

TOWN OF WAYLAND – RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Public Meeting Minutes

Posted in accordance with the provisions of the Open Meeting Law

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 2017 AT 7:00PM

Wayland Town Building | 41 Cochituate Road | Wayland MA 01778

Held in Large Hearing Room, videotaped and broadcast by [WayCAM](#)

Present Asa Foster, Chair; Frank Krasin; Heidi Seaborg; Brud Wright
Recreation: Ed Sanderson, Katherine Brenna

Absent Chris Fay,

Guests Gene Bolinger, RLA, Vice President, Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc.
Cass Chroust, Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc.

Amanda McLain, 1 Kelley Lane
Carrie Munford, 35 Williams Road

7:10 PM MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Asa Foster called the meeting to order at 7:10pm, April 18, 2017

7:00 PM PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Amanda McLain, resident
Wants clarity on environmental assessment that will be done at Oxbow Meadows
Concerned that no soil and water samples will be taken during this assessment
Has children and doesn't let them in Oxbow Meadows b/c concerned about environmental degradation on the site
Asks Dr. Krasin if he knew that the area was nuclear?

Brud Wright arrives 7:12pm

- FK - Eventually I did.
- McLain concerned that FK knew it was nuclear and approached the mic and said there wasn't any
- McLain wants accurate information, that she can trust
- Seaborg – Environmental assessment is based on previous assessments when the area was cleaned
- McLain – concerned when it went to ATM, and residents didn't have the correct information
- Ed- land was ruled as surplus land by the federal government and given to Wayland (not sure what if any fee was exchanged). In 1993 there was a preliminary limited environment assessment and since then a number of additional environmental analyses have been completed, including soil and water sampling and analysis. It was completed on the land of oxbow meadows and the land where the adjacent workforce housing was constructed. Nuclear issues were identified and analyzed at that time. National Parks asked us to complete the current environmental screening process, in order to transfer the land from passive recreation to active recreation use. If something in the initial screening through data collection is identified, the Town will complete more detailed environmental analysis. However, extensive environmental analysis has been completed in the past on the site and since that time the site has been used for passive recreation.
- McLain – genuinely concerned for the safety of the site.

- Ed – the town studied the land, completed extensive testing and remediation and confidently built residences there; it's gone from Nike missile site to residences. Since that time there has been no other industrial, commercial or other potential use at the site that would indicate a reevaluation of the site is needed.
- McLain – wants reassurance that the soil and the water is safe; voters at ATM maybe didn't know that the assessment was just data collection
- Brud – troubled that neighbors think that kids playing soccer there will cause the site and its surroundings to somehow now be unsafe; neighbors walk the trails there, they live in homes built there. They assume the land is safe based on the previous studies. The standards for safety are much higher for building a home, than for a grass field.
- Brud – this isn't a new problem that was discovered on this property. What do you think might be unsafe about that property, if nothing has been there for 13 years since its' been last tested?
- McLain – I don't know what they tested, or where they tested; concerned about digging up the soil, and children breathing it.
- FK – personally tested for radiation, found no radiation.
- McLain – why did you test for radiation, if you believed it was not nuclear?
- FK – to ease the concerns of the neighbors
- Asa- the study will review whether everything was done appropriately
- Ed – if it comes back that we need to do more analysis, we will do that analysis; environmental screening process was driven by the federal gov't, because of a use transfer, not because of any new concerns detected at the site.
- McLain – wants good faith, that it is safe for the neighbors, and have been given misinformation.
- Brud – no desire to build anything on a property that has a problem, none of us do. Willing to spend a limited amount of money to assess the documents. Don't want someone to dig test pits and test soil and water, if there is no logical or scientific reason to do so; if we are told it's clean and it's not necessary. We did it before; we stopped a project at Loker and turned over the funds to CPC because we weren't confident in the water there.
- Ed – it's our stance that the previous work and assessments on the property that allowed the residences to be constructed is accurate, and there have been no other uses on the site that would indicate that the site is now unsafe.
- Kerry Munford - 11-12 year old children, look forward to them playing soccer on the field, saw that funding from CPC is \$300k, and the project budget was for \$400k, concerned that the parking spaces and the privacy wall would get left out given the 100k discrepancy.
- Ed – We have a 300k budget, preliminary plan was at 287k, up to 399k with fences and more spaces, etc. Working with DPW and the designer to revise the plan to get it to 300k; there will be another public meeting when the plan is solidified more. Most likely the privacy fence will not be included in the final design and parking will be reduced, but we are trying to conserve some of the existing trees. Also plan to stagger start times, to control flow of traffic and public.
McLain – person presenting the environmental assessment will be at the next meeting?
- Ed- yes

- Ed – Meeting packet includes scope of work, RFQ and 2 page memo to describe overall project tasks and initial steps
- Gene – Open Space & Rec Plan (OSRP) update – 1 goal was to survey town residents for needs, also to visit the properties in town, school yards, fields, courts, playgrounds, and recreation sites. Within the OSRP there is a needs section, the final section that is called Section 9 Seven Year Action Plan which describes goals, priorities, actions, attached to a Capital Project.

3 Basic Categories of Goals

1. Enhance Conservation & Passive Recreation
2. Enhance Active Recreation
3. Planning Initiative and Strategic Plans

In the end, goal is to have a very specific plan. For active recreation – we know we have a shortage of fields, need to rehab fields to perform and maintain at a higher level, possible upgrading irrigation, sub drainage, soils, look at configuration of fields; looking at footprints of fields.

Identified needs in terms of courts, and playgrounds. Improvements conservation, to trail heads, ADA, parking.

For the town wide recreation facilities plan, W&S will prepare a conceptual improvement plan or diagram for each site, and develop costs for each site.

