

Community Preservation Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Meeting of February 16, 2011  
Kingsbury Room at the Wellesley Police Department

The Community Preservation Committee met in the Kingsbury Room at the Wellesley Police Station on February 16, 2011

**Present were the following CPC members:** Jack Morgan (Chair), Allan Port (Vice Chair), Tony Parker, Dwight Lueth, Bob Goldkamp Jim Conlin, Joan Gaughan. Stephen Murphy joined the meeting at 7:40 PM. Susan Minio, CPC administrative assistant, was also present. Absent was Don McCauley.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

**Citizen Speak**

No citizens chose to speak.

**Fuller Brook Park Coordinating Committee Discussion regarding Fuller Brook Park Update Handout Proposal 2.1**

Present for the discussion: Katherine Babson, Chair, Board of Selectmen, and FBPCC member; Bill Charlton, DPW and FBPCC; Bob White, Trails Committee and FBPCC; Suzy Newman, School Board and FBPCC; Rose Mary Donahue, FBPCC; Neal Seaborn, Chair of NRC and Chair of FBPCC; Heidi Gross, NRC; Janet Bowser, Director, NRC; Paul Cramer, NRC and FBPCC; Ursula King, NRC.

Mr. Seaborn presented the NRC version of proposal 2.1 to conduct a peer review of the project costs and evaluates the phasing options of the Fuller Brook Project moving forward.

The Chair requested that the discussion rather focus on the differing opinions between the NRC and the Fuller Brook Park Coordinating Committee on issues around management of the project rather than on the merits and request proposed in Proposal 2.1.

Mr. Seaborn stated that the NRC assumes the FBPCC will continue in its current role phase 3 of the project with a small subset of that team that would oversee the day-to-day work and advise the larger FBPCC. He stated that this is in alignment with what was agreed to at the January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting -- subject to NRC approval. It was his understanding that the NRC was to provide a vote on this agreed-to organizational chart. According to Mr. Seaborn, on February 14<sup>th</sup> the NRC met and discussed the new organization. After a long discussion, the NRC created a revised organizational chart that addresses some of the issues they had with the chart as approved by vote by the FBPCC. The NRC chart contains two changes: 1) the role of the Chair and the Project Manager for the committee would not rest with one person; 2) due to the lack of understanding of the scope of work, no job qualifications specified, and no known budget, they removed DPW from the role of project manager as it was unclear if they could manage the project. Mr. Seaborn and other members of the NRC felt and stated that the NRC was ultimately accountable for the project and was not comfortable assigning someone to the role without these issues being known.

The Chair then asked for feedback from members of the FBPCC.

Rose Mary Donahue stated that there is not overall agreement between the FBPCC and the NRC on these issues. She noted that the DPW had expressed that they can manage this project within their department. In addition, it was her understanding is that NRC expressed that they will select the project manager (not the FBPCC) and that this was part of the communication and management issues impacting this project.

Ms. Babson stated that it was her understanding was that NRC wanted to retain the right to override the recommendations of the FBPCC on who would be project manager.

Mr. Charlton explicitly stated that Mike Pakstis had offered to be the project manager. Mr. White stated that this was his recollection of the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting as well, and in fact, the FBPCC had voted on Mr. Pakstis for the role of the Chair and project Manager at that meeting.

Allan Port, Vice Chair, stated that he was very concerned that both the NRC and the FBPCC had been asked to come back to the CPC this evening with an agreed-to management structure and plan for taking this project forward, and both groups had failed to do so.

Mr. Seaborn, and members of the NRC stated explicitly that they were ultimately responsible for the project and wanted to do due diligence on the role of the PM. Mr. Seaborn stated that the NRC was asked for their opinion on the management structure.

Mr. Port stated for the record that he could not vote any money to this project without a clear management plan in place.

Mr. Parker noted that if the NRC needed more time then the discussion should be tabled until there is a holistic approach to how the FBPCC will work.

Ms. Babson clarified what was asked of the NRC at the close of the last meeting, in her recollection. She noted that Town Counsel opined that the NRC has the legal right to delegate the management the management and oversight of the project and therefore, the NRC was asked to meet as a group after the January FBPCC meeting and vote to delegate the management of the project as agreed and voted at the January 25 meeting.

Paul Cramer spoke up that while he had not been at many of the meetings he wanted to state that he did not agree with the Chair and PM being held by one person.

Mr. Port stated that there has been a breakdown in communications and suggested that that until there is agreement on both sides as to what the management structure should be, the CPC would withhold its support of the project.

Jim Conlin stated for the record that given the history of NRC management issues and group dynamics, he could not vote to support the project without agreement and management oversight in another body.

Dwight Lueth stated that the WHC is very supportive of the project. However, the management piece must be resolved as it was previously outlined at the close of the January 26 meeting. As it now stands we (he and the WHC) can't support the project.

Joan Gaughan stated that there have been misconceptions of what has happened and what needed to happen. The NRC needs to regroup and revisit what was asked of them and then she believes the issues can be resolved.

Ms. Donahue stated that she did not want anyone to think that the FBPCC has not worked hard to get the management role in place. They believed that they had a process in place that was voted on and agreed to. The FBPCC has asked for the NRC agreement on the management process and would like a written statement of what was agreed to and voted upon so that everyone is clear with roles, responsibilities, and the process moving forward.

The Chair stated that the CPC will not appropriate any money toward the project until the CPC gets a clear, written statement of how this project would be managed agreed to by the FBPCC and the NRC. At that point the CPC can evaluate the project requests. He noted that a great majority of the CPC recognize that the park needs to be rehabilitated and restored. However, he

feels that the two groups are quite far apart and that they may not come to an agreement. Until that happens, CPC will not make a motion regarding the FBP project at ATM and in addition, will not agree to spend funds from the CPC administrative funds for any additional studies or project pieces.

Mr. White asked about timing for being able to move this project forward at this coming ATM. The Chair noted that, in principle, the answer is CPC will post meetings every night at ATM and that the groups would need to come to agreement before article 16 comes up for discussion. However, the earlier the better.

Allan Port stated for clarity that the FBPCC needs to get an agreeable management structure in place and the NRC must vote to delegate the responsibilities to this management structure.

The Chair ended the discussion on this project.

#### **Invoice approval**

Allan Port moved that CPC approve the CPA coalition dues for 2011 for the amount of \$3000 from the CPC administrative fund. The motion was seconded by Dwight Lueth. After a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### **Discussion on the Motions for ATM**

The Chair noted that CPC would bring forward motions for the Administrative funds and the \$450,000 request from the WHDC as previously voted upon by the CPC.

As for the Fuller Brook project, the Chair noted that he told Advisory that it was clear that the committee had overall strong support for the project but there were substantial management issues and he did not know what would come forward for the project.

The Chair opened discussion on the CPC report into the advisory book for ATM. He raised two questions to the committee:

- 1) Will CPC keep the \$765K for FY12 (presumed to be mostly at a STM) and the 3.6 million for FY14
- 2) What does the committee want to say about the current situation and whether or not CPC will bring anything to ATM.

Tony Parker said that he feels that the report is well written and he would leave the numbers in with the good hope that the project would move forward.

Allan Port moved that in the context of the long range plan that the CPC adopt the current report for submittal to advisory subject to final edits. James Conlin seconded the motion. After a vote the motion carried unanimously that the CPC report to Advisory be submitted as it current stands subject to final edits.

The Chair noted that the meetings posted for March 9 and March 23 would likely only happen if something comes forward with St. James or Fuller Brook. They would not be removed from the calendar until closer to their actual dates.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55