

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MAY 15, 2018

Present: Chairman Stephen Garvin, Vice-Chairman Peter Abair, John Hincks, Charles Karustis, Nancy Kilcoyne, Justin Finnicum, Meagen Donoghue (Director of Planning and Community Development) and Beth Suedmeyer (Environmental Planner).

The statutory requirements as to notice having been complied with, the meeting was convened at 6:45 p.m., in the Flynn Building – Silva Conference Room.

### **Master Plan RFP Proposal Submissions**

Chairman Garvin opened the meeting and announced that the Board would be interviewing two candidates for the Master Plan Consultant position. The Chairman asked the Board if there were any suggestions regarding procedure for interviewing. Ms. Donoghue suggested that she and Ms. Suedmeyer be left out of the interview proceedings. Chairman Garvin replied affirmatively. Ms. Kilcoyne recommended that the line of question be performed in a rotating manner. Mr. Hincks agreed that a clock-wise rotating procedure for questioning applicants, would be best.

Board members and Staff discussed the screening and ranking process. Mr. Hincks inquired about the ranking standing, as of tonight. Chairman Garvin replied that the answer to that inquiry was not a part of public meeting. Mr. Hincks said that he wanted to be sure that the Board as a whole had deliberation opportunity. Chairman Garvin agreed

Ms. Donoghue added that the RFP was approved by Town Counsel and Town Manager. Mr. Karustis commented that when reviewing the four chosen applicants, the range narrowed, which Ms. Donoghue confirmed. Mr. Hincks stated that he expected a narrowing process, and Board contribution to that process. Chairman Garvin said that there was misunderstanding here, but that it seemed that the Board did have the ability to have some deliberation and was able to weigh in on the decision.

### **Interview – Horsley Witten Group**

At 7:00 p.m., the Board and Staff introduced themselves, as did the Horsley Witten team.

Present: Members of the Horsley Witten group: Nate Kelly, Principal in Charge, Krista Moravec, Horsley Witten Leader, Rachel Setsky, Senior Program Manager with Camoin Associates; and Rory Fitzgerald, Community Planner and Urban Designer, with Fitzgerald and Halliday.

Mr. Kelly began the Horsley Witten Group presentation, and noted the firm is composed of planners, scientists and engineers. He added the Board was most familiar with the Horsley Witten scientists, and engineers as peer reviewers who provided their services to the Town. He went on to say that Horsley Witten started in 1988 as a four-person office, and the firm now works in 50 states and 10 countries, with 56 full-time employees. Mr. Kelly indicated the Sudbury Master Plan's core team members would be: himself, Nate Kelly, very much involved with day-to-day work, Krista Moravec, and Senior Project Manager, Jeff Davis, an expert in areas of facilitation, web design and has a talent for zoning as a Senior Planner. He also mentioned Craig Pereira, Senior Planner, great facilitator and flood plain manager and mitigation, disaster preparedness.

Ms. Setsky said that her group would be mostly involved and supporting the team with the economics of market trends; locally, regionally and nationally, which affect land use decisions in Sudbury. She added that her group is working with on a project in Canton at this time with Horsley Whitten, and have been working together on a numbers of projects, proving to be very successful.

Ms. Fitzgerald of Fitzgerald and Halliday said that her company employs 42 full-time staff, was founded in 1987, and works in 27 states. She said that she works out of the Hartford, CT office she added that Ken Livingston would be the Senior Advisor, in addition, the team comprised of Fred Gomes Director of Community Planning Service and herself as the Community Director.

Mr. Kelly explained the various stages involved in a proposed Master Plan and described the project phases as The Departure; which covers the areas of Public Transportation, Targeted Engagement, Baseline Report, and an Early Awareness Campaign. He went on to explain that The Inflight stage is the meat and core substance of the project, and covers the areas of Full Engagement, Formative Issues, Goals and Strategies, and Diversity of Technique. He described the final stage, as The Landing, encompassing sections that included Open House, Document Work Session, Adoption, Zoning Bylaw Report, and the intent to leave Sudbury with a great plan.

