

DRAFT

Meeting Notes from Fairbank Community Center Task Force Committee

Date: Sunday, April 10, 2016

Location: DPW, Conference Room

Committee Members in Attendance	Others in Attendance
Jack Ryan Greg George Jim Kelly Len Simon Christine Hogan Dick Williamson Sarah Troiano	

Meeting Agenda

- 1) Continued discussion of and vote on number for design costs for Town Meeting Article 33.
- 2) Discussion of presentation of Task Force recommendations to BOS, PBC, CIAC, FinCom, other Town committees, the Town Forums on April 14th and the Town as a whole.

Meeting Start:

- Meeting convened at 5:30 pm

Discussion Items:

- Chairman shared feedback from his recent presentation to the PBC:
 - PBC reminded him that final design will not resemble the current Option 3 or Option 4
 - PBC also shared that including SPS was the right move since a) we have a need for space and b) we are building a new building
 - PBC also pointed out that there are more space sharing opportunities with SPS and other users such that the 9K square foot number for SPS should likely decrease
 - PBC also shared that the price tag of \$1.2MM to include Design Development was a good price
- Reviewed the phases of development:
 - Conceptual Design (*completed*)
 - Schematic Design (*to be covered in phase funded by Article 33*)
 - Design Development – this is the step that leads to validated construction costs (*to be covered in phase funded by Article 33*)
 - Bid Development for Construction (*will require additional vote at Town Meeting and ballot*)
- A simple review of the Town’s high level options was shared:

- Do nothing and let the building deteriorate to being unusable over time
- Do not approve Design Funds and begin process of making repairs to the building as needed; estimated to cost between \$12-\$14MM over the next 10 years
- Approve design funds to advance the project to next phase

Agenda Related Discussion Items:

- It was acknowledged that there was some discrepancy in members’ understanding of the basis of the vote at the 4/4 meeting.
- For the benefit of those not in attendance at the 4/4 meeting and to help clarify members’ positions, several attendees shared their basis for that vote.
 - Two camps emerged:
 - One noting that their vote in support of the \$1.2MM in design funds was not a vote or endorsement for Option 4, but a vote “for design funds that would keep the options contained in Option 4 on the table.”
 - One noting that the motion was in effect an endorsement of Option 4, of which they did not support
- All agreed that seeking Design Funds is the correct next step to keep the project moving forward; but the question remains what should be the basis for these Design Funds
 - Discussed differences between Option 3 and Option 4 including programmatic, financial and square footage differences.
- Several members shared their preference for basing the request for design funds on Option 3 vs. 4 largely due to:
 - concerns remaining about capital cost of Option 4 and
 - risks of a new center which could substantially increase expenses and revenues
- Conveyed need to further explore operating plans to achieve the new revenue numbers, and desire to further evaluate some of the Option 4 features
 - Noted that the proposal on hand for Design includes funds for further Operating Plan (revenue and expense) analysis at both the Schematic and Design Development phase.
 - Noted that more concrete decisions around features, such as the double court gym, a new warm water pool, an additional preschool and scope of the fitness center will be ultimately decided in the Schematic Design and Design Development work.
- Consensus that basing the design funds on an Option 3 baseline emerges
- Members agreed that it was important to provide greater clarity on the Task Force’s position on the basis of the design fund request

Motions:

- Sarah Troiano makes a motion: “Move to vote on design fees of \$1.2MM for article 33. This includes schematic design and design development based on Option 3 with the opportunity to explore further considerations.”
- Christine Hogan seconded the motion
- Motion passes unanimously with 7 voting in favor

Meeting End:

- Meeting adjourned 7:35pm