

Present: Bob Beagan, Jim Hill, Christopher Morely (Chairman),
Seamus O'Kelly, Lynne Remington, Pat Brown, Bill Kneeland,
Thomas Friedlander and Sherrill Cline, Director of Planning and
Community Development Jody Kablack and Assistant Planner Jim
Kupfer

At 7:34 p.m., Chairman Morely called the meeting to order.

**Public Hearing: Community Preservation Act – FY16 Project Submissions –
Part 2**

At 7:34 p.m., Chairman Morely opened the Public Hearing to hear six of the eleven presentations for the project submissions received for requests for FY16 Community Preservation Act (CPA) funding. Chairman Morely further stated the Committee heard the other five presentations at its last meeting, and it would deliberate the projects at its January 7, 2015 and January 28, 2015 meetings.

Chairman Morely explained the Committee evaluates the proposals for whether they are CPA-eligible and how the project proposal fits into the Town's short and long-term CPA budget-planning goals.

**COMMUNITY PRESERVATION FUND – SUDBURY HISTORICAL SOCIETY MUSEUM – LORING
PARSONAGE PROJECT**

Sudbury Historical Society President Stewart Hoover and Sudbury Historical Society Secretary Ruth Griesel

At 7:36 p.m., Chairman Morely welcomed Mr. Stewart Hoover and Ms. Ruth Griesel to the meeting. Mr. Hoover stated the Sudbury Historical Society is requesting \$200,000 for both FY2016 and FY2017 to restore the Loring Parsonage to eventually be used for a Sudbury History Center and Museum, and to possibly add a new meeting facility. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a package of information regarding the project, including a "Loring Parsonage Preliminary Budget Pricing dated October 8, 2014", a "Loring Parsonage Scope of Work prepared by Spencer & Vogt Group, Inc. dated September 3, 2014" and accompanying architectural plan drawings. Mr. Hoover explained the project tonight through a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Hoover stated the Parsonage is approximately 300 years old, and the Sudbury Historical Commission and the CPA program have done a great job preserving the exterior of the building. He displayed photographs of the exterior and interior spaces of the building. Mr. Hoover described the many uses the building has served in the past, noting the Society believes it is time for the Town to find a long-term use for the building. He stated the interior is in need of restoration and he displayed photos of ceilings, moldings and stairwells which need repair, and areas of the building which are not handicap-accessible. The Society believes the building is a treasure which could become a resource for the Town. He reviewed estimated costs of \$2,150,000 (\$950,000 to restore the Parsonage, \$600,000 for a new extension and entry and \$600,000 to add on an exhibit gathering space). Mr. Hoover also reviewed the potential sources of funding, including \$250,000 of Town funds previously earmarked for a historical museum, \$200,000 from historical-related grants, \$400,000 over two funding cycles of CPA funds, and a capital campaign. He also announced the project has received financial support from The Sudbury Foundation for \$150,000.

Mr. Hoover emphasized the importance of a town recording its local history and having a central location for Sudbury to educate the public on its rich history.

Chairman Morely stated the support from The Sudbury Foundation is good news. He asked why the history museum part of the project is being split off from the restoration phase. Chairman Morely also asked if plans still include the suggestion by the project architects to tear down the existing kitchen area. Mr. Hoover stated the Society wants to have a successful capital campaign, and realistically, it seemed too much to ask the Town to fund the entire project. Even though it may be slightly more expensive to do the project in two phases, the proponents are trying to be practical.

In response to a question from Mr. Friedlander, Ms. Griesel explained approximately \$250,000 in private funds had previously been donated for a history museum by the Harry Rice Fund, which is being held by the Town in a trust. Mr. Hoover stated the Selectmen have been asked to release the funds.

In response to another question from Mr. Friedlander, Mr. Hoover explained where most of the Town archives are currently stored. Mr. Friedlander stated it is very important for a town to have a small museum of some sort.

Ms. Remington asked how the space would be used if a history museum is not built. She also asked if the architects have considered how this project impacts the pending Town Hall renovation project. Mr. Hoover stated the first floor of the building would be used for rotating exhibits and the second floor would house the Society's offices. He also stated the Society has worked closely with the Town's Facilities' Director Jim Kelly to understand shared systems both buildings could use.

Sudbury resident Neil Kaufman, 165 Nobscot Road, asked if the Society has considered working with the Goodnow Library and/or the Wayside Inn. Mr. Hoover stated there were meetings in the past with the Wayside Inn, but nothing has come from them. However, he further stated the Library has interest in the project, but it does not have the space to accommodate the mission.