Mr. Kelly asserted that the team approaches each step methodically and knows that we are going to be making constant changes along the way. He added that the document created is never finished and is always ongoing and a living reference. He maintained that having a document that we can hold and read is most critical in planning. He explained that at the onset of Targeted Engagement, it is a fact finding process, with many interviews with department heads, community leaders; which helps with ideas in areas that escape US census, and the GIS data base; which is local knowledge that feeds into the plan and gives it more substance. This all goes into the baseline report; which is the reference document (transportation, housing) and the Early Awareness Campaign is where we start creating excitement about the project and many tools are implemented here; including project website, and media outlets. He emphasized that while in the "In Flight" stage there is the excitement phase of the project with full engagement, whose key is diversity of techniques, face to face, electronic, etc.

Ms. Setsky stated that the heavy residential profile of Sudbury would be the focus, since 90% of the Town's assessed value comes from residential properties. She added the group would study methods to diversify the tax base while aligning community values. Then the team would examine how these policies impact the residential and commercial property owners. She stated that her group looked at commuting patterns; and what type of barriers were present regarding business development. Ms. Fitzgerald added that Sudbury is a bedroom community that has people working in Boston, Waltham, Framingham and the closest MBTA train stop is in Newton, and there is no local MBTA bus service and limited regional bus service by the Metro-West Regional Transit Authority. She added that the team would also look to balance the traffic situation, and address the congestion on Rt. 20 and Rt. 27, which is both local, and regional traffic. She mentioned that the group would also strive to balance the need for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists; and knew that there is a strong desire in Sudbury to add more sidewalks throughout Town. She added that the team would look to identify destination points and connections, and hope to provide recommendations on how to preserve historic aspects and character of the Town, and preserve the Town center.

Mr. Kelly stated that with the increased housing pressures in the Town, especially Meadow Walk, and the diversified housing stock in the Town, pressures from 40B; managing such growth is critical. He added that total reliance on the MA statutory regulations for development is not the only way to plan and his team would explore other ways to achieve a Master Plan. Mr. Kelly stressed that engagement from beginning to the end of the project is key.

Ms. Moravac stated that residents have limited time and we want to make the best use of presenting effectively; and provide different options to give feedback. She continued saying that the Public Participation Plan involves thinking about messaging, and educating residents, and relating it to them in their daily life and how it affects them. She added that the language that we use is very important as well,

and we must also go to events where the people are and continue seeking out those events, throughout the process. Ms. Moravec said that the team can also sponsor pop-up parks, walking tours, and provide information regarding the formation of the Master Plan, while entertaining at the same time. She stressed that the team must be strategic with our questions, so the final result will be clear.

Questions from the Board:

Question

Vice-Chairman Abair asked the team what strategies are undertaken, to ensure valid communications with client and the Town.

Mr. Kelly replied that his firm has the public participation plan, which they had been doing for some time. He will also provide another 3 to 4 page management document addressing all those issues, including point of contact and how do members of the Board communicate with different consultants, which products will go through Meagen, and would it be fine for us to pass across-lines of communication; be it e-mail, etc. He added the Team must be sensitive to the law concerning public discussion. He stated this is an aspect of the opening workshop that we will have, going over the public participations plan, project management plan, and making sure that all those expectations are met in the line of communication in addition to regular communications including conference calls or group meetings

Question

Chairman Garvin asked the team how they draw from the existing Master Plans in developing the new Master Plan.

Mr. Kelly said that it comes down to the homework aspect of it. The team must go through preliminary work at the beginning; such as reviewing zoning, previous plans, housing, and transportation and bring back to the Board their take away. Ms. Moravec added that we review what has and has not been done to determine if these areas are still relevant or not.

Ms. Setsky said that on the economic side, we see if local or regional parameters have changed.

Ms. Fitzgerald commented on the transportation aspect, stating her group sees if there has been changes in traffic trends.

Question

Mr. Hincks asked what expectations the team would have of the Board and staff.

Mr. Kelly answered that the team would present options to the Board regarding how to be involved, and when the management plan proceeds, team goes through the management plan, we will talk about who is going to read drafts as the process goes along. Mr. Kelly added that in some communities, all Board members want to read it, and if everyone wants to read it, then organization of feedback must take place. He mentioned that it is most favorable when the Board and Staff are comfortable with putting themselves out front; such as helping with the facilitation of groups, writing for local papers, engagement involvement, with perhaps, using their own personal media accounts.

