

Wasley Property Committee
April 8, 2021, 7:00 pm, Warren Town Hall and zoom

Present: Robert DeLayo, Scott Parkhouse, Tim Angevine, Nathalie Broadhead, Kathy Engle-Dulac, Kathy Newton, Elizabeth Chandler, (online: Josh Tanner)

Public: online

1. Approval of 3/11/201 Minutes:
 - a. Moved by KN, Sec by Eliz
 - b. Approved by all
 2. Any additions to the agenda:
 - . Elizabeth moves to include "discussion of next steps", sec by Kathy Newton
 - a. Approved by all
 3. Questions/discussion on Robert's Rules
 - . Revisiting past note and meeting recordings made clear that committee goal is shared by all members, but failure to effectively utilize Robert's Rules to ensure all voices are heard and given weight has allowed details to be missed
- i. Proposal to utilize established agenda format as suggested in Robert's Rules, featuring:
1. Approval of past meeting minutes
 2. Any additions to the agenda due to received communications, etc
 3. "Old" business: revisit and wrap up
 4. "New" business
 5. Public comment
 6. Establish next month's "old" and "new" business for agenda
- ii. Discussion: consent calendar discussed with little enthusiasm; not pursued
- iii. Proposal approved without dissent
4. Survey discussion
 - . Elizabeth edited the document to include the following:
- . Recap of feedback that went into revision
1. Heard from several members of the public, sought to edit to reflect that feedback
 2. Included more background of purchase on "history"
 3. Explain reason, mission, and goal of committee
 4. Mention other town properties for recreational use by the public
 5. Made survey totally open/not guiding (written interview)
 6. Clarify that suggestions for use of property will be evaluated in regards to cost, sustainability, etc and these evaluations passed on to BoS
- i. Reading of edited survey
- a. Discussion:
- . Concerns raised about sentence regarding mention of private sale approaches
1. Concerns that this might be leading due to absence of mention of other potential uses for the property
 2. Was included to fit with rest of that paragraph
 3. Could move to mention "use of fields, dog park, rec trails, etc", mention of private sale, inclusion of other ideas mentioned
 4. Suggested moving future uses to offer options (get people thinking of what could be done on the property that they may not have considered) separate from history of property, in another paragraph

5. Because many people haven't seen or experienced the property, having some suggestions is important, but they need to be presented in a balanced format
 - a. Also mention of historic charcoal hearths in far back field, playing/rec fields, hiking/cross country skiing trails, dog park, passive use/open space/keeping space for the future, sale, nature education center, (interest expressed by private parties to purchase the property, no mention of promises made by interested parties as to the future of the property)
 6. Inclusion of pictures for some versions of this tool for publications, but other versions will have to feature only text/black and white
 7. Question of potential for our neighbors to attend an open house/event at the property
 - . Potential to have a park and rec event there, potentially at the end of August?
- i. Concern about narrow drive, no room for cars to pass in both directions
 - a. Invitation for town to go to property at their own convenience
 8. Elizabeth read edited version of survey; "since the committee was formed" through "the purchase of the property"
 9. Kathy Newton moved to accept, Nathalie Broadhead second; approved unanimously
 10. Survey will be submitted to BoS at their meeting for approval for printing, and taken to Jocelyn Ayer (by Elizabeth Chandler) for entering into SurveyMonkey and electronic distribution next week
5. Next steps:
 - . Survey will be submitted to BoS for approval
 - a. Jocelyn Ayer offered to set survey on SurveyMonkey, link will be sent to Don of P&R
 - b. Elizabeth has pictures of property for inclusion on survey/online, will send to committee to test links, appearance, etc
 - c. Questions re: anonymity of respondents:
 - . Do we want people to include their names on their responses in case they offer important suggestions so we can follow up with more discussions with that person? (undecided, dropped)
 - d. Committee discussing this being the only information collection possible, some discussion regarding assuring future information collection; wait to see what comes back from this attempt at information collection
 - e. Post deadline for responses vs waiting for sufficient responses, suggesting to mention discussion of these responses at our May meeting
 - f. No funding needed for this as no printed copies intended unless requested by town residents (BoS approval sought for any procedures that would require expenditure of funds, such as printing/mailing)
 - g. Suggestion to offer presentation of town properties and uses
 - . Tim and Craig potential to present on town properties; soils, uses, etc
 - i. Differentiation of town owned/public access vs other types of ownerships/access
 - ii. Potential for group to address this activity/event (Tim, Nathalie, Craig, Elizabeth)
 - iii. Greenprint has a map/maps of town properties, Jocelyn may also have maps like this
 - iv. First event presenting to committee at May meeting
 6. Public comment (limited to 3 minutes each)
 - . Waltraud Tammen:
 - . Town owns property, property not currently for sale, committee tasked to learn the town's will regarding use of property, ergo she is concerned that individuals interested in sale should not be included as part of meetings or in survey. Interest in sale should have no bearing; also concerns regarding presentation of list of town properties accuracy as pertains to public access to these properties
 - a. Herman Tammen:

- .Hybrid meetings require sufficient audio equipment; conversation was engaged and completed without opportunity for public comment; requests inclusion of newspaper article in survey to set historical perspective; wants committee to listen to audio
 - b. Christine Owen
- .Could not hear what was happening in the meeting, wishes that meeting would be held in person; Wasleys and neighbors wanted property to be preserved; want more opportunity for public conversation
 - c. Andrea Kliss
- .Surveymonkey could be analyzed more effectively and could use more interview-based analysis
 - 7. Discuss next month's agenda (meeting on May 13)
 - . Last month's minutes
 - a. Additions to the agenda
 - b. Wrap up survey
- .Where published, what responses received, what other formats we want to explore
 - c. Basis of our recommendations:
- .Other board/committees/departments we need to consult to establish our recommendations
- i.Tim and Craig present re: town properties access and uses
 - d. Public comment
 - e. Discuss agenda for next meeting
- 8. Motion to adjourn: Kathy Newton, seconded by Scott Parkhouse, unanimous approve at 8:42

[Click for audio](#)