

Present: Chairwoman Sherrill Cline, Lynne Remington, Eric Poch, Pat Brown
Diana Warren, Thomas Friedlander, Scott Smigler, Nancy Kilcoyne and
Mara Huston, Acting Director of Planning and Community
Development, Beth Suedmeyer

At 7:00 p.m., Chairwoman Cline called the meeting to order.

**Public Hearing: Community Preservation Act – FY20 Project Submissions –
Part 1**

At 7:00 p.m., Chairwoman Cline opened the Public Hearing to hear four presentations for the project submissions received for requests for FY20 Community Preservation Act (CPA) funding. Chairwoman Cline explained the CPC will hold two Public Hearings this year and the Committee will hear the remaining presentations on December 19, 2018. She stated tonight's Hearing was duly noticed, and it allows the community to hear about projects from the applicants. Chairwoman Cline stated the first three applicants had come before the CPC on November 7, 2018. The fourth applicant, the Playground Modernization for the Sudbury Public Schools had not been heard from yet this year.

PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – COOLIDGE AT SUDBURY PHASE 2 -

Present: Regional Housing Services Office Consultant, Elizabeth Rust and Jesse Kanson-Benanav, Senior Project Manager B'nai B'rith Housing.

The proposal was submitted by Covenant Commonwealth Corporation, requesting \$452,000 to construct Phase 2 of the project at Coolidge at Sudbury. The request was originally \$631,000, but reduced as \$178,000 in funding was received from West Metro Home Consortium.

Mr. Jesse Kanson-Benanav explained his company constructed Coolidge at Sudbury Phase 1 which was completed in 2014. Phase 1 is 100 percent leased with a long waiting list, which demonstrates the need for affordable senior housing in Sudbury. Both Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be for residents 55 and older.

Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated they had received their comprehensive permit in 2017, and that they are funded by the Department of Housing and Community Development as well as State and Federal tax credits. They have received funds from the Sudbury Housing Trust. Mr. Kanson-Benanav further explained even though they do have funding, there is still a construction gap due to increasing construction costs

Because of the uncertainty of the market caused by changing construction costs, labor costs and interest rates, Mr. Kanson-Benanav's Board feels it is imperative to move

forward with the project now and begin construction in Spring 2019 to mitigate any further risks of changing conditions.

Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated they will start construction on time in Spring 2019. There may be some costs cut by using vinyl siding and drought resistant plants. These changes are still in compliance with their permit.

Phase 2 consists of 56 units for low to moderate income seniors and older adults. This project is located adjacent to Coolidge at Sudbury Phase 1 located at 189 Boston Post Road

Ms. Rust noted the 56 units for Coolidge would be required to keep Sudbury above the 10 percent at the 2020 recalibration of affordable housing.

Chairwoman Cline asked if there were any questions from the public. There were none.

Mr. Friedlander asked whether the final cost numbers have been obtained since the last meeting on November 14, 2018. Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated the number he has received is 1 million over the budget that was submitted in their initial application. Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated he is working closely with the contractor to see if there can be additional savings. The numbers are reflective of the direction of construction industry at this time. Mr. Friedlander asked if there was a final number. Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated the cost is now at \$14.3 million. Ms. Rust stated that number is just for the direct construction costs. However, the budget consists of contingencies and other construction costs. Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated that entire project is now at approximately \$20 Million.

Mr. Friedlander asked if the Quarry North Project were to proceed, how would that affect the SHI. Ms. Rust explained the Quarry North would actually be in the SHI for 2030. Ms. Rust explained that without the Coolidge project, Sudbury would not have safe harbor against 40B developments in 2020.

Ms. Huston asked why wouldn't drought resistant greenery be used anyway because of the environmental impact of non-drought resistant greenery. Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated his professional team will keep cost cutting in mind as well as high quality. They will be in compliance with their permits and the requirements of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Smigler asked whether there is a risk of losing the other funding? Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated that all the other investors listed in the application are committed to the project and he is guaranteeing 56 units.