Ms. Moravec said that utilization of the Board's own networking, is beneficial, and with its ability to spread the word about events. She went on to detail, that it is equally rewarding for the Board and Staff to be involved with the drafting of the Plan, and formation of interested subcommittees is also ideal. Mr. Kelly highlighted the importance of committee members having specialized knowledge and interest, and

stated that regular meetings take place; reviewing the progress; plus additional communications, at various times.

#### Question

Mr. Karustis asked to please discuss the time schedule for completion as well as deliverable services in the process.

Mr. Kelly responded that it is a tight timeline, not out of the question, but a year as been a minimum timeframe for what the group has done in the past. He added that one area of variability is that it takes a few months to “dive in” and perform intense preparation and the Board might have a difficult time getting to the documents during certain times, like summer. He asserted that the group can move quickly and stressed that a year is a good minimum; and is achievable, but would never want to go as long as two years, and not beyond 15 months. Chairman Garvin asked if 15 months would be a preferable timeline. Mr. Kelly replied that might be the preference, but the group had no fear of a shorter time. Mr. Finnicum asked what are some of the risks in the schedule, and how could we mitigate some of those risks. Ms. Moravec replied with making sure we are ready for the next topic, and continue the conversation on particular events, in as many ways as possible. She said that she focuses on the public engagement piece, and if conversation could continue between the larger events, then that takes a collective effort from the Board, the steering committee to make sure that all are continuing the process in an efficient way, and are very focused on the questions that we want to ask, and will help expedite the process. Mr. Kelly said that another potential time risk would be “losing control” of a particular issue and he saw that more with zoning projects rather than planning projects. He added but with hot issues like housing, and traffic, they require more public preliminary education in order to keep to a more controlled meeting timeframe. He mentioned that the team would try to educate folks as much as possible. Ms. Setsky mentioned that working early on with identifying all concerns is beneficial for timing.

Chairman Garvin said that people will have summer travel plans, so are there strengths or weaknesses as to when these actions occur. Mr. Kelly responded that he would rather be gathering data in the summer.

#### Question

Ms. Kilcoyne asked if the proposal is flexible enough to adapt to requests from the committee, state, community members, and staff as they arise. Mr. Kelly responded that he would be very frank about a conversation held prior to this meeting regarding how Horsley Witten writes the scope going into these meetings. He said it is not a typical scope, and it is written to address the issue that you are now questioning. He explained that Horsley Witten puts a framework around these projects, brings a set of tools, and composes a participation draft at the beginning of the process. He said that if the Board chooses to speak with any of our clients, they will affirm our ability to pivot, and our ability to meet new challenges as we go through a project to change the plan, if need be. He stressed that ultimately, it comes down to a serious commitment, and the team has that commitment.

#### Question

Mr. Finnicum what drew Horsley Witten to this project, in particular?

Ms. Setsky responded that the group has been doing much work in MA recently and currently in the city of Newton and Canton. She noted they have been very involved in the nuances of MA, which is very interesting and this Master Planning would be a good extension of that work.

Ms. Fitzgerald said that she had not done much work in MA and this is a great opportunity for her team to work with Horsley Witten on this project.

Ms. Moravec said that she loved the traditional historic town atmosphere. Mr. Kelly added that in the RFP, the plan would not only consider the requirements of the statutes, but the framework laid out in other reports, and structural values in the green communities aspect, and loved the various components which that presented. He added that it is exciting when a community thinks outside the statutory box, and looks at other options.

Question

Vice-Chairman Abair asked why the team felt that they were a good fit for Sudbury, and how many times has this team worked together?

Mr. Kelly answered that the three professionals had not worked on a single project together. Ms. Moravec said she has worked with both of these firms, and is very excited about them, and the good results achieved. She further mentioned that Horsley Witten's approach to sustainable issues and view of the big picture; interconnects all issues. Mr. Kelly stressed the aspect of technical proficiency, including achieved skills with infrastructure planning, zoning regulations, wetland biology, and habitat, which is part of what attracted us to work with Ms. Fitzgerald and Ms. Setsky.

