



Town of Sudbury

Housing Trust

HousingTrust@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314
www.sudbury.ma.us/housingtrust

MINUTES

67-73 NOBSCOT ROAD SUBCOMITTEE

MAY 8, 2021 AT 8:00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Housing Trust Members Present: Vice Chair John Riordan, Kelley Cronin, and Karl Pops

Sudbury Housing Authority Members Present: Amy Lepak, Steven Swanger, and Tania Vitvitsky

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau and property owner Hank Rauch

Mr. Riordan called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM.

Minutes for Approval: April 15, 2021 and April 29, 2021

Mr. Swanger made a motion to approve the minutes of April 15, 2021 and April 29, 2021 as amended. Ms. Lepak seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.

67-73 Nobscot Road – Possible Property Acquisition – Status Update and Discussion

Mr. Duchesneau provided an update regarding the status of the easements based upon the research which had been conducted by Town Counsel (KP Law). Town Counsel found the easements over 99 Nobscot Road and the main access point at the southwestern portion of the property were both in place.

There was then discussion about property owner's request to retain access over the 99 Nobscot Road end of the property, even if the property were to be sold. Mr. Rauch confirmed they were seeking to retain access from Nobscot Road over this portion of the property, but they were open to various scenarios where access could be provided in this location.

Ms. Cronin inquired if the main access point would work for their purposes. Mr. Rauch stated this location was too far away and would take longer to get there, and there were also some bridges which would need to be upgraded and improved if they could not access the property from the 99 Nobscot Road location.

The Housing Trust members did not feel the property owner's request to retain access to the property in this location was going to be an issue in any negotiations moving forward.

Review and Discussion of Engineering Firm Proposal Submissions

Mr. Pops indicated the Allen & Major Associates meetings were part of the additional fees in their proposal. He noted Beals + Thomas had shortest project timeline. Mr. Pops also stated the development budget for all of the proposals only appeared to include site development.

There was then discussion regarding how the proposals did not include a detailed analysis or costs for the analysis of the existing building on the property for reuse.

Mr. Riordan noted the Beals + Thomas proposal stated the architect fee would be another \$5,000 to \$7,000 for architectural services.

There was then discussion regarding the Beals + Thomas property survey details and in particular if there would be a boundary survey. Mr. Pops noted Bohler Engineering would provide a detailed site survey, but did not specify an extensive property boundary survey would be conducted. However, Mr. Pops also indicated what they were proposing should be more than enough for the subcommittee's property analysis.

Ms. Cronin stated the pricing and services for all of the firms proposals needed to be clear in order to make an educated decision.

Mr. Duchesneau noted the subcommittee could interview the firms to clear up some of the questions the subcommittee still had with regard to each of the proposals.

Mr. Pops stated it appeared Allen & Major Associates, Beals + Thomas, and Bohler Engineering seemed to have the most comprehensive proposals and therefore perhaps they were the best firms to bring in for interviews.

Ms. Lepak raised concerns about coordination with Hancock Associates in bringing on a architect to analyze the existing buildings.

Ms. Vitvitsky indicated the Devellis Zrein Inc. proposal stated an architect or structural engineer was not included in their proposal and would be an additional cost.

The subcommittee then discussed the timeframes for the various proposals and what a reasonable timeline might be for the analysis of the 67-73 Nobscot Road property.

Mr. Riordan suggested Allen & Major Associates, Beals + Thomas, and Bohler Engineering all be contacted for interviews by a few members of subcommittee.

Mr. Swanger made a motion to interview the firms of Allen & Major Associates, Beals + Thomas, and Bohler Engineering with Mr. Duchesneau participating from Town staff. Ms.

Lepak seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.

Mr. Swanger recommended Mr. Pops and Ms. Cronin serve on the interview committee, and they both agreed to participate.

Mr. Duchesneau indicated they would look to conduct interviews the week of May 17, 2021 and then hold the next subcommittee meeting the week of May 24, 2021.

The subcommittee members determined their next meeting would be on May 27, 2021 at 8:00 AM.

At 9:08 AM, Mr. Swanger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Pops seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.