**TOWN OF CONCORD**  
**SELECT BOARD**  
**AGENDA**  
**Wednesday, February 22, 2017**

**7PM – Select Board Room – Town House**

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Consent Agenda:**
   - Town Accountant’s Warrants
   - One Day Special Licenses
   - 51 Walden Inc.  
     
     3/11/17  8-11PM  51 Walden Street  (Wine & Malt)

3. **Town Manager’s Report**

4. **Sanctuary City Update**

5. **Wright Tavern Temporary Bus Parking**

6. **Junction Village – Board Discussion**

7. **Public Comments**

8. **Committee Liaison Reports**

9. **Miscellaneous/Correspondence**

10. **Committee Nominations:**
   - Tracy Winn of 404 Monument Street to the Concord Local Cultural Council for a term to expire 5/31/19; Cheryl Baggen of 3 Bolton Street to the White Pond Advisory Committee for a term to expire 5/31/19

11. **Committee Appointments:**
   - Maryann Lippert of 19 Cranberry Lane to the Conservation Restriction Stewardship Committee for term to expire 5/31/2017; Neil Ryder of 96 The Valley Road to the Conservation Restriction Stewardship Committee for term to expire 5/31/2019; Town Treasurer Kerry Lafleur to the Retirement Board as the Select Board Representative for a unexpired term beginning 3/1/17 and expiring 5/31/18

12. **Adjournment**

---

**PENDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>February 27</td>
<td>6:30PM</td>
<td>Select Board Meeting</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>February 27</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Finance Committee Hearing</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Finance Committee Hearing – schools</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Finance Committee Hearing (snow date)</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>6:30PM</td>
<td>Select Board pre-meeting</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Select Board Hearing</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Planning Board hearing</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Select Board Hearing (snow date)</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Planning Board Hearing (snow date)</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>7PM</td>
<td>Select Board Meeting</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Date of Event</td>
<td>Location of Event</td>
<td>Type of Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-62 51 Walden, Inc.</td>
<td>978-369-7911</td>
<td>March 11, 2017</td>
<td>51 Walden Street</td>
<td>Wine &amp; Malt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Municipal Leaders:

MAPC closely follows federal actions that could impact our cities and towns. We are particularly concerned about those policies that could undermine equity and inclusion in our region, limit the appropriate discretion of local officials, or cut funding for critical programs. In the past several weeks, President Trump has enacted a number of Executive Orders relating to immigration and border control. One such order, relating to so-called “sanctuary jurisdictions,” could have serious implications for municipal governance and finance, impinge upon local decision-making, and complicate relations between law enforcement and area residents.

This memo provides basic information on the Executive Order and sanctuary jurisdictions, local practices that might be the target of this order, as well as policy and legal considerations facing cities and towns. Beyond this memo, MAPC will continue to take steps to help communities to navigate this fast-moving policy landscape. Ensuring our region remains welcoming to all residents, regardless of where they came from or the circumstances of their arrival, is important to the long-term economic and social well-being of Metro Boston.

THE EXECUTIVE ORDER AND SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS

On January 25, 2017, President Trump signed Executive Order 13768: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States. Among other immigration enforcement policies, the Executive Order instructed the Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security (DHS) to ensure that “designated sanctuary jurisdictions” are not eligible to receive federal grants, except as deemed necessary for law enforcement purposes by the Attorney General or the DHS Secretary. The Executive Order further grants the DHS Secretary “the authority to designate, in his discretion and to the extent consistent with law, a jurisdiction as a sanctuary jurisdiction,” and empowers the Attorney General to “take appropriate enforcement action against any entity that violates 8 U.S.C. 1373, or which has in effect a statute, policy, or practice that prevents or hinders the enforcement of Federal law.” 8 U.S.C. 1373 is a statute that bars state or local agencies or officials from restricting the transmission of information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

While there is no formal definition of a “sanctuary jurisdiction,” the term can refer to a number of policies and practices adopted by counties or municipalities across the country. For example, a city or town may choose not to use their law enforcement resources to check or report on the immigration status of individuals with whom they interact. They may also decide not to comply with federal requests to detain undocumented immigrants after there are no longer local or state reasons to detain the individual, or if the locality feels further detention may violate the detainee’s constitutional rights. Municipalities that have arrested undocumented immigrants on charges unrelated to their immigration status may also decline to transfer detainees to federal immigration officials. The Executive Order refers to such jurisdictions as those that “willfully refuse to comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373.”
Currently there are four self-declared sanctuary cities in Greater Boston (Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea and Somerville). Northampton and Springfield are the other declared sanctuaries in the Commonwealth. A number of cities and towns in our region follow practices that reflect those described above, even if they have not assumed the sanctuary designation. Additionally, there are active public debates on sanctuary-like resolutions or ordinances ongoing in municipalities across our region.

