

TOWN OF SUDBURY  
COUNCIL ON AGING  
MINUTES OF MEETING

January 28, 2020

Joint Meeting with Select Board

WEBSITE: <http://sudbury.ma.us/departments/CouncilOnAging/>

**Members Present:** Sandy Lasky, Jeff Levine, Bob May, Pat Tabloski, Bob Lieberman  
John Bealer joined the meeting at Town Hall. Bob May left meeting early

**Also Attending:** Deb Galloway, Director of Senior Center

**Excused:** Amy Unckless, Connie Steward

**Guests:** Jack Ryan

Meeting called to order by Vice- Chairman Jeff Levine at 7:25 pm at Fairbanks Center

**Non-Support of Proposed Plan “B”. (Formal Statement attached)**

Motion and Vote upon a draft formal Statement from COA regarding non-support of proposed two article combination for May annual meeting of a “Plan B” for Community Center from Select Board Member Bill Schineller. Discussion of the draft proposed by Jeff Levine occurred. Motion received to accept, seconded, and unanimous vote taken.

Meeting was recessed and moved to Town Hall Lower Level to allow for presentation if needed. Notice posted on door of Senior Center entrance of the move of the meeting to Town Hall.

Meeting reconvened at lower Town Hall at approximately 8:00pm.

**Video Taping of future COA meetings**

Select Board voted to approve motion by Janie Dretler to have Sudbury TV record all future COA meetings. Actual wording to be found within Select Board Minutes. February 4 meeting later determined to be first such recording.

A vote for Adjournment at Town Hall lower level was unanimous at approximately 10 PM Motion: Levine, Seconded: Lasky.

Next scheduled meeting Tuesday February 4, 2020 at 3:00 PM at the Senior Center. This is a special meeting and agenda has been posted. In preparation for the town wide discussions of the Community Center proposal(s) these added dates have been reserved for possible COA meetings.

February 11, 2020 Tuesday—Normal Monthly meeting

Respectfully Submitted:

Robert May  
Secretary

**The Following was read at the Select Board Meeting of January 28, 2020.**

The COA has voted to oppose both Plan B Articles. We take this action for the following reasons:

1. 3 consultants over the past 7 years have recommended not renovating the existing building.
2. At the request of the Working Group, ICON, in its presentation on November 19, determined that the cost to renovate the existing building would be approximately \$21 Million dollars, plus escalation, plus owner's project manager's fees, plus the cost to temporarily relocated the users during construction.
3. The Plan B, Phase 1 Article bases its cost on an Assessment done by the Facilities Director about a year ago. That Assessment was based upon several walk throughs by the Facilities Director where he identified obvious and necessary repair needs to the Building. The Facilities Director qualified his Assessment as follows:

"As context, it must be kept in mind that the 1958 portion of the building has significant inherent roof and wall load limitations. This along with the age and water infiltration issues make any repair and renovation of this portion problematic and difficult to estimate. Any item below that affects walls and roof within that area has a significant impact on that loading, and hence cost."
4. The Facilities Director identifies several areas where wall and roofing issues will have an impact on the cost, but that incremental cost associated with these issues is not identified in the Assessment because it requires more detailed study.
5. The Assessment also states:

"The scope of repair and renovation will trigger new code requirements."
6. The Assessment does not attribute any cost to the triggering of code update requirements, but if code update requirements are triggered, as we expect they will, they will apply to the entire building, not just to the 1958 wing.
7. The largest cost element of the Assessment was attributed to repair of the Building Envelope. In the last sentence of the Assessment section covering the Building Envelope, the Assessment states:

"Given these issues, serious consideration should be given to the demolition of the school wing in its entirety."
8. The Plan B, Phase 1 Article not only underestimates the construction costs, but it also underestimates contingency standards, both in percentage terms and base line terms. The construction estimates are too low, and since the contingencies are based upon construction costs, they are also too low. In addition, the proponent uses contingency percentages that are 3 percentage points lower than those used by ICON for renovation projects.
9. Because of constructions standards in the 1958 time frame, it is highly likely that the school wing contains asbestos. In addition, because of water infiltration in the school wing over the past 10 years, it is highly likely that the building is infested with mold. There is no accounting in the Plan B Phase 1 supporting documents for the hazardous waste and mitigation costs the Town is likely to incur in connection with the renovation plan.
10. The proponent has not discussed his plan with all the user groups. He did discuss them briefly with members of the COA, and he was told at that time that his

plan would not meet the needs of the user groups as identified to the working group, and though suggestions were made to the proponent as to how he could adjust his plan to meet those needs, he failed to include any of these suggestions because of cost.

11. It appears that the proponent started from a not-to-exceed price and worked backwards to make his proposal fit within that constraint without consideration of user needs.

12. Because the cost estimates are totally unreliable, because the Plan does not meet the needs of any of the users, and because inclusion of such unreliable and misleading Articles would confuse and mislead the voters, the COA believes it would be irresponsible for the Select Board to accept either Plan B Article for the May Town Meeting warrant.