Sudbury resident Dick Williamson, 21 Pendleton Road, asked if the referenced grants are reimbursable grants. Mr. Hoover stated the grants mentioned would be for matching funds.

At 8:02 p.m., there were no further comments or questions from the Committee or public, and the discussion was closed.

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE – PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – NORTH GATE FARM PRESERVATION

Present: Property Owner Pamela Lupo Duggan and wetlands specialist Dan Wells

At 8:02 p.m., Chairman Morely welcomed Sudbury resident Pamela Lupo Duggan and her wetlands specialist Dan Wells to the Meeting. The Committee was previously in receipt of emails from Sudbury residents Siobhan Hullinger and John Baranowsky.

Ms. Duggan stated she is requesting \$1,417,500 for the purchase of development rights to her property located at 999 Concord Road, which she described as approximately 40 acres on a scenic road. She explained the property was not included on the 2009 Open Space and Recreation Plan due to incorrect floodplain information. Ms. Duggan stated her family has used the property for agriculture for a long time, and she does not want it to be developed. She also mentioned the property has a lot of wildlife in the vicinity. Ms. Duggan asked the Committee what else is needed to have the project move forward at the 2015 Town Meeting.

Chairman Morely asked how many of the 40 acres are unbuildable. Mr. Wells stated the wetlands were delineated a year ago, and some of the information was based on six lots on Concord Road, but the number of lots has not been finalized.

Mr. Friedlander asked for clarification of what the request is for, and what the Town would receive in return. Ms. Duggan stated her appraisal was based on permanently restricting the land in a conservation/agricultural preservation restriction, and the value of \$1,417,500 million was based on ten lots.

Mr. Friedlander suggested the project is a bit premature in presentation because the number of lots and wetlands delineations are not certain at this time.

Chairman Morely stated that, based on his experience as a member of the Planning Board, he is apprehensive that the required information would be able to be compiled in time for the 2015 Town Meeting.

Ms. Kablack stated she informed the applicant that, typically, the Committee does not review a project like this until a viable plan had been confirmed. She also stated her office is awaiting additional information from the applicant.

Mr. Friedlander asked if there is an urgency for moving ahead with this request this year rather than next year. Ms. Duggan stated she has been working on this proposal for two years, and she would like to get it behind her. She did acknowledge a stamped plan is needed and that she had encountered problems receiving information in a timely manner from a surveyor.

Ms. Remington stated the Committee would want to see an approvable preliminary subdivision plan before taking a position on the project. Mr. Wells asked what would be needed from a conservation standpoint. Ms. Kablack explained it will all depend on the wetlands delineations. Mr. Friedlander stated significant wetlands fill would not typically be allowed by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. O'Kelly asked for confirmation, which Ms. Kablack provided, that the applicant is requesting either a Conservation or Agricultural Restriction, which would be a permanent restriction held by the Town into perpetuity.

Ms. Remington suggested that the applicant should contact the Conservation Commission to schedule some informal discussions. Ms. Duggan stated she has met with the Commission.

Chairman Morely encouraged the applicant to continue to communicate with Ms. Kablack, and he emphasized the Committee needs to deliberate a definite and confirmed plan.

Sudbury resident John Baranowsky, 103 Belcher Drive, stated the plan does not meet the minimum requirements for a preliminary subdivision plan, and there is no engineering seal attached to the plan. He believes the number of estimated lots is not accurate and that there may barely be six lots. Mr. Baranowsky stated the wetlands information is key, and he believes the proposal must start with a subdivision plan. He further stated he does not see how this project can move forward based on the information presented.

At 8:19 p.m., there were no further comments or questions from the Committee or public, and the discussion was closed.

**COMMUNITY PRESERVATION FUND – PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION – DAVIS
FIELD RE-DEVELOPMENT**

Present: Director of Parks & Recreation Nancy McShea and Park & Recreation Commission Chairman James Marotta

At 8:19 p.m., Director of Parks & Recreation Nancy McShea and Park & Recreation Commission Chairman James Marotta were welcomed to the Meeting to discuss the request for \$1,000,000 to redevelop the existing multi-purpose rectangular fields and to add four little league fields at Davis Field, while maintaining the ability for current users to enjoy their recreation activities. The Committee was previously in receipt of an email from the Sudbury Youth Soccer Association dated December 15, 2014, stating it supports the project proposal. In addition, copies of a letter to the Board of Selectmen from Mr. Marotta dated November 25, 2014 were distributed tonight.

