



# Town of Sudbury

## Master Plan Steering Committee

Flynn Building  
278 Old Sudbury Road  
Sudbury, MA 01776  
978-639-3387  
Fax: 978-443-0756

MasterPlan@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/masterplan

### MINUTES

JULY 19, 2019 AT 8:45 AM

POLICE STATION MEETING ROOM, 75 HUDSON ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

**Members Present:** Chair John Sugrue, At-Large; Vice-Chair Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi, At-Large; Nathalie Forssell, At-Large; Jan Hardenbergh, At-Large; Dan Carty, Board of Selectmen; Pat Guthy, Commission on Disability; Ellen Joachim, Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School Committee; Amy Lepak, Sudbury Housing Authority; and Robert May, Council on Aging.

**Members Absent:** Janie Dretler, Board of Selectmen; Dave Henkels, Conservation Commission; Lisa Kouchakdjian, Sudbury Public School Committee; John Riordan, Zoning Board of Appeals; Lee Swanson, Historic Districts Commission; Fred Taylor, Historic Districts Commission; and Dick Williamson, Parks and Recreation Commission.

**Others Present:** Fabiola Alikpokou, Staff Planner, Horsley Witten Group; Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning and Community Development; John Hincks, Planning Board; Nate Kelly, Principal, Horsley Witten Group; Nancy Kilcoyne, Planning Board; Krista Moravec, Senior Planner, Horsley Witten Group; Jennifer Roberts, Board of Selectmen; and Taryn Trexler, Historical Commission.

### **Welcome**

Mr. Sugrue opened the meeting at 8:45 a.m.

### **Regular Meeting Business**

#### *Approval of Minutes*

Mr. Sugrue asked if there were any proposed edits to the June 21, 2019 minutes. Mr. Carty and Ms. Guthy provided amendments.

Mr. Sugrue motioned to approve the minutes of June 21, 2019 as amended. Mr. May seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

#### *Administrative Report*

Mr. Duchesneau stated the Master Plan Steering Committee's (MPSC) presence at the Touch-A-Truck event went well and there was good community attendance. He added Ms. Dretler and Ms. Forssell assisted at the event, and pictures were included on the Town website.

### **Follow-Up Survey to Public Forum**

Ms. Moravec detailed there were over 200 responses to the survey, which was a good indicator this tool was most useful, and added there was an attachment to memorialize what people have said in a more comprehensive manner.

Ms. Guthy questioned a survey comment regarding the Sudbury School System scores and ranking. Ms. Moravec responded the Sudbury School System was ranked very highly. Mr. Carty noted the submitted comment was likely referencing the top Massachusetts school rankings according to “Boston Magazine” and “US News and World Report.” Ms. Moravec stated this aspect should be included in the report.

Mr. Duchesneau asked about the rate of school decline. Mr. Moravec responded the trend has leveled according to the chart within the Town Services section.

Ms. Moravec noted the older Sudbury population (70 years and older) who are not as likely to participate in the survey or provide comments. She stated extra effort was made to reach out to the older residents.

Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi commented about land use responses and concerns about housing stock, and mentioned diversity of housing stock to include smaller houses. Ms. Moravec stressed housing was an important aspect of the Master Plan, and discussed different types of housing stock and inclusion of regulatory standards. She noted the efforts of the Sudbury Housing Trust.

Ms. Moravec detailed transportation related comments received in the survey responses. Mr. Hincks noted there appeared to be conflict between growth and the number of housing units, and those people concerned about traffic were against an increase in the number of housing units. Mr. Hincks suggested providing the population with the facts regarding the Quarry North/Melone Property development where traffic studies have been completed. He stated those studies demonstrate an increase of only 200 vehicles on a road that accommodates thousands of cars per day. Mr. Hincks emphasized the problem on North Road/Route 117 was the result of a poorly timed traffic light, which could be fixed. Ms. Moravec agreed about presenting such examples to the public and also including alternative methods of transportation.