Ms. Remington asked how they were going to close the \$1Million gap in funding. Mr. Kanson-Benanav stated that he was confident that they would be able to do so. He stated

that the CPA funds, which wouldn't be approved until May, would allow them to buy back some of the scope that would have to be cut out to get the budget down.

Chairwoman Cline stated a letter was received from Mr. Charlie Russo, a member of the Conservation Commission, but as a resident, urging support for the Coolidge Phase 2 Project.

PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – GOODNOW LIBRARY, SUDBURY
NEWSPAPER DIGITIZATION

Present: Esme Green and Karen Tobin

The proposal was submitted by Ms. Esme Green. Ms. Green stated the Goodnow Library is requesting \$25,000 to digitize Sudbury's local newspapers dating back to 1915. Through the use of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Green explained the newspapers are currently saved on microfilm and they would like them to be converted to digital format for preservation purposes. The software that is currently used to access the microfilm is not the easiest equipment to use and is not searchable.

Ms. Green explained once the newspapers are converted, there is not much more cost to maintain the database. The digital database is searchable by numerous queries. Ms. Green stated other libraries have also converted their papers and she has reached out to them to seek out the best practice.

Ms. Tobin added the company that digitizes the material does do a nice job of cleaning up the images and making it easy to read.

Ms. Green stated the conversion of the data is based on a per page pricing system which would cost approximately \$30,000 to digitize the collection. Ms. Green stated they do have \$5000.00 from the Goodnow Trust that they can use. Both the Friends of the Goodnow Library and the Goodnow Foundation were unable to contribute to this project.

Ms. Green notes that in FY15 they migrated the Sudbury archives onto a new platform with funding gratefully received from CPC. Therefore this request is just another step in that process of preserving and protecting Sudbury's unique historical resources.

Ms. Green noted Sudbury High School yearbooks will be converted to digital format for free thanks to a grant from Boston Public Library as part of the Digital Commonwealth program

Public Comment

Sally Hild of the Sudbury Historical Society, 206 Nobscot Road, voiced her support for this project and how it will be helpful to them also. The project has far reaching effects and it is accessible outside of the library as well.

Mr. Friedlander questioned whether they had looked into obtaining the newspapers in digital form directly from the newspapers. Ms. Green had not looked into that option yet. There was a question of the feasibility of migrating the data from the newspaper to the proposed database and whether that would result in cost savings. Ms. Green feels there would be copyright issues. Mr. Friedlander asked if there would be the same copyright issues for any newspaper. Ms. Green explained that the Sudbury papers are sent out and put onto microfilm yearly.

Ms. Tobin stated microfilming will still be done as it is the standard that is used for preservation. Therefore, there wouldn't be any savings from digitizing instead of microfilming.

Katina Fontes, president of the Sudbury Historical Society, 19 Dorothy Road, expressed her support for the digitization project and how labor intensive it is to search the microfilm.

Ms. Green stated preserving on microfilm is the standard because you can lose internet access or the paper copy. They would continue to microfilm, and digitization will be in addition to the microfilm. The companies that digitize the newspapers also do the microfilming. Mr. Friedlander asked if the original newspapers would still be retained. Ms. Green stated no, they deteriorate very quickly.

Ms. Brown stated creating the new database, while not disaster proof, seems a step in that direction. Ms. Brown asked if the microfilm was kept in disaster resistant storage. Ms. Green stated yes, they are in a fireproof cabinet in the library.

Ms. Brown asked if adding the new format would make the information more secure as there would be two formats of the newspapers. Ms. Green stated yes, that is correct.

Mr. Smigler asked where the data would be stored. Ms. Green stated it could be hosted locally. Mr. Smigler asked if the Town or the vendor would own the data. Ms. Green was not exactly sure. Ms. Warren asked if they could find out definitively if the Town would own the data. Ms. Green stated yes.

Ms. Huston confirmed that the request was for \$25,000, and asked going forward if digitization would be part of the normal operating budgeting process (that is, not requesting CPA funds in future years). Ms. Green agreed, stating that digitization for future years would be funded from the operating budget..

PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – FIRE PROTECTION FOR LORING PARSONAGE

Present: Stewart Hoover, Former President of the Sudbury Historical Society and Katina Fontes, Current President of the Sudbury Historical Society.

