

## **SBAC meeting on August 7, 2013 – Final Minutes**

Present: Steven Perlmutter (chair), Loretta Arthur, Ken Bassett, Owen Beenhouwer, Vincent Cannistraro, Jen James, Maggy Pietropaolo, Hathaway Russell, Peter Sugar

Public attending: 5.

Carolyn Bottum COA, Dan Pereira REC, Bob Sutherland CCFC  
(Comm.Ctr.Feas.Study)

Meeting called to order 7:29 by Chairman Steve Perlmutter

What community uses might be feasible on this site? What history regarding a community center and community uses in town might impact the school site? Carolyn Bottum and Dan Pereira were invited to give a report on the question of having a Community Center and Parks+Recreation Dept. facilities on the Ballfield Road school campus. They handed out two pages showing the Key Findings (p.2) and the Location Assessment Summary (p.40) of the Community Center Feasibility Committee Study dated July 2012 (available on-line @<http://www.lincolntown.org/DocumentCenter/View/4770> .

Carolyn Bottum and Dan Pereira: Study's first charge was to determine possible sites based on a program based on Town needs.

Elderly are now 28% of Town's population. COA needs 9,70 SF, by Mass Office of Elder Affairs calculation State standards.

Parks+Recreation Dept. needs about 14,600 SF. Total need if co-located could share and work in, 19,300sf (separately, need 24,300sf).

COA has 4,300sf it can use in Bemis (formerly was more spread, e.g. pods) P+R has half of A pod, all of B pod. Bemis not well suited for Senior Center, many inadequacies that cannot be appropriately reconfigured: social sense and spaces to accommodate these are missing, etc. Current investment needs w/o any changes is anticipated at \$3.6m. Many other organizations use Bemis and B pod. Hence a Community Center would be very desirable for the Town -- many in area communities. Parks + Rec. happy with their space in B pod, needs to be near the schools. Schools have jurisdiction over any remediation. Some programs off-site also. Parking conflicts w. pre-school needs addressing.

A firm recommendation is not given in the Study, more info. needed, as well as the Town's desires for the two groups. No indication yet whether the Town wants a Com.Ctr, perhaps \$10m.

Traffic evaluations for this site if a Community Ctr. comes have not been considered yet. Soccer field(s): would the center field be adequate for Town uses -- yes, though larger size would be of benefit in competitions. Pereira emphasized that the town and town soccer cannot afford to lose one of the fields on the center field unless it gains another field from somewhere which is unlikely. Fields not in perfect shape. P+R wants to be able to control upkeep, even rest a field a year (not possible now --fields get full use, sports and recess, never get a rest!). Town Hall field so wet in spring, cannot be used 40% of the time.

In sum, Town's vision for Community Ctr. is needed, with acknowledgement of costs. Bemis Hall needs improvements. Hartwell Pods need addressing in themselves and in regard to future users.

What to do with Hartwell pods, one-story and inefficient land use? Though not part of this SBAC study, the Town's vision is again needed, in a sense for the next 50 years. There will probably be needed increases in footprints, better (more) parking for starters. School Dept. has to face their future use and upkeep (re-construction) sometime. Pre-schools are all growing (Hanscom and here -- need another CR e.g.) -- where can they expand?

Campus use is obviously tied in to desired uses, though SBAC with its limited time and lack of any money cannot resolve how the Community Center with its needs might possibly fit. However, it may be able to generate some ideas for the consideration of the town, time permitting. Parking remains a potentially major problem for the many uses (school, pre-school, Com.Ctr.). Site evaluation study could answer some of these questions.

Some Community Ctr. functions could marry into school functions (e.g. kitchen(s) + cafeteria), when/if space is available. Are cross-uses really viable, as these typically involve conflicts?

Other Agenda topics for tonight:

Minutes for June 18 -- OK as is -- approved unanimously.

Minutes of July 24 edits needed:

Priorities are self-evident in some topics, some not. These should be finalized, recorded

to let Committee move on to new discussions.

p.1 Issue of groundwater and solutions >>>

Is this a prime consideration? Yes if construction (some scenarios) happens, but perhaps not until that time. (Low priority if repair option, otherwise high)

p.2 General comment >>>

Are buildings really nearing the end of their life -- in the context of health and safety -- that does not seem to properly represent the physical conditions and possibilities to repair them as needed. Strike that sentence.

p.2 doors out from each classroom >>>

Dilemma re preferences -- safety vs. easy access to outside. Brooks direct access to gym is different question and has high priority....There was a discussion on pros and cons of exterior doors, without a decision -- again, it depends on the individual scenario/path chosen.

p.2: sprinklers needed? >>>

Again depends on the scenario. As part of code upgrades, Com. considers it priority. If not, e.g. under min. repair option(s), perhaps do not need it now.

p.3. switchgear >>>

Urgent in school admin. mind, as there could be a major crisis resulting in downtime of 3-4 weeks. Cannot decide on what to build now (e.g. what size). This is, therefore, a high priority.

p.4 traffic issues >>>

Would need to be solved as part of any construction plan, not urgent need if just repairs.

p.4 moisture and mold conditions >>>

High priority as part of air quality improvement.

These edits to be summarized as possible and incorporated in July 24 minutes.

Educational needs seem fully discussed and prioritized.

Steve plans to extract priority levels from the past discussions, as a separate working document to help in defining the alternate paths.

Health + Safety (see pp.-9 of Maguire Report):

Brooks Field house pre-cast panels/ immediate replacement -- is this work necessary? On p.9 Maguire calls it imperative. Even any repair option should take this into account. Should be on the list of items to address in any project. This was given a high priority.

Objections to Maguire were cost first, timing (of failures), not so much the repair resolutions. We need to be able to answer questions raised. Remember Maguire assumed NO educational improvements.

A subgroup will work with Buck and Michael Haines to review the necessary short-term items...to see what the repair only option might look like. This includes

understanding what has been done since the resubmission of the SOI and what remains to be done. Another subgroup will focus on the L-shaped options. Both subgroups will be organized at the 8/14/13 meeting. Both subgroups will perform their work before the September 11 charette of the committee. All ideas are welcome

Charrette during week-day night(s)/ long perhaps, perhaps in two pieces. Start 9/11 6p.m. – 11:00 p.m..

SOI items....

Of the several paths, State reimbursement will depend on the option and should be considered as a possibility or not -- in all pathways. Many towns explore options to go beyond State supported items at their own expense because they consider these especially important.

Pushing problem down the road will probably not be acceptable to the Town. Town wants something, though there is high concern on increase in taxes. SC says SBAC not to concern itself with costs -- that seems somewhat not possible.

How will charette work? Who will attend/ participate? Committee needs to review what are best conditions to achieve definition of pathways yet have public attendance.

Next meetings scheduled for Wednesdays @ 7:30pm at Hartwell Multi-purpose Room:

August 14

August 21

NONE on Aug. 28

September 3 (note: this is a Tuesday)

September 11: planned for the first charette. Start 6:00 p.m. End 11:00 p.m.

Perhaps the first of two parts.

Motion to adjourn @ 10:0pm / passed.

*Respectfully submitted by Owen Beenhouwer*

