



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

APRIL 12, 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; Vice-Chair Jennifer Roberts, At-Large; Nathalie Forssell, At-Large; Jan Hardenbergh, At-Large; Janie Dretler, Board of Selectmen; Pat Guthy, Commission on Disability; Ellen Joachim, Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School Committee; Amy Lepak, Sudbury Housing Authority; Robert May, Council on Aging; John Riordan, Zoning Board of Appeals; Fred Taylor, Historic Districts Commission; and Dick Williamson, Park and Recreation Commission.

Members Absent: Dan Carty, Board of Selectmen; Dave Henkels, Conservation Commission; and Lee Swanson, Historic Districts Commission.

Others Present: Stephen Garvin, Chair, Planning Board; Nancy Kilcoyne, Planning Board; Diana Warren, Historical Commission; Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning & Community Development; Beth Suedmeyer, Environmental Planner; Nate Kelly, Principal, Horsley Witten Group; Krista Moravec, Senior Planner, Horsley Witten Group; and Fabiola Alikpokou, Staff Planner, Horsley Witten Group.

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

Regular Meeting Business

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sugrue motioned to approve the minutes of February 15, 2019 as amended. Mr. Riordan seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Sugrue motioned to approve the minutes of March 15, 2019. Mr. Riordan seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Administrative Report

There were no administrative reports presented.

Bus Tour Follow-Up

Ms. Moravec outlined the main topics/questions regarding the tour:

- Anything new learned?
- Locations to view by someone who did not take the tour.

- Top challenges/opportunities for Sudbury in the next 20 years.

Ms. Roberts commented on the various housing communities in town and noted there were developments she was unaware of before the tour. She suggested creating a document which would include the location of all the affordable and non-affordable housing communities in town. A related discussion followed.

Baseline Report: Demographics/Community Profile

Ms. Moravec posed the following considerations to the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC):

- Was your perception of Sudbury altered or inconsistent?
- What concerns you? Where are opportunities?
- How will the Master Plan be influenced by these trends?

As guidance in addressing the above questions, Ms. Moravec referred to the Community Profile document created by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) and noted there was another such demographic study profile/projection documented by UMass.

Discussion ensued regarding the United States Census and projections. It was noted the Census is conducted every ten years and would next be performed in 2020.

Mr. Garvin stated the planning process was more interested in the trends and understanding the data, but at the same time not getting too involved with the absolute numbers.

Mr. May suggested a subcommittee be formed for this aspect of the Master Plan process. Mr. Sugrue asked the MPSC if they thought the projection baseline was far off.

Ms. Moravec recommended compiling Sudbury specific data and incorporating it into the MAPC Community Profile document. Ms. Roberts agreed with that suggestion. Mr. May stated he did not think anything was more important than having agreement on the baseline data, otherwise there would be major discrepancies further along in the process. Ms. Moravec agreed with the importance associated with the baseline data and asked MPSC members to be mindful of what specific data had relevant importance to the process. Mr. Sugrue agreed obtaining the correct data was important, but pointed out the MPSC did not need to get bogged down with exact numbers and percentages. He indicated identifying and noting trends was the most important piece of analysis for this data. Ms. Guthy stated the MPSC must feel confident with the data presented, but she did not at this time.

Ms. Guthy commented on the water supply and wells in Sudbury, and wondered how the water supply would support future growth. Mr. Riordan agreed the water supply was a huge concern in town as well as environmental issues.

A significant conversation took place regarding the 55+ population that lives alone. Mr. Garvin suggested the 55+ population be included in that group for study, due to regulatory age stipulations for newer housing. Ms. Moravec suggested further study of the Town's data in consideration of those in the 55+ age group who are living alone.

Ms. Moravec announced Tom Dworetzky, from Camoin Associates, would be presenting information related to economics and housing at the next MPSC meeting. She also noted the working groups would review the documentation associated with that presentation.

Ms. Dretler recommended all new larger housing developments be displayed on a map. Mr. Sugrue agreed and added it would be helpful to see how these developments related in proximity to the Town's open space land. Ms. Dretler commented she too was surprised to see how many new housing developments there were and would like to explore the effects of the developments on transportation, schools, and other community resources. Ms. Suedmeyer directed the MPSC how to access some of this information via online resources which would help to show various reports regarding open space and population.

Mr. Williamson recommended the use of asterisks for documenting sources within related reports. Ms. Moravec agreed with the recommendation. Mr. Hardenbergh commented including such notes on the Master Plan website might be helpful.

Public Outreach

Stakeholder Outreach

Ms. Moravec presented the Sudbury Master Plan Stakeholder Outreach Plan document. She commented on outreach strategies and stakeholder topic meetings which could be used to confirm existing conditions and trends, and to discuss future needs and potential strategies to meet those needs. Examples included:

- Surveys receiving information about ongoing greater public surveys and how to access them.
- Hosting a Working Meeting – Having a focused discussion with a group to discuss Master Plan topics of interest, possibly facilitated by a consultant. It was noted Town boards, committees, and commissions which do not have representation on the MPSC should be contacted using this method. Meetings with the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen would be held at various stages during the update process as well.
- Email via the Planning and Community Development Department to Town boards and committees – The Planning Department will send an email with questions (no more than three) for the specific group to consider at their next meeting. Worksheets would be provided and responses would be emailed and provided to Town staff and the consultant.
- Email via Planning Department to Community Groups – These would be the same emails distributed to the Town boards and committees, but adjusted slightly. In the first outreach email, a contact person would be requested to keep the group current on the project.
- Email via other Town Departments – If appropriate, other Town departments would be asked to conduct similar outreach to the various Town boards, committees, and commissions they staff. Worksheets would be provided and responses would be emailed/provided to Town staff and the consultant.
- Steering Committee Meeting In A Box (SCMIAB) – This approach would give members a script to present to their respective committees or other community groups they are involved with. The contact person would ask questions (no more than three) to have the committee or community group consider at their next meeting or individually. Worksheets would be provided. Responses will be collected at a later date or sent to Town staff or the consultant.