Mr. May asked how he might view comments made by other MPSC members on different subjects, as well as his own comments. Mr. Duchesneau stated concerns regarding the Open Meeting Law when comments were exchanged as a group. He emphasized the best way to express ideas was at the MSPC meetings. Mr. Duchesneau noted the Horsley Witten Group compiles the comments and incorporates them into each baseline chapter. Ms. Moravec stated she would be happy to review such comments at the meetings. She indicated she had received comments from Mr. May, Mr. Hardenbergh, and Ms. Lepak which also included grammar and text edits within the draft chapter.

Mr. May stated he felt he was not receiving enough information about various issues in town. Ms. Moravec noted the purpose of the MPSC meetings was to discuss such issues. Mr. May replied the level of detail would require more than two hours once per month and recognized the conflicts associated with the Open Meeting Law. Mr. Duchesneau recommended MSPC members send comments to staff which could be sent directly to the Horsley Witten team. Mr. May added people could respond to such comments via staff. Mr. Carty cautioned that comments reflecting opinion could not be sent which could indicate deliberation.

Mr. Carty noted one way to make edits to draft documents was to employ redlining which could identify the originator of comments/edits, and could be reviewed at the next meeting. Ms. Moravec reiterated the

importance of the communication process which Mr. Duchesneau had outlined. Mr. May stated he felt more discussion time was necessary to cover topics presented at meetings.

Ms. Moravec apologized for not sending the Town Services Baseline Report to the members in advance. She said more detailed issues should be addressed by the Working Group. She asserted that moving forward, comments and details would be distributed to the group before the next meeting. Mr. May acknowledged the Horsley Witten Group was doing a good job to the extent they could. Ms. Moravec promised to set up a process where all members could view the comments of other members.

### **Baseline Report: Town Services**

Ms. Guthy stated she felt the section regarding the Police Department lacked detail.

Mr. Hardenbergh mentioned the Town services of the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) and the Medical Reserve Corps (MRC). Ms. Moravec stated all service-oriented Town professionals were included in the Baseline Report, but not all of the Town's boards, committees, or commissions. She mentioned these entities could be included if MPSC chose to.

Ms. Guthy suggested an appendix in the back of the Baseline Report could include a listing of boards, committees, or commissions not otherwise mentioned in the Report.

Mr. May spoke about "the history of Town Master Plans" as described by Ms. Moravec and detailed that such history had much to do with space needs. He added he expected the MPSC to address social issues which were critical. Mr. May agreed with an earlier mentioned goal which was to get correct information into the Town because there was some inaccurate data circulating around the community. He noted there was very little discussion regarding the matrix of the Town's services and added it would be helpful to know the total number of the Town's service population. Mr. May commented about service volunteers involved in the tax offset program, which included some 100 such volunteers.

Mr. May noted there was no discussion regarding SudburyTV, which was a very significant and important service in town. He suggested having an MPSC discussion regarding expectations to be covered. Mr. Hardenbergh agreed. Mr. Kelly commented this area reflected one of the more challenging topics and the way municipalities typically address this topic was by recognizing the numerous Town departments doing their strategic planning. He suggested MPSC members look at the broader picture (big quality of life issues) rather than individual buildings, programming, and staffing.

Mr. Hardenbergh recommended these other established department procedures should be highlighted and perhaps offer a summary of each one, such as Livable Sudbury. Ms. Moravec noted Livable Sudbury was the exception.

Ms. Guthy stated providing the number of each type of employed service person is worthy to note and not overly detailed. She noted people working in the tax write-off program should be recognized. Ms. Moravec agreed and stated volunteerism is a significant aspect of the community, which was mentioned at the workshop and the survey. Ms. Moravec stated she would get those volunteer numbers from Senior Center Director Debra Galloway and include them in the report. Ms. Guthy reiterated that including both paid and unpaid employees in the report reflects who we are as a Town. Mr. Hincks agreed with Ms. Guthy and stated this aspect involved Town administration, but was not really a Master Plan process and the MPSC should not argue about the validity of the tax write-off program. He added the purpose of the MPSC involved examining trends and planning for them, but was not about making determinations on

how the Town should be run. Ms. Guthy stated she respectively disagreed with Mr. Hincks' sentiment and affirmed the tax write-off program was a means of controlling residential taxes and was reflective of the town's values.