Recent media reports suggest significant enforcement operations aimed at undocumented immigrants have ramped up in major cities such as Los Angeles. President Obama’s enforcement priorities (since 2014) focused on deporting undocumented immigrants who had committed crimes or had outstanding orders of removal from an immigration judge. President Trump’s Executive Order expands these criteria to include undocumented immigrants who “have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation in connection with any official matter or application before a governmental agency; or in the judgment of an immigration officer, otherwise pose a risk to public safety or national security.” This means enforcement actions are likely to cast a wider net than those pursued in recent years and give federal agents broader discretion to determine individuals against whom they can take action. b

POLICY AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS
Significant policy and legal uncertainty remains surrounding the actual implications of the Executive Order. The Trump Administration has issued no further guidance on which jurisdictions or policies are considered non-compliant with 8 U.S.C. 1373. The City of San Francisco, a declared sanctuary jurisdiction, has filed suit seeking relief from this order and two cities in Massachusetts, Chelsea and Lawrence, have similarly initiated action in court.

Further questions surround the President’s authority to withhold federal funding from sanctuary jurisdictions. Generally speaking, the Executive is constrained in withholding federal funding from state and local governments without express statutory authority granted by Congress. c Even through Acts of Congress, the Federal Government’s ability to pressure state and local governments to adopt certain policies by withholding funding has been narrowed by the Supreme Court. d It is questionable whether federal authorities have the ability to withhold funds in order to coerce local or state governments to take actions that are unrelated to the purpose of the funds in question. This is one of the central arguments of the Chelsea/Lawrence lawsuit against the Executive Order.

Furthermore, while the Administration alleges that sanctuary jurisdictions are violating 8 U.S.C. 1373, this is the very argument is being challenged in both the San Francisco and Chelsea/Lawrence lawsuits. The plaintiffs in both those cases argue that statute applies only to restrictions on the transmission of information and maintain that their policies, such as not routinely inquiring about immigration status, do not prohibit or restrict the sending or receiving of information, and therefore do not violate the statute.

Funding from Department of Justice and Homeland Security programs is considered most at risk, although some of those funds might be deemed necessary for law enforcement, a specific exception incorporated into the Executive Order. How broadly the Trump Administration will attempt to hold back funding from sanctuary jurisdictions, and in what form such sanctions might appear remains unclear. We do not yet know if the Administration will attempt to withhold funds already awarded, or if they will focus on changing grant criteria or contract terms for future awards.

NEXT STEPS
MAPC staff have already contacted state public safety officials, the Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office, and legal experts to gauge their perspectives on the matter. Going forward, we will engage local law enforcement professionals and municipal leaders from a range of communities, as well as immigrant advocacy organizations. As we learn more details about the ramifications of this Executive Order, we will make sure to keep you informed and ask that you do the same. We will also follow any reports of
heightened enforcement activity in our region and work with local partners to understand their scope and impact.

Difficult decisions confront local leaders in responding to this Executive Order. Constitutional norms cannot be taken for granted. The federal funding of communities that want to maintain their discretion over the use of law enforcement resources relating to immigration enforcement could be at risk. There are, however, grounds to believe legal challenges could protect local discretion and that the loss of funding could be limited, though it is worth noting that legal action can take time to pursue and funding restrictions could be enacted before those challenges are fully adjudicated.

While this memo should not be read as formal legal advice, we believe cities and towns interested in preserving or initiating welcoming policies have good and defensible reasons to stay the course while closely following federal actions and court decisions. These municipalities should work together on strategy and policy development, partner on legal approaches, and, as more is learned about the implementation of the Order, share intelligence about the implications of decrees from the Trump Administration. MAPC stands ready to act as a partner and a resource in all of these endeavors.

If you have any questions or information related to these issues, feel free to contact Lizzi Weyant, Government Affairs Manager, at MAPC. Ms. Weyant’s email address is eweyant@mapc.org.