Question

Mr. Karustis asked how this document is kept alive. Mr. Kelly responded with examples saying the Town of Easton had a process of strategic planning already in place within their municipal departments that made it very easy for Horsley Witten to insert Master Plan into existing process. We continually update and check on performance. The second example he gave was in Shrewsbury, which created a new feedback loop, as they got further along into the process. They also developed an implementation committee, which was different from the steering committee they had in place for the plan; and they institutionalized the process through the Board of Selectman. Mr. Kelly explained that there is a matrix of plan, the team provides in a booklet, so it makes it very easy for anyone in the Town that booklet stays on your desk for utilization, which helps keep the plan alive. Ms. Moravec said the booklet helps keep the plan in the public eye after the process is completed, and works as an action plans to promote things what needs to get done.. She added that the team could develop a standalone project website, which can easily be transferred to the Town.

Question

Vice-Chairman Abair asked what happens when within your analysis, you see an issue, but in the information phase that issue is not picked up. He added or in a reverse situation, you have support from the community on something, but the data does not support it.

Mr. Kelly answered the team first find out which is correct, as we are very data driven, but added that he and Ms. Moravec have been involved in community discussions where the community was right and the data was wrong. Then the two had to work on finding the discrepancy. He provided the topic of climate change as being an example, stating where some do not have a sophisticated understanding of the issues, and how those are going to play out in their community. He stressed that it comes back to education and emphasized its importance.

Question

Ms. Kilcoyne said that she has a vision for Sudbury that will take more than 10 years, and asked how far in the future will this team go?

Mr. Kelly answered there is always the temptation to make a futuristic plan for 15 years for example, but the issues such as climate change could suggest a 50 year plan. With economic development and transportation, the team might not be able to extend a plan for that long, because things are changing rapidly.

#### Question

Mr. Hincks asked what types of projects are the least favorite of the team, and why, and what are the conditions the make them bad.

Mr. Kelly answered that the team is working on a comprehensive plan now, not to be named, which just entails meeting standards with no incentive to plan more creatively. He detailed that comprehensive planning in RI is mandatory and is somewhat of a trap, which many communities there fall in to.

Chairman Garvin asked the group what questions what questions they had.

Mr. Kelly asked what the Board saw in their goals, and what are you ready to do for this project? Are you excited about engaging the community, or do you feel that you want to sit back a bit and let the consultant team direct the project? Chairman Garvin answered that the Board is very excited about the project, and worked very hard to promote this project and receive funding for it. He added that this Board is diverse and Staff has equally done much work to promote this effort. He continued stating the Board is interested in being engaged, but how much and at what time, will be key.

Mr. Karustis added that the Board wants the community to be involved with the Master Planning project as this is everybody's plan. Vice-Chairman Abair said that it has challenges, and needs full community input and this would be challenging for the Board so the firm's expertise is very significant to the project.

The Board thanked Horsley Witten for their presentation.

#### **Interview – Barrett Planning Group, LLC**

Present: Judy Barrett of Barrett Planning Group, and Jennifer Goldson and Christie Apastilla.

Ms. Barrett said that she takes pride in her master plan work and therefore does not delegate it somebody else. She added she has worked with some 25 Master Plans in MA. She said that creating a Master Plan means putting forth an effort about how to provide the best plan for the people for the people who live and work in town for today and the future. She added that her firm brings expertise in engaging the public providing creative, innovative approaches, as well as practical and realistic implementation. She emphasized that she and her staff work all hours and are skilled with social media. She spoke of being creative and innovative. In particular, getting people to ask questions about things they have not thought of before, but at the same time, have their feet on the ground. Ms. Barrett stated her team will create a plan that does not just sit on the shelf. She outlined the recent plans her group has worked on including: Lincoln Comprehensive Plan, Westford Comprehensive Plan, Groton Master Plan & Zoning, Littleton Master Plan, Shrewsbury Master Plan, N. Andover Master Plan, Tewksbury Master Plan, and explained the relevance of each of these plans. She detailed topics critical to Affordability, Housing, Transportation, Age Friendly Community, conservation lands, and recreational needs of children and residents.