Mr. Marotta explained the project through a PowerPoint presentation. He explained the location of Davis Field on Route 117, and he stated the Commission unanimously voted in favor of the project proposal. He also provided some history for the project, noting Gale Associates was engaged and a field inventory was completed. Mr. Marotta stated the report indicated 28% (10 out of 36) of the fields within six Town complexes were judged to be below acceptable standards. He further stated there are 9,571 scheduled team events played on the 36 inventoried fields per year, which equates to approximately 266 events per field per year. Mr. Marotta stated the field needs assessment conclusions indicated that, in April through June, the Town is short by 4-7 little league fields.

Mr. Marotta reviewed the planning efforts which have occurred following the field study in 2012. The proposed plan calls for a \$3.6 million renovation to Davis Field, of which \$1,000,000 is being requested from CPA funds to level the field space, to construct a parking lot with at least 140 spaces, and to install four little league baseball fields and 2 large multi-purpose rectangular fields. Maps of Davis Field and the proposed plan were displayed. It was also noted that the Park and Recreation Commission is also requesting \$275,000 to \$300,000 in Town funds to install lighting at Cutting Field, but this is not a CPA request.

Chairman Morely asked if the parking lot would be paved. Mr. Marotta responded affirmatively, noting the proposed lot size has taken rail trail parking also into consideration. He also highlighted the proposal allows for all current users to continue their use of Davis Field.

Mr. Marotta asked for the Committee's support for CPA funds to be used for this needed recreational purpose.

Mr. Beagan asked Ms. McShea and Mr. Marotta to describe the current poor condition of Haskell Field. Ms. McShea stated Haskell is a great space, but it has been overused, and is in jeopardy of not being able to have the grass brought back. She explained a portion of the field along Hudson Road will need to be taken off-line for a year to try to salvage the grass. Ms. McShea stated the Davis project would allow for Haskell to have the resting time it needs.

In response to a question from Ms. Cline, Ms. McShea explained the space on the map other than the new Little League fields, which would each be entirely fenced, would be used for interchangeable rectangular fields.

Mr. Friedlander asked where the project balance of \$2.6 million would come from.

Mr. Marotta stated the Town would be asked for a \$2 million debt exclusion, a state PARC grant for \$400,000 will be applied for, and approximately \$200,000 would be generated from user groups.

The Committee asked if the Selectmen and Finance Committee have taken positions on the project. Mr. Kneeland stated the project was presented to the Finance Committee on December 15, 2014, but no position has been voted.

Ms. McShea stated it is hoped the project would go out to bid before Town Meeting, so voters could have real numbers to consider. Mr. Marotta stated it is possible the cost estimate could be value-engineered down a bit.

Mr. Beagan stated this plan has been worked on for a few years, and, although it may not be the most ideal plan for Park and Recreation, it is the best plan for all user groups. He emphasized some of the fields are in rough shape, and he urged support for the project.

Chairman Morely stated major benefits of the project would be to level the current fields and to provide well-draining fields.

Sudbury resident Joseph Laferrera, 47 Windmill Drive, stated that it seems to him that the Commission is relying on the Gale Report when it is to its benefit, but not for all information. Mr. Laferrera stated the Gale Report stated only one little league field is needed. He also does not believe the length of the Little League season (April-June) should dictate how many fields are built. Mr. Laferrera also stated some of the information presented tonight is new and being presented for the first time.

Mr. Marotta referenced the letter he wrote to the Selectmen, stating it quantifies the number of hours and number of fields needed for Little League. He also offered to discuss the information with Mr. Laferrera.

Mr. Laferrera reiterated the 2012 Gale Report stated only one little league field was needed. He also questioned how current users are not going to be impacted if four new fields are built. Mr. Laferrera stated preservation should be the primary goal for CPA projects, and he questions whether this proposal would in fact, limit and undermine the diversity of recreational opportunities available in Town.

Mr. Marotta reviewed that the Davis family gave two deeds to the Town, and the one for Davis Field was given for recreation.

Mr. Laferrera questioned why other properties, such as Melone, Ti-Sales, and the Curtis Middle School have not been considered, and why the project has to be at Davis Field. He questioned if sufficient due diligence has been done on alternative locations which could be options. Ms. McShea stated Davis Field has active recreation as its use.

Sudbury resident Neil Kaufman, 165 Nobscot Road, stated he is 78 years old and it is harder and harder to pay property taxes in Town. He questioned whether residents are truly being asked to purchase four little league fields for approximately \$900,000 each.

Mr. Marotta stated approximately 51% of Sudbury households have school-aged children.