Mr. May commented he would be working with and conducting focus groups with the Council on Aging and all users of the Senior Center.

Ms. Moravec then spoke about the specific boards, committees, and commissions; and the local and regional groups; and outlined the following related stakeholder Topic Meetings:

- Historic, Cultural, & Natural Resources
- Mobility & Connectivity
- Health, Housing, & Equity
- Economic Resiliency & Town Infrastructure
- Recreation

Other target engagement strategies and outreach included:

- Surveys
- Hosting a Working Meeting
- Email via Planning Department
- Email via other Town Departments
- MPSC MIAB
- MPSC Member Contact

Outreach topics were discussed in consideration of helping with promotion (email, posting flyers, etc.). Group discussion ensued regarding the outreach plan and the various Town groups to be considered in the public outreach process. The logistics of meeting with various groups was discussed including approximate planning timing and size of meetings. MPSC members felt the Economic Resiliency & Town Infrastructure Stakeholder Meeting would likely be split into two different meetings/topical discussions. Ms. Guthy recommended combining the Natural Resources and Recreation Stakeholder Topic Meetings.

Mr. May mentioned the Sudbury Foundation, which funds various Town volunteer organizations, should be included within Local & Regional Groups of the Sudbury Master Plan Stakeholder Outreach Plan. Mr. Duchesneau confirmed the Sudbury Foundation would be included in that listing, as well as any other appropriate groups the MPSC might suggest.

Ms. Moravec emphasized the Master Plan process was always in draft form, and designed to be supplemented and updated as needed. Ms. Suedmeyer mentioned the inclusion of various parent and religious groups who might be offered surveys or Meetings In a Box sessions. Ms. Moravec stated she had special materials for such groups and found that population to be very important to the process.

Ms. Dretler also mentioned the Sudbury Villagers and the League of Women Voters, and provided contact information for Ms. Moravec.

Mr. May noted the applicability of the Livable Sudbury Report which had input provided from over 500 people in the community. Ms. Dretler further suggested approaching those 500 residents and asking them if they would choose to add more comments or provide survey responses if they had not done so with the recent Livable Sudbury survey. Ms. Moravec suggested asking somewhat different questions to this selected grouping.

Ms. Roberts recommended getting the input of young families and felt social media may be a superior outreach tool for this demographic group as they may not have the time for numerous committee meetings. Ms. Moravec stated it was her hope the Sudbury Public School Committee would help to reach parents via e-mail regarding upcoming events.

Op-Ed Series

Ms. Moravec indicated she had spoken to the Sudbury Town Crier and they had agreed to run the op-ed series on the Master Plan update process. She reviewed several of the MPSC suggestions for the op-ed series:

- “Launch of the Master Plan Update Process” in April 2019
- “Where We’ve Been” – in May 2019
- “400th Anniversary – Bridge to the Future” – in June 2019
- “Sustainability – What Does it Mean” – in July 2019

Ms. Moravec also suggested op-ed submissions promoting the Master Plan Public Forum and a follow-up after the Forum. She recommended the op-ed submissions be posted on the MPSC website as well.

At this time Mr. Garvin left the meeting.

Public Outreach: May Public Forum

Ms. Moravec stated the Public Forum was scheduled for May 22, 2019 and distributed a proposed format for the Forum highlighting small group discussions.

Mr. May inquired about conducting the Public Forum on a Saturday in order for the senior population to be more likely to attend. Mr. Duchesneau indicated the May 22nd date had been selected to plan around various springtime activities. Ms. Moravec suggested a supplemental follow-up session could possibly be held on a Saturday before or after the Forum. Ms. Suedmeyer stated obtaining school gym space for the Public Forum was difficult at this time of year and added the Goodnow Library was the recommended venue for the Forum.

Ms. Moravec reviewed the proposed Public Forum agenda. She noted the Horsley Witten Group and Camoin Associates would be presenting at the Forum and asked for alternate facilitators and note takers from the MPSC. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Hardenbergh volunteered to act as alternate Public Forum facilitators. Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi and Ms. Kilcoyne volunteered to act as alternate note takers.

Mr. Kelly noted having an MPSC member act as an alternate facilitator is beneficial because the member has recently studied the associated materials and knows the Town. However, the challenge is the ability to separate the topics of discussion, as it would not be a debate.

Next Meeting

Mr. May inquired about additional intercommunication methods. Ms. Moravec replied that all additional MPSC correspondence/information would be directed to Mr. Duchesneau and Ms. Suedmeyer. Ms. Roberts suggested the utilization of a message board for MPSC members. Mr. Sugrue indicated that method would not be possible in light of Open Meeting Law requirements. A group discussion followed. In preparation for the next meeting, Ms. Moravec suggested MPSC members consider:

- Logistics of Meetings In A Box.
- Promotion ideas for the May 22nd Public Forum.
- Additional groups for inclusion on the Stakeholder Outreach list.

At this time Mr. Riordan left the meeting.

Ms. Moravec stated the Public Forum would provide further valuable insight and the Public Forum Press Release would be out on Monday.

Mr. Sugrue motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:53 a.m. Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi seconded the motion. All members voted in favor with Mr. Riordan absent from the vote.