changed at all because of the new sub-divisions that we have, and where will the Town best be served in prioritizing where we would put the walkways if we could afford it.

In conclusion, Mrs. Sidlo expressed her appreciation for the Selectmen's concern; she informed the Board that they had submitted packets of information to each member of the Finance Committee in anticipation of their meeting with the FinCom.

Chairman Donald thanked all present for their attendance and concern.

Joint Meeting with Proponents of Youth Commission

Present: Neal Shifman, Cornelius (Neil) Hickey, and Karl Michaels, Sudbury Residents; and Randall Wilburn, Minister/Wayland.

Chairman Donald convened a meeting with proponents for the establishment of a Youth Commission.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson stated that the proponents of the Youth Commission have kept the Selectmen's office informed through meeting with him and forwarding minutes of their meetings; also, Mr. Thompson stated that Town Counsel had no problem with the formation of such a Commission as stipulated in their proposal received September 10. Mr. Thompson stated that one of the purposes of tonight's meeting is to determine membership of the Commission.

Mr. Neal Shifman stated that the Commission would represent the concerns of citizens who want to deal collectively with the youth in Sudbury and to meet the needs of families in the community, but they also want to have this Commission be a sanctioned body and, therefore, request Selectmen's support.

Selectman Fox referenced the Board's October 11th vote to support the creation of the Youth Commission.

Mr. Thompson stressed the importance of the membership since this Commission would help coordinate the activities of schools, the Teen Center, the Juvenile Restitution Committee, and would also help serve as co-ordinator for the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Neil Hickey agreed that the make-up of the Commission is critical to the success of it. Responding to Selectman Fox, he stated one of the proponents who are present could serve on the Commission in some capacity.

During further discussion, all agreed to a 5-8 member commission; proponents and Selectmen will give input to Mr. Thompson as to names of people or names of positions, i.e., Police Chief, non-affiliated citizen, School Committee, Teen Center representative, President of Student Council; Mr. Thompson may advertise in the local publications.

It was on motion by Selectman Fox unanimously

VOTED: To appoint a Youth Commission, sponsored by the Sudbury/Wayland Lions Club, under its Chemical People Project, supported by the Selectmen at its October 11, 1984 meeting, in accordance with the broad outline submitted at that time entitled, "Proposal to the Town of Sudbury for the Creation of a Youth Commission", following review and discussion of all names submitted by the proponents of the Youth Commission, the Selectmen, and by application.

Note: It was agreed when the Commission is officially formed, rules and regulations governing its conduct will be adopted.

Cancel Meetings

The Board canceled meetings of Monday, December 24 and 31, due to holidays, and agreed to skeleton crews in all Town offices on both dates.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Attest:

Richard E. Thompson
Executive Secretary-Clerk