



Town of Sudbury

Community Preservation Committee

cpc@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314

www.sudbury.ma.us/cpc

CPC MINUTES

DECEMBER 6, 2023

VIRTUAL MEETING

Members Present: Chair Sherrill Cline, Vice Chair Kirsten Roopenian, Jan Costa, Dave Henkels, Justin Finnicum, Mara Huston and Lynne Remington

Members Absent: Jennifer Roberts

Others Present: Ryan Poteat, Community Preservation Coordinator; Glenn Pransky and Jeff Winston, Representatives for Hop Brook; Marcia Rasmussen, Planning Development Assistant; and Carmine Gentile, Chair Sudbury Housing Trust

At 7:04 PM, Ms. Cline called the meeting to order.

Ms. Cline read the Public Hearing Notice into the record.

Hop Brook

Glenn Pransky and Jeff Winston were present to discuss the application with the Community Preservation Committee. There was an original request made in 2019 and the project is ongoing. The Brook has been treated and the water chestnuts have diminished. Treatment needs to continue to keep the regrowth at a minimum. The hope is to restore the water to Class B recreational quality.

Ms. Huston asked what "Class B" would offer residents. Mr. Pransky stated that a Level (Class) B water quality would offer the ability to boat and possibly swim in the near future. Ms. Huston asked how long it would take to get to Class B water quality. Mr. Winston said they were still working with consultants and did not know exactly how long this would take until these studies were completed. Mr. Finnicum asked if anything was being done upstream to improve water quality and/or prevent the pollutants Sudbury is fighting to stop entering our waterways. Mr. Winston gave a brief history of a 30+ year battle to do exactly that. The EPA had to intervene and did eventually stop pollutants being dumped into the water. There are still very high levels of phosphorus which has settled on the bottom of the ponds.

Parkinson Field Driveway

Marcia Rasmussen was present to discuss the application with the Community Preservation Committee for \$250,000 to redo the driveway.

This driveway extends 140 feet from Hudson Road to Parkinson Field which was acquired by the town in 1977. The driveway is adjacent to the Ti-SALES. It is a single lane driveway which causes traffic and safety issues. The field is not used as frequently as it could be because of the access issues. Part of the driveway goes through Ti-SALES property and the owners are concerned that the public speeds through their property creating safety concerns. They intimated that they may need to close their gates cutting off

access to the field. There is also the expectation of increased use of the driveway and field as it is proximate to the BFRT.

Ms. Remington asked how the \$250,000 ask would be broken down. Ms. Rasmussen stated it was the hope it would cover all the costs including a land survey, wetlands delineation, permitting, engineering, and construction. Additional studies are needed as to the proximity to wetlands.

Ms. Remington asked if the project could be spread over two years. Ms. Roopenian was happy to hear that there had been communication with Ti-SALES. Ms. Roopenian also asked if there had been any conversations about a notice of intent or request for determination in connection with the design of the BFRT? Ms. Rasmussen stated that this is not part of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Project but that given the redevelopment of the intersection at Hudson Rd. which includes the BFRT, the Ti-SALES driveway and the Parkinson Field driveway, Ti-SALES had raised concerns and the possibility of closing their driveway. Ms. Rasmussen was therefore trying to be proactive in planning for the redesign of the Parkinson Field driveway. Ms. Cline asked what entity would be managing this project. The Planning Department would be managing the project initially. Ms. Rasmussen needs to coordinate with DPW regarding managing the construction. She confirmed that the \$250,000 ask would be enough to at least provide a gravel road – if not paved.

Public Comment

Len Simon, 40 Meadowbrook Circle, commented he felt this part if the road should be paved. He stated he believed this would be safer for cyclists. The Department of Public Works needs to be kept in the loop throughout these decisions. They had previously declined to construct the portion of the BFRT from the diamond to Rt. 20 so it's unclear whether the DPW would take this on.