Sincerely,

Marc D. Draisen
Executive Director

---

a Exec. Order No. 13768, 82 FR 8799, 2017
b Exec. Order No. 13768, 82 FR 8799, 2017
c e.g. requirements that states enact drunk driving prevention measures, such as a higher minimum drinking age, or lose a portion of federal transportation funding, were statutory, not executive mandates.
d See South Dakota v. Dole; and NFIB v. Sebelius
DATE: 02/03/2017

TO: Selectboard
VIA: Chris Whelan, Town Manager
VIA: Richard Reine, PWLF, Public Works Director, TMG Chair
VIA: William Renault, PE, Town Engineer
FROM: Chris Olbrot, PE, Asst. Town Engineer
SUBJECT: Wright Tavern Temporary Bus Parking

In early November 2016, the Concord Museum requested for the Traffic Management Group (TMG) to consider a proposal to reserve a "bus stop" area in front of the Wright Tavern for transport of children in educational programs. The reason for this request is that the Museum's programs are being temporarily moved to the first floor of the Wright's Tavern building while the Museum undergoes renovations.

The TMG evaluated and discussed this request at its meeting on January 23, 2017. Ms. Leah Walczak, Director of Programs for the Museum, attended the meeting as well. Based on the evaluation of field conditions the TMG did not support the original bus stop area due to its proximity to the intersection of Lexington Rd. and Main St. in Monument Square and the potential conflicts it may have caused to pedestrians and motorists.

The TMG recommends the Bus Stop area be positioned further east down Lexington Rd. in front of the church with appropriate pavement markings and sign installation as shown on the attached application. The TMG contacted the First Parish Church to inform them of the new parking restriction. The Church requested that the bus only parking be time restricted to maximize parking for Church activities which primarily occur on evenings and weekends. Therefore, the bus parking will only be in effect Monday thru Friday, from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Additionally, this is on a temporary basis until the renovations at the museum are complete and a Certificate of Occupancy is approved and not to exceed 3 years (Jan. 2020).

Attached please find the Traffic Control Device Installation Application for the Selectboard's approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Once executed, please send a copy back for the TMG's record and the sign installation and line painting will commence as soon as weather permits.
Traffic Control Device Installation Application

Street Name: Lexington Road  
Sign Type: Bus Stop 7-107 LR  
Type of Installation (new, replacement, change in location, other): New

Additional Information: This is a temporary sign which will be removed after a period of 3-years. (Jan 2020)

Recommended By: Traffic Management Group

Installation requirements: Post "Bus Stop" sign MUTCD 7-107 LR 12"x18" as well as Additional custom made signs as shown below in front of #20 Lexington Rd. Center the sign in the stall. Paint a 40' x 10' bus parking stall.
JUNCTION VILLAGE

Update, May 2015

Concord Housing Development Corporation
Agenda

- Background & Timeline
- Request clear BOS for support of:
  a) additional local funding b) zoning
- Why additional funding is needed
- Why additional funding should be provided
- Summary
Why we are here

Seeking Support for $3,000,000 of Town subsidy for Grantham Assisted Living
Why clear support required now?

- Project must have permits before submitting tax credit application to DHCD
- CHDC/Grantham will spend $200,000 + on permitting, engineering, plans etc.
- No sense going forward without clear BOS support for zoning and $3,000,000 funding
Background

- Concord Housing Development Corporation
  - CHDC is charged... with increasing and maintaining housing for people with low to middle income, on behalf of the Town
  - CHDC is a Separate Corporation, created through legislation, with a Volunteer Board that is appointed by selectmen

- Land Donation
  - Received Junction Village deed from state in 2013 – must be used for affordable housing or site reverts back to the state
  - CHDC delineated the wetlands and recorded the access easements
Background

- CHDC’s Junction Village Goals
  - Make best affordable housing use of land
  - Create a project that benefits and is supported by community
  - Collaborate on open space opportunity

- Land not residentially zoned
  - Zoning thru friendly 40B LIP process
Timeline-Presentations & Meetings

- 1/13 CHDC accepted donation of site
- 5/13 Solicitation of developer interest issued
- 7/13 Eleven proposals from 9 developers
- 9/13 CHDC recommends mixed-income family rental to Town officials
Timeline-Presentations & Meetings

- 11/13 CHDC to West Concord Advisory Committee
- 11/13 WinComm Neighbors email list of concerns
- 2/14 CHDC makes presentation to Planning Board
- 10/14 Grantham presents at Harvey Wheeler
- 11/14 CHDC presents to League of Women Voters

CHDC: Junction Village May 2015 Update
Community Feedback - Multifamily housing

- Too much traffic
- Too many school children
- Not in keeping with 20 units project predecessors discussed with neighbors
Assisted living impacts

- About same traffic as 20 SFH
- No school children
- All units count toward 10% SHI
- Project Keeps town above 10%
- Truly affordable housing -Serves needy elderly
Why more funding required?