The town has completed many studies, but never gotten to the point where you have a specific road map, with dollar value associated with each. Site specific diagrams and costs and a strategy to implement over a ten year plan will provide that road map.

- Asa – a lot of studies conducted, beneficial to you to not repeat studies. Also WRAP Committee effort should inform your work. Should be completed by end of June and will have looked at certain regulations and how they limit what can be done at certain sites
- Gene – want to be in sync with what's been done, and would use what's of interest of us.
- Brud – they created an inventory, and vetted the inventory. Nothing creative with the inventory.
- Brud – question – Looking at active and passive recreation, both important; Parse it out, through conservation commission and recreation commission etc. so make it clear where funding should come from, possible to jointly support.
- Gene – trying to solve very acute shortages, too much stress on too few footprints, need to work at a higher level. Passive and active are not mutually exclusive. Alpine has potential to have a bigger footprint for fields, but also abuts conservation land, so could do both active and passive improvements at same sight. Big victory with this approach. The dollars needed for conservation improvements are much smaller. We will look to find a balance in our analysis.
- Brud – we have two active recreation development goals within the context of bringing better order to projects;
 1. 8v8 (now 9v9) field at Alpine on the existing tee ball field

2. A home for an artificial turf field – Loker recreation site, or Middle School current soccer field.

Will your study look at those two developments and the pluses and minuses for different improvements at different sites?

- Gene – at the end of the day, absolutely, vet out the options and identify the cost associated with each project. 6-12 more solutions in addition to the 2 you mention.
- Asa – As far as the timeline. Completed by August? The sooner the better. We need to submit an article at fall town meeting, early September in order to get it considered.
- Gene – that’s the goal. Plan outreach meeting in May and June, continued community dialog. WHS property, biggest property as recreation facilities. Can use the HS Master Plan efforts too.
- Brud – Rec Commission and School Committee have two slightly different agendas
- Gene – important point: two audiences that need to be tapped; school community and athletics; the other is the interest in all other properties across town, for recreation programs. The needs are great on both sides. Important how it’s funded.
- Ed - Joint SC and RC commission meeting on the 24th, to be confirmed. Want to vet a preferred master plan at this meeting; opportunity to get people to weigh in, especially on phasing the improvements there.
- Asa – potential conflict, turf at the MS, or turf at Loker Recreation Area, completely different groups of interest there. SC can weigh in at the MS, but not at Loker Recreation Area.
- Brud – can highlight the beneficiaries of each site in the report.
- Asa- MS needs to be rehabbed desperately, so rehab it and add turf somewhere else. Turf typically includes lights, regardless of location, will be a factor.
- Gene – a second turf field, at the MS, a school property, how much of window of time is available to community. Lots of immediate needs.
- FK – wiser choice to put turf at Loker, if you decide to put it at the MS, you’ll lose the use of the MS field for a full year; there are no current fields at Loker.
- Brud – Loker’s appeal is complete control by the Rec Commission, won’t have complicated relationships with the School Committee
- Asa – MS fields need to be closed at some point, as they need to be rehabbed.
- Brud – collecting 150k in field users fees, can spend that on fields too.
- Gene – outreach, want to do some leg work before we go to the community, key stake holders; rely on the RC to identify the key stake holders:
 - o Initially use regular scheduled meetings of the Rec Commission and Conservation Commission to disseminate information – invite user groups, permit holders, field advisory group, etc.; another meeting with more conservation focused users
 - o Then some general public meetings
 - o Later in process have meetings with BOS, Fin Com and SC once we have a real plan.
- Gene – maybe introduce project at a Rec Commission meeting in about 5 weeks (May 23 +/-)
- FK – a site to add to your list - former Paine estate, now called Traditions, near Greenways, tagged for Recreation, but surrounded by Conservation Land. Need to solve access issue.
- Asa – also if the Library doesn’t go through this summer, than that parcel might be an option.

- Gene – regarding water, irrigating natural grass fields, irrigating from town drinking water sources, MWRA water, individual wells on each property?
- Brud - BoPW felt that wells would pull from the same source, decided to water with potable water, and it required a bylaw change – that change happened. Subject to drought restrictions, etc. Drip-irrigation doesn't work with aeration of fields. Water Dept. may want to charge RC for water use. So irrigated with town water.
- Gene – no charging yourself for that water, currently.
- Brud – be nice to have a little paragraph regarding well/water source for each site to give us a sense of what to think about and also maintenance and operational costs for the various recommended improvements
- Gene – part of the equation is maintenance of town assets.
- Ed – asked the Commission to review the initial list of sites provided by W&S and add to it.
- Ed will work with W&S to get them info on other ongoing efforts – Dudley Woods, Oxbow Meadows, Beach, WRAP Committee Report, former Paine Estate, Library site, etc.

8:27 PM PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public present to comment.

8:27 PM TOPICS NOT REASONABLY ANTICIPATED BY CHAIR 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF MEETING

Ed – Weston and Sampson has submitted a proposal for \$8,400 related to addressing outstanding Con Com conditions at the HS. Rec Commission believes that School Committee should pay for it 100% and it shouldn't be split with the Rec Commission. Ed to talk with Ben Keefe.

8:25 PM NEXT MEETING DATE & TOPICS

Monday, April 24, 2017; 7:00pm | Wayland Town Building - Joint SC and RC meeting to discuss HS master plan

Monday, May 8, 2017; 7:30pm | Wayland Town Building – regular meeting of the Rec Commission

8:31 PM MEETING ADJOURNED

Adjourn; There being no further business before the Recreation Commission Brud Wright moved, seconded by Heidi Seaborg, to adjourn the meeting of the Recreation Commission at 8:31pm; Discussion: None; Vote: 4-0-0.