The Committee overall agreed it would make sense to have the driveway paved. Ms. Cline asked Ms. Rasmussen to make a decision on the surface and get back to the CPC by mid-January when the warrant article had to be drafted.

Richard Williamson, 22 Farmstead Lane commented he was on the original Bruce Freeman Rail Trail committee and the question of a parking lot at Parkinson's Field was brought up then (over 20 years ago).

Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Phase 3

Marcia Rasmussen was present to discuss this application with the Committee. Phase 3 is the section of the BFRT that starts at the diamond adjacent to Station Road, crossing over Boston Post Road and continuing south to the Framingham line. Phase 2D is currently under construction (4.4 miles, from Station Road north to the Sudbury/Concord line. The town is seeking \$750,000 to continue this project. Ms. Rasmussen discussed the complexity of the project as a whole but illustrated the massive potential and benefit it will bring to the community. She described the natural beauty along the rail trail which is currently inaccessible to most residents. Both the Rail Trails Advisory Committee and the Parks and Recreation Commission voted to support this application.

Ms. Remington asked if last years (FY24) CPC allocation had funded the BFRT 25% plan. Ms. Rasmussen answered that at the May 2023 Town Meeting, \$300,000 had been awarded for work along the CSX extension. Ms. Remington also asked if this year's request of \$750,000 could be spread out into future fiscal years. It unknown at this time but the full amount is being requested so that work may continue as quickly as possible.

For context Ms. Rasmussen stated that at the May 2022 Town Meeting, \$500,000 had been appropriated for the design and construction of Phase 2D north of the Mass Central Rail Trail and that as of October 2023, there was still a balance of \$471,000. These funds can only be used for their approved use but there is the potential for a large sum of money being reverted.

Ms. Cline pointed out that this request is an amendment of the original request of \$250,000. Ms. Cline reviewed previous allocations as follows: \$500,000 for Phase 2D in May 2022, and that same year, \$300,000 was also appropriated for design and construction south of the Mass Central Rail Trail (Phase 3) of which \$152,000 is remaining. In 2023, \$300,000 had been awarded also for Phase 3. There is also a \$192,000 grant. Ms. Cline calculated \$644,000 as the available funds on hand for Phase 3. With an award of \$750,000, the total available funds would be \$1,394,000, which is \$154,000 more than what the projected costs for Phase 3 will be. Ms. Rasmussen explained that she was trying to cover all bases, expects funds to be reverted but is asking for enough money in contingency to keep the project on schedule and in compliance with language in the previously awarded warrant articles.

Ms. Roopenian mentioned funds committed by Transportation Improvement Projects (TIPS). Ms. Rasmussen stated the CPC had awarded \$650,000 back in 2018 and received a \$12,000,000 commitment by Transportation Improvement Projects (TIPS) but it is the town's responsibility to have a solid plan in place to be eligible for these funds. She further explained the \$500,000 amendment in this year's request was because she had not realized previously awarded CPC funds could not be used for other parts of the BFRT project. The increase is what she anticipates being reverted from those previous awards. Ms. Huston asked about a Mass Trails grant. Ms. Rasmussen stated that the grant was for \$1,250,000 and had been factored into the budget. Ms. Rasmussen explained all these factors were taken into account; the balance needed to complete the project is \$596,000 but this would leave no contingency. Ms. Huston asked if there was an opportunity to apply for another Mass Trails grant. This is possible and being worked on but the deadline (January 2024) may not be realistic.

Public Comment

Richard Williamson of 22 Farmstead Lane. Expressed passionate support for this project. He told a brief story of his excitement in using the rail trail to provide day care for his daughter/grandson who lived down the rail trail in Framingham. His grandson is now a sophomore in college. He stated he was now well into his 80's but is still excited and hopes he will have the opportunity to see the completed rail trail.

Mr. Finnicum expressed his appreciation of Mr. Williamson's story; he pointed out that the Sudbury section of the rail trail will connect miles and miles of existing rail trails. It will be a vital link and that the CPC has bit of pressure to get this completed.