Ms. Barrett covered areas that define a town plan such as the process for deciding what to do and how. She added her team would also perform a comprehensive community analysis, which works to improve the health and well-being of people in a community and creates one that offer better choices for where and how the people live. She called this planning for the community's evolution. She asserted that long range implementation cycles typically run 5-10 years. Ms. Barrett said the procedure of her firms is to

review the communities past plans, studies and reports. To collect data, both more recent and some less recent; and figure out what was already done. Ms. Barrett indicated there is no substitute for talking with residents, She outlined that the next areas of examination included trends, estimates and predictions and use available projections from other agencies ; and questions what do we need to do. She stressed that in the end, the Town wants and will get a plan that is consistent. She spoke of capacity and the important implementation process. She recommended guiding the implementation process, sponsoring implementation activities, keeping citizens actively engaged in planning, and committing to the master plan's success by evaluating and updating the plan, as needed. She outlined lessons learned including implementation planning starts at the beginning and not at the end of a master plan process.

Ms. Barrett indicated the Master Plan needs people with differing opinions, backgrounds, and interests who can work to together as a team. She stressed the importance of a master plan committee and that the Planning Board needs to remain present throughout the process.

Ms. Barrett continued by saying that citizen engagement is key and suggested various methods to ensure the involvement via town-wide forums, place making, neighborhoods/land marks, topic discussions, web and social media being present.

Ms. Goldson said there is always tension between what planners do, and the preservation of action. She said a great deal of their work involves trying to balance these changes vs. the needed changes. She informed the Board that there would be three community-wide forums and detailed them. She stated a substantial aspect of the process starts with one-on-one interviews, which try to get to know the key players in the community. These evolve core assessment meetings with groups, which become very focused on the various elements of the plan. Ms. Goldson mentioned utilizing the meeting in a box concept to provide the Town with everything it needs to hold a small meeting by neighborhood.

Ms. Barrett mentioned developing a logo that defines the project giving it an identity and a special look. Ms. Barrett said that interactive actives are helpful tools. Ms. Barrett spoke about inclusionary zoning and affordable housing measures, and detailed the need for increased public transportation, and revisiting sewer line topic.

Ms. Apastella continued speaking about the Master Plan considerations such as public transportation and reviewing sewer lines in commercial areas.

Other topic areas discussed included: sustainable environmental measures, impacting of new housing on Town resources, evaluating infrastructure needs, strategizing economic development measures to deepen the town's commercial tax base, and preserving the town's rural and historic nature.

Questions presented to the Barrett Planning Team:

#### Question

Mr. Hincks asked about the strategies that would be used to ensure solid communication with the client and community engagement.

Ms. Barrett replied that periodic meetings are essential and at an initial meeting, the team and the Board, would work out the details. Additional periodic meetings could be incorporated with the Board to include web-ex calls or face-to-face meetings.

Ms. Apastilla added that regular call-in meetings could be scheduled with an agenda if requested and it is up to the client to dictate what they want.

Ms. Goldson added that the Board and Staff would have a progress report every month. In addition, the team would outline what they expect to do the next month and put together timely action plans.

Ms. Apastella said that the team would set up a schedule, recognizing that things might need to change.

Question

Mr. Karustis asked how the team would draw from the existing Master Plan, regarding zoning bylaws, etc., in developing a Master Plan.

Ms. Barrett responded that initially she likes to refer to the existing Master Plan, and study the recommendation section; and then have a conversation with the client regarding things that have already been done, or not done.

Ms. Apastilla added that she likes to start the planning process by talking to the open space groups, and presenting highlights of an open space plan in combination with the last Master Plan, and see what might have changed since the creation of the last Master Plan.

Question

Ms. Kilcoyne asked what expectations the team had of the Staff and the Planning Board.

Ms. Barrett responded that there are decisions that have to be made all along the way, and clear direction is very helpful to the team. She added that she would expect to review documents and resources the Staff has, particularly in areas that may not be available online. She added she may also ask the Town for access to local data including GIS information and findings from the Finance Dept. She added that she would like to obtain the most recent bond prospectus, which provides much information about the community.