Ms. Moravec stated the included section in the report would be titled "Volunteerism" and it would reflect the sentiment of the MPSC as expressed at the meeting. Mr. Carty stated it was important this aspect be documented in a portioned budgetary fashion and should include the current date as the numbers will change quickly. Mr. Sugrue stressed the inclusion of trends is the most important item. Ms. Moravec agreed with including staffing and volunteers as it might relate to trends, but indicated she was unsure about taking a budgeting approach.

Mr. Sugrue queried if the Baseline Report with included the comments was intended to stand alone or to set up some of the factors that go along with implementing the Master Plan. Ms. Moravec replied the section was intended to elicit MPSC discussion and could also be part of pulling all aspects together and serve as a snapshot depicting trends - but statements were often necessary when describing trends.

Ms. Lepak noted she did not see walkways mentioned in this report but they were maintained by the Department of Public Works. She suggested superimposing the walkways on the Recreation map. Ms. Moravec agreed to investigate these areas and check with staff for accuracy. Ms. Lepak also mentioned the Town may use Willow Hill for recreation, but it was not a public school. Ms. Moravec acknowledged the oversight. Mr. Carty noted the Town uses the Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School for recreational purposes, but that site was not included in the report.

Mr. May felt it was difficult to address Town services without including the assets involved, and stressed the assets were going to be a significant factor for the Town. Mr. Carty stated the assets were included in the facilities section. Mr. May asserted the report should somehow include this financial aspect. Mr. Hardenbergh agreed with such financial inclusion within the report. Related discussion took place.

Ms. Roberts mentioned some reporting inconsistencies regarding school facilities and related projects with no mention of the dire need at the Fairbank Center under the Park & Recreation section. Ms. Moravec stated more details would be provided after interviews with the Park & Recreation Commission had occurred and the section would be revisited, as well as, the open space section.

Ms. Guthy noted the report made no mention about students who attended vocational technical schools. Ms. Joachim stated the vocational aspect is somewhat complicated at this time considering there is no vocational education agreement in place. Ms. Guthy indicated residents were still attending those schools and the fact must be included. Mr. Carty agreed. Mr. Duchesneau recommended the current state of the potential vocational education agreement should be included. Ms. Joachim suggested inclusion of a Lincoln Sudbury Regional High School facility description and Ms. Moravec noted the addition. Mr. Carty recommended including the fact the high school was a regional facility and not property of the Town of Sudbury. Mr. May expressed concern about the resident funding of the Lincoln Sudbury Regional High School without direct oversight by the Town. Handicap accessibility compliance at the high school was discussed.

Mr. May suggested inclusion of charting to depict usage of the Goodnow Library and trends regarding library participation rates. Ms. Moravec agreed to include such trending and charts. Ms. Guthy recommended inclusion of the Makerspace renovation recently completed at the Goodnow Library. Ms. Moravec commented the addition was included in the teen services section, but she would further define the Makerspace aspect.

Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi queried about including all Town department staffing information for consistency. Ms. Moravec responded it could be included without difficulty and agreed it was a good aspect to include. Mr. Sugrue commented the inclusion was beneficial if it related to future planning of the Town. Ms. Moravec reiterated the benefit of consistency. Mr. Carty agreed all facility use charting depicting trends was a good idea.

### **Public Outreach Update**

Ms. Moravec announced a follow-up Master Plan Forum would be held on August 8, 2019 from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Senior Center on Fairbank Road. She mentioned related Master Plan Forum emails were sent and announcement flyers would be dropped off at the Senior Center later that day.

Ms. Moravec stated the latest op-ed article was submitted to the Sudbury Town Crier yesterday and Mr. Carty agreed to provide the op-ed for the August submission.