Len Simon, 40 Meadowbrook Circle stated he believed Framingham had purchased their section of the rail trail and that Sudbury should be working in concert with them. He was concerned in having gaps in funding. He was in support of this project.

Glenn Pransky, 102 Barton Drive stated that the Massachusetts Interagency Task Force has made the BFRT one of two top priority in trails in the entire state. He believed that if Sudbury can complete the plan and get it submitted that it would likely not only be funded but moved up to their number one priority. On the contrary, should this not be funded, the cost would likely increase and would be moved down in priority.

John Drobinski, 984 Woodside Road agreed with Mr. Pransky's statements and stated his support in funding this project and that this request is a unique opportunity to make that happen.

Ms. Roopenian wanted to make sure that the public understood that the CPC were doing their due diligence in asking some hard questions. The questions being asked will help at Town Meeting and are being asked so that the CPC is as prepared as possible should these questions come up.

Sudbury Housing Trust Allocation

Carmine Gentile presented the application for the SHT. Should the CPC approve this request, the Housing Trust would be able to purchase a deed restricted property. The Trust's goal is to provide and preserve affordable housing in Sudbury. They have not created any new affordable housing units in 7 years. He stated that the shortage of affordable housing is a crisis in Sudbury. There are many reasons families may want or need to live here but simply cannot afford it. He was confident that with \$400,000, the SHT could create one new unit in the next year. He mentioned that there is a \$4.3B bond bill for housing pending at the State House. This is up significantly from the last bond bill of \$1.5B but less than half of what advocates were looking for. This illustrates the desperate need for funding. Mr. Gentile gave a hypothetical example: A home costing \$600,000 which need \$100,000 of repairs. The buyer and the trust would work with a lender, the buyer mortgages \$300,000, the Trust pays the mortgagor \$300,000 and pays for the \$100,000 of repairs. The property then would have a deed restriction placed on it in perpetuity keeping it affordable when the buyer is ready to sell the property. Mr. Gentile expressed his support of other projects brought before the CPC this year but hoped the CPC would fund this request.

Ms. Huston asked if there was a specific project in mind that these funds would be used for. Mr. Gentile explained the process. Ms. Huston wanted to know if the funds would be held for when an opportunity arose or if there was a specific property in mind.

Mr. Finnicum asked how this related to 40B housing. Mr. Gentile explained that with 40B, a private investor would build a development and make a certain percentage of the units affordable which does add to Sudbury's affordable housing inventory. What the Housing Trust is looking to do is different. They would like to buy a single-family home (or two-family) home and subsidize the purchase to a qualified applicant to make it an affordable unit(s) for purchase with a deed restriction.

Ms. Cline pointed out that the application mentioned the Mortgage Assistance Program which was not CPA eligible. Mr. Gentile explained that money came from the state and lottery income. Ms. Cline asked how much money the Housing Trust currently had available for purchasing property. Mr. Gentile gave a rough estimate of \$200,000 which, added to the \$400,000 request would be enough for the SHT to create a new unit. Ms. Cline asked how that money was allocated between the different projects the Trust has and how much CPA eligible money remained. Mr. Gentile said there was approximately \$113,000 remaining from the \$292,000 allocated to the SHT last year.

Approval of Meeting Minutes - if presented

No minutes were presented at this time

Future Meetings

December 20, 2023

January 3, 2024

January 17, 2024

Administrative Report

There was no administrative report presented at this meeting.

Ms. Huston requested an updated financial statement of the current CPA applications. She mentioned that the applications were listed but would like an updated version showing what the current monetary requests. She also requested the amount expected to be reverted. Estimates can be made available but active projects cannot be considered for reversion until they are completed.

Ms. Roopenian made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Henkels seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Ms. Cline – Aye, Ms. Roopenian – Aye, Ms. Costa – Aye, Mr. Henkels – Aye, Ms. Huston – Aye, and Ms. Remington – Aye.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 PM.