- Project construction costs have risen
- DHCD caps tax credit funding for assisted living projects
- DHCD Tax Credit allocation process super competitive
DHCD Funding Priorities

- Projects that address homelessness
- Projects that assist families
- Family projects in communities with excellent school systems
- Assisted living

CHDC: Junction Village May 2015 Update
DHCD Funding Priorities

- Assisted living projects require more local support to compete for DHCD funding
# Project Cost Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Proposal</th>
<th>2017 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Cost</strong></td>
<td>$13,570,000</td>
<td>$16,922,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Credits</strong></td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Mortgage</strong></td>
<td>$8,035,000</td>
<td>$8,322,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHCD Subsidy</strong></td>
<td>$435,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Subsidy</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,570,000</td>
<td>$16,922,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHDC: Junction Village May 2015 Update
### Description of Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,693,000</td>
<td>Updated price estimate based on comparable building under construction in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Additional cost due to Concord infrastructure needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>Construction cost inflation to 2017 projected start date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$509,000</td>
<td>Construction contingency and soft cost increase due to higher construction cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,352,000</td>
<td><strong>Total Increase in Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(352,000)</td>
<td>Increase in DHCD and mortgage financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td><strong>Total Gap for Local Sources of Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHDC: Junction Village May 2015 Update
Grantham Assisted Living

83 units
17 – affordable at or below 30% of median
26 – affordable at or below 60% of median
40 – affordable at or below 150% of median
Market Assisted Living Vs. affordable incomes

Average annual market assisted living cost $63,600 per Genworth Financial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Cost as a % of income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30% = $20,700</td>
<td>293%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60% = $41,400</td>
<td>154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>150% = $103,425</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grantham Assisted Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Total Monthly Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30% of median &lt; $ 20,700</td>
<td>$ 2,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60% of median &lt;$ 41,400</td>
<td>$ 3,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>150% of median &lt;$103,425</td>
<td>$ 4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Service fee (~$1,750) paid by MassHealth’s Group Adult Foster Care Program

**Service fee partially paid by MassHealth; part by resident

All units count on Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI)
Grantham at JV is cost effective per SHI unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SHI Units</th>
<th>Local Subsidy Amount</th>
<th>Per SHI Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Annex Unit 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalli Woods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Old Bedford Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bulkeley - Phase 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
<td>$92,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888 Main Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Old Bedford Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$222,000</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Annex Unit 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$71,400</td>
<td>$71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bulkeley - Phase 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$41,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junction Village</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,145</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SHI units</td>
<td>Local Subsidy Amount</td>
<td>Per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Street, Newton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,145,000</td>
<td>$381,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Village, Newton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,853,858</td>
<td>$264,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Street, Needham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA Duplexes, Sudbury</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$68,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beals Street, Brookline</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$1,938,920</td>
<td>$62,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummer Street, Brookline</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$1,944,401</td>
<td>$60,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junction Village</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,145</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today 9.82%

Today 14 SHI units short of 10%

2020 SHI need at least 23-33 units
Multiple new 40B projects

At least 250 new 40B units likely

Traffic 1663 TPD (6.65 TPD per multifamily unit)

School children

Many Board Hearings

much town staff time
Approvable Alternatives to Town Funding $3,000,000 Gap

- 20 unit SHI ineligible family ownership project
  - No upfront town subsidy required; below 10% in 2020; serves higher income households

- 20 unit SHI eligible family ownership project
  - Requires $2,800,000 of Town subsidy; below 10% in 2020; serves higher income households
A Case for CPA Funds

- Lower per SHI unit cost than most Concord projects
- Lower per unit subsidy than projects most in neighboring towns
- Maintain 10% SHI
- Serves needy population
Why clear support required now?