An unidentified Sudbury resident stated children are playing at times on substandard fields. He also stated one has to remember the project will also help to preserve Haskell Field when assessing the proposal cost.

At 8:48 p.m., there were no further comments or questions from the Committee or public, and the discussion was closed.

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION FUND – CONSERVATION FUND

Present: Sudbury resident Dan DePompei

At 8:48 p.m., Chairman Morely welcomed project proponent Dan DePompei, 35 Haynes Road, to the Meeting.

Mr. DePompei stated the need to establish his request for \$200,000 of current CPA reserve funds from the category of Open Space to fund Sudbury's Conservation Fund, pursuant to Massachusetts General Law Chapter 44B (the CPA), or act on anything relative thereto is no longer needed. He explained the current Conservation Commission is no longer interested in this proposal, and thus Mr. DePompei stated he is withdrawing the project request.

At 8:50 p.m., there were no comments or questions from the Committee or public, and the discussion was closed.

**COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE – PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – MASS
CENTRAL RAIL TRAIL– PHASE 1**

Chairman Morely introduced Assistant Planner Jim Kupfer and Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack to present this request.

With the use of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Kupfer stated the Selectmen have requested \$300,000 of CPA funds for engineering, design and construction of a 1.8 mile rail trail between Dutton Road and Union Avenue to local and Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation standards. He further stated this portion would be known as Phase I of the Mass. Central Rail Trail (MCRT). Mr. Kupfer displayed maps of the proposed trail, noting Phase 1 would be a portion of a larger 4.6 mile rail trail. He noted the Phase 1 portion is the lowest cost section of the trail to construct and it would better connect several neighborhoods and the Route 20 commercial district.

Mr. Kupfer stated this trail could be used for a ten-foot wide, multi-use recreational trail which meets American with Disabilities Act access standards and has a surface approved by the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). He further noted the proposed MCRT Phase 1 cost estimate of \$300,000 includes the salvage value of the rails, which is estimated at approximately \$150,000. Mr. Kupfer summarized the process which has occurred to date. He stated the Town Manager received \$15,000 for the development of design specifications and bid-ready documents and Sudbury Greenways has the task of raising approximately \$8,000-\$15,000 in funds for wetlands delineation. If project funding is approved at the 2015 Town Meeting, Mr. Kupfer stated the public would be engaged next summer and construction could begin in the spring of 2016. He also mentioned a few relevant grant programs which would be pursued.

Mr. Kupfer noted the project meets several of the Open Space and Recreation CPA criteria. He further noted the project was a Board of Selectmen goal, is consistent with the Town Master Plan, and had strong public support by voters for three related non-binding resolutions presented this year at Special Town Meetings. Mr. Kupfer explained the Selectmen asked Town staff to manage the project and develop recommendations for how best to proceed, which will be presented to the Selectmen in January 2015. He stated the staff is reviewing several options for this project.

Mr. Kupfer stated NStar has offered new information regarding its transmission line project from Sudbury to Hudson, which could impact costs significantly, if not eliminate them entirely for FY16. Ms. Kablack added that if NStar proceeds with its plans, the company could essentially build the MCRT for Sudbury. She explained

there are a lot of questions to be answered and it is not yet known for how long the project would be delayed. There are other variables that are under discussion currently which could impact the CPA proposal and the amount of funds requested, and she hopes to have more information for the CPC before the warrant article deadline.

Mr. Friedlander asked if the total project costs and request are for \$300,000 and if NStar will comply with local bylaws. Ms. Kablack stated the current request is for \$300,000, and, if NStar proceeds, they would comply with all applicable laws.

The Committee asked a few questions regarding whether the transmission lines would be above or below ground. Ms. Kablack stated NStar is looking at a number of alternatives. She further noted above ground lines installed in Wayland and Weston, which is not the preference in Sudbury.

Mr. Beagan asked if the Town were to proceed on its own with the project, whether NStar could later destroy what had already been done and paid for by the Town.

Ms. Kablack stated this would be a possibility and will be dependent on their lease with the MBTA.

Mr. O'Kelly asked who owns the trail and whether any private funds have been received to date. Ms. Kablack stated the owner is the MBTA, and no private funds have been received to date for the Sudbury portion.

Mr. Hill asked if NStar builds an overhead power line, could it restrict uses under them. Ms. Kablack stated the impression she has received from DCR and the MBTA is that they would want both the transmission line and the rail trail.