The Historical Society is requesting \$63,000 to design and install a VESDA (Very Early Smoke Detection Apparatus) fire detection system in the Loring Parsonage. The Loring Parsonage was originally built in 1730 and is one of the oldest buildings in Sudbury. It is currently being converted to the Sudbury History Museum.

Mr. Hoover explained the history of the project through a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Hoover stated the Historical Society has spent \$1,700,000 to get the Parsonage to where it is today. Mr. Hoover explained the sources of that money as follows: \$290,000 from a State Grant, \$726,000 raised by the Historical Society, \$286,000 from the Harry Rice and Wood Davison Trusts, and \$400,000 of CPA funds.

Mr. Hoover explained that the Town owns the building and the Sudbury Historical Society has a 30 year lease. If this application is not approved, the building will have a standard smoke detection system. A VESDA system was originally planned for the building, but had to be removed from the project due to the soaring construction costs.

Mr. Hoover explained how the VESDA system works and advised that it is significantly more sensitive to changes in the air, alerting the fire department to the existence of fire long before a standard smoke detector would. He emphasized that both the building and the SHS's historical relics are irreplaceable.

Ms. Kilcoyne asked if the Fire Protection System would impact the integrity of the building. Mr. Hoover stated no. There would only be small copper pipes around the ceiling.

Ms. Warren asked if the main components of this system would be housed in the basement. Mr. Hoover was not sure of that. The contractor will be producing a design which is included in the requested \$63,000. Ms. Warren asked how many square feet the system would take up. Mr. Hoover stated the system is relatively small. Ms. Warren asked if the pipes for the system would be located in the ceiling. Mr. Hoover stated that he didn't have the design yet. Ms. Fontes stated the pipes would likely be outside the ceiling as the construction will be done before the Fire Protection is installed. Ms. Warren expressed her concern that the current estimate was not sufficient to conceal the system, as was done at the Hosmer House.

Sally Hild of the Sudbury Historical Society commented on the construction of the system at the Hosmer House. The installation of the system was very discreet so that the pipes are barely visible. The quote received for the Loring Parsonage is from the same

company that did the Hosmer House and the company is aware of the historic feel the Town would like to maintain.

Ms. Warren as a member of the Historical Commission expressed her concern that they were not asking for enough money to do the project historically correctly. She reminded the CPC that it had approved funds for the same system at the Hosmer House. Mr. Hoover stated they can go back to the vendor and ask him to revisit the project and confirm that the funds requested will do the project done properly.

Ms. Remington asked if the Hosmer House has had any false alarms. Sally Hild stated they had spoken to the Fire Chief regarding that and he stated no.

There were no further questions or comments from the Committee or the public at this time.

PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM – PLAYGROUND MODERNIZATION FOR SUDBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (SPS)

Present: Donald Sawyer, Director of Business and Finance for the Sudbury Public School District.

Mr. Sawyer presented the project through a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Sawyer explained this project and the history of this multi-year project. Mr. Sawyer explained there are four elementary schools and 4 projects. Haynes school was done in 2018, Noyes is projected for completion 2019, Nixon to be funded 2020 and the final project will be Loring in 2021.

Mr. Sawyer explained a typical playground has the life expectancy of 10-15 years. During those 10-15 years, structures will be added and structures will be removed. Most of the big structures are 16-20 years old.

Mr. Sawyer stated the Haynes playground was started in the end of the school year in June 2018 and completed in August 2018. The Haynes playground funding was voted at the October Town Meeting and \$275,000 budgeted for the project was awarded from free cash.

Mr. Sawyer stated the Noyes project was approved at May 2018 Town Meeting. The total project cost was \$415,000; \$250,000 received from CPA funds and \$165,000 in free cash. The Noyes project is in the design phase and will be started in the school year 2019-2020, i.e. in the summer of 2019. Currently students, parents, teachers and vendors are being consulted for the design. No contracts have been awarded and no funds have been expended from the CPA fund. He expects the selection of contractors to be made in the next 90 days so the project can begin immediately after school ends in June.