- Project must have permits before submitting tax credit application to DHCD
- CHDC/Grantham spend $200,000 + on permitting, engineering, plans etc.
- No sense going forward without clear BOS support for zoning and $3,000,000 funding
$3,000,000 is a good investment relative to other affordable housing investments

Support required from the selectmen, staff, planning board in order to go forward.
Appendix
Failing to Maintain 10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential 250 unit 40B</th>
<th>Cost per unit</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>58 kids</td>
<td>$10,000-$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>250 units</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total cost range</strong></td>
<td><strong>$830,000-$1,178,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes -</td>
<td>250 unit</td>
<td>$2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on Mews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise Taxes</td>
<td>375 cars</td>
<td>$75-$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total taxes range</strong></td>
<td><strong>$733,125-$751,875</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Net Annual Cost to Town</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,975 - $426,126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantial need for elderly affordable housing

- **39% are Low Income**
  - <80% of median ($33,050 - $47,150)
  - 638 units

- **27% are Middle Income**
  - 80%-150% of median ($47,150 - $99,100)
  - 502 units

- **27% are High Income**
  - >150% of median (> $99,100)
  - 728 units

CHDC: Junction Village May 2015 Update
# Trips per Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Trips per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Mixed age rental</td>
<td>731.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mixed age rental</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed age rental</td>
<td>332.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Elderly Ind/AL/MC</td>
<td>226.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Assisted living</td>
<td>224.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Assumed Trips per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living &amp; Group Home</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind/Assisted Living/MC</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHDC: Junction Village May 2015 Update
Winthrop/Com Ave. LOS grades remain same for 60 unit apartment and 83 units assisted living.

110 apartments reduce Level of Service one grade morning and evening.

“Additional traffic generated by all development scenarios not expected to significantly impact operations at the intersections to the north (Concord Rotary) or south (Laws Brook Road). “
SHI Units Needed Detail

6,852 total number of housing units in 2010
+ 510 growth from 2010 to 5/2015
+ 100-200 projected growth 5/2015 to 2020
7,462 – 7,562 projected units in 2020

746 - 756 affordable units required to stay above >10%
- (718) on SHI today
- (5) in pipeline

23 to 33 Short of 10% in 2020 depending on future growth and number of new SHI in future growth*

*(Historically 8% of housing growth has been affordable.)
Electronic Green Card

Directions
Thank you for your interest in serving your town! Volunteering is easy with the Electronic Green Card – simply follow these steps.

1) Select which board or committee you want to serve on from the list. You may select more than 1.
2) Fill out the personal information, experience, and education sections.
3) Rank your top 3 committee/board preferences.
4) Click submit!

Town Committees / Boards
Natural Resources Commission

I would also be interested in helping on projects.
Yes

Name
Mary Ann Lippert

Email Address
malippert@comcast.net

Address
19 Cranberry Ln

City
Concord

State
MA

Zip Code
01742

Cell Phone Number
978-808-9839

Home Phone Number
978-369-5667

Work Phone Number
Field not completed.

Place of Employment
Field not completed.

Profession
Retired software engineer

Voting Precinct
2
Title: Ms.

Gender: Female

Relevant Experience/Education: Many years of gardening experience

Relevant Degrees/Professional Certificates: Field not completed.

Please order your top 3 committee preferences below:

Natural Resources Commission

If you checked "I'd like to help on a project," please specify what kind of project you would be interested in working on.

I would like to work on the Natural Resources Commission subcommittee Conservation Restriction Stewardship Committee

Email not displaying correctly? View it in your browser.
Electronic Green Card

Directions
Thank you for your interest in serving your town! Volunteering is easy with the
Electronic Green Card – simply follow these steps.

1) Select which board or committee you want to serve on from the list. You may
select more than 1.
2) Fill out the personal information, experience, and education sections.
3) Rank your top 3 committee/board preferences.
4) Click submit!

Town Committees /
Boards
Natural Resources Commission

I would also be interested in helping on projects.

Name
Neil S. Ryder

Email Address
neiryd8@gmail.com

Address
96 The Valley Road

City
Concord

State
MA

Zip Code
01742

Cell Phone Number
978 489 8803

Home Phone Number
978 318 1964

Work Phone Number
n/a

Place of Employment
n/a

Profession
Retired (previously pharmaceutical research manager)

Voting Precinct
5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Experience/Education</td>
<td>Biologist; photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Degrees/Professional Certificates</td>
<td>BSc and PhD in Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please order your top 3 committee preferences below:</td>
<td>Conservation Restriction Stewardship Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you checked &quot;I'd like to help on a project,&quot; please specify what kind of project you would be interested in working on.</td>
<td>Field not completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>