In response to a question from Ms. Brown as to the width of the path NStar would need, Ms. Kablack noted they would require a 12' wide paved path

Ms. Remington questioned why the Town would go forward at all with this project until it has a clear understanding of what NStar will and will not be doing and when. She stated she attended a DCR meeting, and she felt DCR was uncertain of its plans and requirements. Ms. Remington stated it seems premature for the Town to build a trail segment when DCR has not yet finalized its standards.

Chairman Morely opined the proposed Phase 1 would be an important segment to build.

Ms. Brown stated there has been public feedback that the Town has waited a long time for a trail to come to fruition and there will be some who will not want to wait any longer until NStar finalizes its plans.

Ms. Remington stated the \$36 million of State funds mentioned in the recent Special Town Meeting Article does not exist, but rather it has only been earmarked. Ms. Brown agreed that there is no mention of the \$36 million in the Transportation Bill.

Ms. Cline asked how the \$15,000 approved by the Finance Committee would be spent. Ms. Kablack stated it would cover the first part of design specifications. However, she further stated that, if the choice is made to not proceed with a design-build project, the funds would not be needed.

Ms. Cline stated she believes DCR's preference is for a hard surface, paved trail.

Ms. Kablack noted that, if a DCR design is built by each Town, then there would be inconsistencies from town to town. She emphasized the project has moved quickly, but many factors need to be vetted to ensure the project is viable for this year.

Sudbury resident John Baranowsky, 103 Belcher Drive, stated he believes the NStar information is a “show stopper.” He opined high-voltage transmission lines are usually overhead.

Mr. Beagan asked if any other town is ahead of Sudbury on the MCRT. Mr. Kupfer stated Wayland is working on it, but he does not consider it is ahead of Sudbury at this point.

Sudbury resident Dick Williamson, 21 Pendleton Road, stated there are numerous trails along NStar power lines. He also stated the rails have significant value, but because they are owned by the State, the Town would not see this revenue for a long time.

Mr. Williamson stated he was in error at the recent Special Town Meeting, noting his \$36 million reference was not from the Transportation Bill, but rather from a submission to the Governor which was not approved. He stated no funding has been authorized by the State for this rail trail.

Ms. Remington asked what would be done regarding disposal of the rail ties. Mr. Kupfer stated there are only two locations where this can be done in the region, and the cost of this disposal would need to be clearly defined in any contract executed.

Selectman Len Simon stated there has been a kick-off meeting for the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (BFRT) with its consultants VHB. He emphasized there will be many opportunities for residents to provide input regarding what type of trail they want which will be safe for all users.

Sudbury resident Dan DePompei, 35 Haynes Road, stated the Article Mr. Williamson referred to was sponsored by Sudbury Greenways. He opined that he thought the intent of the article was to comply with the local bylaws in the quickest manner, which would mean not paving the trail. Mr. DePompei further stated there are many recreational trails in the United States which are not paved.

Chairman Morely noted the project has been submitted by the Board of Selectmen. He further stated constructing a trail quickly was the initial project impetus, and a non-paved trail could be paved at a later date.

Mr. Kupfer stated the Town is planning more discussion regarding rail trails at a Forum which will be held at Town Hall at 7:00 p.m. on January 22, 2015.

At 9:26 p.m., there were no further comments or questions from the Committee or public, and the discussion was closed.

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE – PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – SUDBURY HISTORICAL COMMISSION PROJECTS

Present: CPC and Sudbury Historical Commission (SHC) member Jim Hill

Mr. Hill thanked the supporters of previously funded historic preservation projects. He described the projects submitted by the Sudbury Historical Commission, requesting \$22,000 of CPA funds to complete the three projects proposed as follows:

Hearse House/Town Pound and Revolutionary War Cemetery Information Kiosk \$15,000 to purchase/build an information kiosk and to produce a historical sign/plaque recognizing the donors and volunteers who made this project possible.

Continuation of Old Home Survey
\$5,000 to continue the survey of ten identified homes and buildings, as required by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC).

Restoration of Signage within the Town Cemeteries
\$2,000 to restore signage in the Town Cemeteries.

Mr. Hill emphasized the Commission has a history of completing projects under budget and returning unused funds to the CPA account.

At 9:30 p.m., there were no comments or questions from the Committee or public, and the discussion was closed.

Chairman Morely stated the Committee will deliberate the project funding requests at its January 7, 2015 meeting.

Minutes

On motion duly made and seconded, it was:

VOTED: To approve the minutes of November 19, 2014.

Mr. Kneeland abstained from the vote.

CPC Future Meeting Schedule

The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for a January 7, 2015 for deliberation of Proposals, in the Silva Conference Room, on the second floor of the Flynn Building.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m.