Mr. Sawyer stated if at all possible they would use a contractor who is already an approved State contractor. Otherwise, they would proceed with the bidding process which could take 90 days.

Mr. Sawyer continued to explain the next project they are working on is the Nixon playground for 2020. Mr. Sawyer noted the original request was for \$335,000 and that number has been reduced to \$235,000. Two grants were received, one from the Cummings Foundation for \$100,000 which is \$25,000 per elementary school, and one from the Sudbury Foundation for \$150,000 for the Nixon and Loring playgrounds.

Mr. Sawyer reiterated what many project managers and construction personnel have stated previously about the rising costs of construction. Mr. Sawyer stated they are slated for one per year but if there were an immediate funding source for Nixon they would look at every possible way to structure the Nixon and Loring playgrounds to be done together to avoid the inflationary costs for the summer of 2021. If the bids were to go out together that could also present some cost savings.

Ms. Huston asked if there was any money left over from the Haynes project. Mr. Sawyer stated yes, approximately \$11,000 in savings and \$25,000 from the Cummings grant that was received after the contracts were awarded. Mr. Sawyer stated that their plan was to apply to Town Meeting at the completion of the 3rd school to have any remaining funds applied to the Loring project.

Chairwoman Cline asked if any of the \$415,000 for Noyes had been expended yet. Mr. Sawyer stated no. Chairwoman Cline confirmed with Mr. Sawyer that the request for this year is \$235,000 and no funds will be requested next year from the CPA. Mr. Sawyer confirmed. However, on further questioning from Mr. Friedlander, Mr. Sawyer admitted that although he hoped the Town would fund the \$125,000 needed to complete the Loring project, he could not be totally confident and may need to ask the CPC for additional funds.

Mr. Friedlander asked, if there were any remaining sums from the Noyes project, how they would be allocated between the Town and CPA since funds had been received from both sources. Chairwoman Cline suggested that the wording of the Article and Town Counsel would have to be consulted.

Looking again at the Excel spreadsheet, Chairwoman Cline asked how there could be \$25,000 left over from the Noyes project if the project has not been completed. Mr. Sawyer stated this was the amount in the contingency budget and by Town Meeting they hope to have the project awarded.

Public Comment:

Jean Nam, 81 Newbridge Road, tried to explain the Excel spreadsheet. For Haynes, they used less of the Town money and less of the grant money therefore they have both contingency and the grant money left over from Haynes. That is why the numbers are shifted on the spreadsheet. The \$100,000 grant is split evenly by \$25,000 for each playground and the \$150,000 from the Sudbury Foundation is dispersing \$75,000 each to Nixon and Loring.

Ms. Huston asked if there is still an opportunity to update Curtis. Mr. Sawyer stated he has spoken with the Principal but it is just in the discussion mode at this time. There are no safety or ADA concerns with Curtis at this time.

Ms. Brown asked what was the plan for maintaining this capital asset so that the schools would not be asking to replace the playgrounds in 10-15 years. Mr. Sawyer explained it will be an ongoing maintenance program incorporated within the school's budget and not a total revamp of the playground. He also expected to receive funds from the PTO and other sources for playground maintenance.

Ms. Huston asked, besides the ADA issues, what make the playgrounds unsafe after so many years. Mr. Sawyer has inspection reports that he can provide with reasons for the updates. There are many variables including changing standards, age of the component parts, and the inability to replace parts.

There were no further questions or comments from the Committee or the public at this time.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the FY20 Community Preservation Act proposals for funding requests submitted to the Community Preservation Committee.

UPDATE ON FINAL REQUESTS

Ms. Suedmeyer discussed as an overview the final amounts requested from the applications which were submitted for FY20. They are as follows:

Featherland Multisport Courts, \$220,000,
The Splash Park has been removed,
The Town Hall renovation as well as Camp Sewataro are TBD,
Coolidge at Sudbury, Phase 2, \$452,000

Sudbury Newspaper Digitization, \$25,000,
The playground modernization \$235,000,
RHSO, \$30,000
Loring Parsonage \$63,000
Total funds requested \$1,025,000

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS

Ms. Suedmeyer researched the possibility of using administrative funds for a few projects. There is a policy in place for the Committee to determine if a project is an appropriate use of funds. Resources are the Community Preservation Coalition and Town Counsel.