Ms. Apastella added that an important role for Staff and Board, is to affirm exactly who the stakeholders are on different aspects of the Plan. She added that it would be important to be clear about what the goals might be for a given meeting. With and what information the team is expected to bring forth, there are options for the design of the meeting. She added the team has different designs for various meetings, and the team would want to layout those options for the Board, asking for their preference. She stressed that working collaboratively is key, and that the Board would be continually seeing the working parts of the Master Plan, as the process went along.

Question

Mr. Finnicum asked the team to discuss the time schedule for the project, and asked if the timeframe felt comfortable and doable for them. He also asked what the stumbling blocks to the timeframe might be.

Ms. Barrett replied that 12-16 months is adequate, and that there might be times when a particular topic arises, that needs more discussion, and that is not always predictable. In regards to a schedule of deliverables, Ms. Barrett stated that Ms. Apastella's recommendation of monthly progress reports would help the team stay on track, as well as being helpful to the Board. She added that discussion documents and goals build on each other, and that process will evolve.

Ms. Goldson added that summer is not always the best time for meetings, due to vacations, and winter can sometimes produce unexpected storms, but ultimately, communication is key.

Question

Vice-Chairman Abair asked the team to explain how their approach is flexible enough to adapt to requests from stakeholders, Town Staff, and community members; as they arise at different stages.

Ms. Barrett gave the example, that at kick-off meeting, the team would work out what is determined to be the basics regarding increased public participation. She said that the meeting in a box could exemplify



that the team might have thought that we had four neighborhoods covered. However, someone comes along and gives their prospective (out of the neighborhood), and we would shift gears and work with them on that. She added that if the Board was asking the team to attend to 3-5 community meetings; that might be difficult to do.

Vice-Chairman Abair queried further asking what if the focus had to change to some area that was not anticipated or apparent at the start of the project.

Ms. Barrett responded that it was possible that might happen. Ms. Apastella added that such circumstance has happened on several projects, one being in Andover. She noted in Andover there were issues with downtown and the watershed district, which ended up becoming areas that were related to many elements that did not fit neatly. So the team had to “deep dive” into these important areas that were not anticipated at the onset of the project.

Ms. Barrett explained that a similar situation also happened with the Milton Plan, and the team had to shift gears; but ultimately all worked out and the project kept to the prescribed timeframe.

#### Question

Chairman Garvin asked the team what interested them with this project.

Ms. Barrett answered that she has worked in many communities that are similar to Sudbury, and that Sudbury was the type of town that she felt very comfortable with. She added that there is a certain tension in the communities and that she works well in that environment.

#### Question

Chairman Garvin asked the team if they had any questions regarding the RFP, in particular.

Ms. Barrett said that she appreciated the listing of issues provided, that the Board deemed important to the Plan; and she found the listing very helpful.

Ms. Apastella added that she views a community like this as a challenge; and the team will strive to attain a balance, and maintain the character of the Town; while acknowledging change in the community.

#### Question

Vice-Chairman Abair questioned that the timeline might be ambitious, and how other commitments might affect the team.

Ms. Barrett responded that the other projects being worked on are smaller, and she has several employees working on those, and did not think that 12-15 month timeline was too ambitious. She added that if anything unexpected came up, it might extend the timeline a month or two, but certainly not a year. Ms.

Apastella added that the team works very collaboratively and shares the load. She stated she has three full-time people working in her office, including herself.

#### Question

Chairman Garvin asked what the team does in order to ensure that all the dominos are set up properly.

Ms. Barrett answered that the kick-off meeting lays out what is going to be done, and what the expectations are, and suggested that meetings not be conducted in the summer months. She asserted that the team can be doing other essential project aspects at this time.

Ms. Goldson said that the team seeks projects that they are interested in doing, and would not take on projects that they could not complete sufficiently.

Chairman Garvin thanked the firm for their presentation.

The Board discussed the two different approaches by the applicants.

At 9:20 p.m., Chairman Garvin motioned to adjourn the meeting.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To adjourn meeting.