Ms. Moravec asked if there was additional Town board, committee, or commission feedback the representatives of those groups wanted to share. She stated the team had reached out to the Park & Recreation Commission to get their input and ideas on the Open Space and Recreation Baseline Report. Ms. Moravec inquired about any pertinent events in August where Master Plan information could be circulated.

Ms. Moravec stated focus-related topic groups would be coordinated for meetings in the fall and stakeholder spreadsheets would also be included. She explained that at the August MPSC meeting information would be shared to allow for more in-depth, focused discussions. Ms. Moravec noted there would be three additional chapters to review at the August meeting – Natural Resources, Open Space and Recreation, and Historic Resources.

### **Open Discussion**

Mr. May stated he appreciated the MPSC's attention to the baseline additions mentioned earlier in the meeting. He mentioned possible overview of utilities and the Eversource situation in Sudbury. Mr. May also suggested the improvement of internet service in town in order to retain small businesses in the community, as well as school internet capabilities. Ms. Moravec noted the Town did not own any of the communication stations in Sudbury. Mr. May stated the Town of Concord had its own utility company for power and internet generation. He suggested Sudbury explore all options. Mr. Duchesneau stated a recommendation for researching potential options on this topic could be made. He suggested an action item in the Master Plan could be that a committee be formed to study the issues surrounding this topic.

At this time Mr. Carty left the meeting.

Mr. Hardenbergh noted the MPSC would be dedicating two more meetings to the Baseline Reports and asked what the future meetings would entail. Ms. Moravec responded there would be a discussion of themes, focus on the structure of the Master Plan, consideration of land use, and the summarization of public comments. Mr. Hardenbergh asked how many months would be needed to create the plan. Mr. Kelly responded the answer was dependent upon how much the MPSC wanted to explore details and present "key issues." Mr. Kelly explained the process of arriving at the Master Plan policy, completing an annotated outline of the plan, and then finalizing the plan to include relative figures and formatting. In the final phase, the Master Plan would be handed over to the Planning Board who would actually adopt the

plan. Mr. Kelly indicated the Planning Board may want to dedicate a certain amount of time to review that plan before holding a public hearing on the plan.

Ms. Moravec stated the MPSC could meet with the Planning Board during various stages of the process. Mr. Hincks noted Mr. Duchesneau provided the Planning Board with all the documentation discussed by the MPSC at each meeting. Mr. Hincks stated he felt the Baseline Report meeting discussion structure was effective for monthly meetings, but when addressing themes, other modes of meeting formats and durations might need to be incorporated. He felt focus could be lost when a group only met monthly. Mr. Kelly was in agreement with Mr. Hincks. Ms. Moravec responded that additional thought would be given to such scheduling and formatting.

Mr. May suggested that when the Baseline Report sections were complete, the Planning Board could participate in a joint meeting to avoid presenting the whole package to that Board at one time. Mr. Hincks agreed a joint meeting to brain storm on themes would be beneficial to the process. Ms. Lepak recommended a retreat concept for such a meeting.

Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi recommended having a complete summary page rather than summarizing items at the end of each Baseline Report section.

Mr. Hardenbergh asked about the scheduling of the next Public Forum in the fall. Ms. Moravec replied that forum could take place around the annotated outline phase. Mr. Kelly asked the MPSC if it would be helpful to share one of the annotated outlines from another community and the MPSC felt it would be.

Mr. Kelly spoke of different plan design options. MPSC members commented on such options and addressed the Action Plan and the Community Plan. Ms. Guthy questioned if there could be a meeting with department heads at the end of the process and Ms. Moravec agreed this would be beneficial. Mr. Kelly agreed and stated “Vetting the Plan” was the title given to such a meeting. Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi advocated for such a joint department head meeting rather than inter-office mail mode.

### **Adjourn - Next Meeting**

Ms. Moravec stated the next MPSC meeting would be held on August 16, 2019.

Mr. Sugrue motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 a.m. Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous with Mr. Carty absent from the vote.