Ms. Suedmeyer asked the Community Preservation Coalition about the use of Administrative funds for a feasibility study for Camp Sewataro and that was determined not to be an appropriate use of Administrative funds.

Ms. Huston asked if an appraisal or survey was an appropriate use of the funds. Ms. Suedmeyer stated, yes that is the typical application for the funds.

MEETING SCHEDULE:

The Committee confirmed that upcoming meetings are set for 7:00 pm on December 19, 2018 and January 2 & 16, 2019.

FINANCE REPORT

Tabled because the financial information is not available.

MINUTES:

November 7, 2018, tabled pending resolution of a question about the minutes submitted.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT:

No report at this time.

Misc:

Ms. Remington asked if there was any further information regarding Camp Sewataro. Ms. Suedmeyer stated there is a December 14, 2018 site walk scheduled for Camp Sewataro but that there is no further information concerning a purchase price requested. Ms. Remington asked if the Park and Recreation had any discussion regarding Camp Sewataro. Ms. Huston stated Park and Recreation has a lot of questions and concerns about running a camp of the size and complexity of Camp Sewataro. Ms. Huston asked why Camp Sewataro was a priority for the Selectmen in view of the other priorities for

the Town such as Fairbank Community Center. Ms. Brown stated the Board collectively chose the top 6 priority projects and Camp Sewataro was one of them. However, the Board had not discussed the use of the property.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To adjourn the meeting at 9:06 p.m.

Dated: December 3, 2018

From: Charlie Russo

To the members of the Community Preservation Committee:

As you consider whether to expend funds to support The Coolidge Phase 2, I urge you to also consider secondary effects. That is, if Coolidge Phase 2 fails to be built, and Sudbury falls under the 10% threshold of affordable housing, properties that possess CPC's other values (open space, recreation, historic) may be endangered by unfriendly 40B developments in the future. In other words, a vote to support Coolidge Phase 2 may not just be a vote in support of affordable housing, but also a vote to defend other CPC values from destruction by unfriendly 40B developers.

I'll note that Coolidge Phase 2 already has permits that were extensively debated and then approved by the Conservation Commission. I am a member of the Conservation Commission, but write today only on my own behalf, as a private resident.

Here's just one specific example: the so-called Bonnie Brook property at 74-80 Maynard Road is approximately 27 acres of undeveloped land traveling diagonally from Maynard Road to the back of Wake Robin Road. It has been prioritized for conservation by both the Town and Sudbury Valley Trustees (SVT), and is critical connector between the 48-acre town-owned Wake Robin Conservation land (which also abuts the recently-obtained 20-acre Broadacres Farm) and the existing 41-acre Mineway Brook conservation property owned by SVT. Conservation Commission has approved wetland delineation for the Bonnie Brook site, and under conventional development according to Town bylaws, the site could fit probably 3-4 single family homes, maybe up to 6 homes in a cluster development near Maynard Road, with the back 15-20 acres of wetland area left undeveloped as a connection between Wake Robin/Broadacres and Mineway Brook.

However, should Coolidge Phase 2 fail and Sudbury fall under the 10% threshold, key properties like Bonnie Brook could be subject to larger 40B developments that ignore the protection provided by Town wetland bylaws and enable development across the full property. For Bonnie Brook, this would break the link between Wake Robin and Mineway Brook conservation properties. This kind of fragmentation of conservation land can impact the health of the environment and residents by affecting drinking water supplies, groundwater recharge, flood control, biodiversity, and more. I'm sure there are other valuable properties in town that would be imperiled by a drop below the 10% threshold.

I know there are many projects competing for CPA funding, and I am not an expert on Sudbury's 40B housing stock projections, but my understanding is that the Coolidge Phase 2 is required for the town to attain a 10.17% affordable housing rate for 2020. I will respect any decision the CPC makes, but I encourage you to consider how all CPC values could be protected by supporting The Coolidge Phase 2.

Charlie Russo

Juniper Road