

FAIRBANKS STUDY TASK FORCE

Wednesday, December 6, 2017

DPW Conference Room

275 Old Lancaster Road, Sudbury MA

Minutes

Members Present: John Beeler (COA), Pat Brown (Selectman), Debra Galloway (Sr. Ctr. Director Ex-Officio), Kayla McNamara (P&R Director Ex-Officio), Jim Marotta (P&R Commission), Jack Ryan (COA), Richard Tinsley (School Committee)

Staff: Jim Kelly (Facilities Director) Julie Harrington (P&R Prog. Coordinator), Kevin Sugarman (Youth Coordinator)

Consultants: Leon Younger, PROS Consulting, Tom Portes (William Architects/Aquatics), Tedd Stromswold (Williams Architects/Aquatics).

Secretary: Carolyn Markuson

Meeting was called to order at 7:02 by Ms. Brown (Chair). Mr. Younger reported on a number of focus group meetings, individual and group interviews and the surveys. The number of survey responses (489) was considered as outstanding by the consultants.

Key Interview findings: These identified needs, concerns about current and anticipated programs, how best to structure the study, and how to design for the future. There were several themes identified in the survey responses: The Town would have full responsibility in the design of the building; future uses e.g. storm relief, disaster assistance; create a community center that would include both parties; and the development of a capital plan (design considerations, program changes, and financial support)

He reported that the surveys showed that there was a positive feeling for a multigenerational community center that would be the focus of the community and that voting sites be included. Demographic changes were taken into consideration as was cost recovery, concerns regarding the School Committee, and that, as the Fairbanks Committee moves forward to include realistic and cautious reflections re the financial capabilities of the Town.

The Senior population continues to grow about 1000 per year. Over the next 15 yrs. 1%-2% growth is shown over all segments of the population. Current P&R programs are strong in response to an active community life. 94% of respondents used the facilities in the last ten years. 6% of respondents noted that a community center was not important.

The top items noted by P&R responses were: indoor walking track, cardio exercise equipment, weight room, multipurpose therapy pool, swim lessons, sports leagues, afterschool and team activities, and exercise and fitness equipped areas.

Top items noted by SC respondents included therapy pool (intergenerational), library, gym component, multiuse meeting rooms for educational (e.g. courses, information, tech learning and use for bringing in outside speakers or events) and recreational activities (e.g. watercolor, quilting, arts and crafts) as well as public meeting spaces for social purposes.

The **P&R** survey response to financial questions regarding cost, 43% P&R responded that they would be willing to support a \$100-\$200/year, 23% \$200-\$300, 10% \$300-\$400 and 9% \$400-\$500 tax increase to fund the project.

44% approved of a 50% cost recovery for the building with costs per visit of 48% \$5, 24% \$10, 22% 20 and 26% \$35 per year. As to generating income from fees, 77% of respondents agreed.

88% (4% nay) approved of the concept for the building and that it was valuable for the community; 79% (7% nay) indicated it would increase their home value; 75% (5% nay) approved of the social senior concept; 66% (12% nay) indicated they would like more fitness.

The **SC** survey responses identified their choice as life-long learning (1), fitness (2), and the following 8 activities all were all #3.

In response to financial questions regarding cost, 36% indicated \$100-\$200/year; 58% agreed with the P&R result for a 50% cost recovery; 79% indicated they wanted the property improved; 75% wish more recreational fitness.

The conclusions from the above indicated a very strong community support from current users. Statistically the difference between users/non-users vary only between 4% and 5%. Noted was the desire to keep current residents in the town.

Financial costs include 1) building, 2) transitioning costs, 3) revenue, and 4) operational expenses. Additional data will be provided in the January meeting. Future actions were recommended: tours of the building, publicity as to the needed improvements, general information of process and progress.

At this point Ms. Brown indicated that there was a quorum present.

The architectural firm presented a series of slides based on the responses that included economic value, health and wellness benefits, social importance, multigenerational and inclusive participation, generational interactions, and educational opportunities. Future financial projections will include both capital and operational expenses.

Design criteria include converting the existing landscape making the arrival experience more welcoming, yet practical. A square footage estimate of building needs added up to around 59,000 sq. ft. Three concept options were developed and have the same square footage. Scenario 1 (\$24,000,000 – \$26,600,000) utilizes most of the existing structure with better interior layouts; Scenario 2 (\$27,800,000 – \$30,100,000) utilizes the salvageable portions of the building and adds new construction; Scenario 3 (\$33,600,000 – \$33,800,000) is all new construction. The current P&R building is in poor condition and does not meet current codes. The SRCTR structure (1989) is in better condition but needs complete interior redesign.

Discussion ensued identifying specific program aspects, such as social lounge, lobby, arts& crafts, demonstration kitchen, therapy pool, early childhood programs, multiuse areas (cafetorium, banquets,

meetings, voting, etc.), increased parking, easy entrances, walking path (indoor and outdoor), terrace, community garden and playground. Partnerships with other organizations/businesses for some program aspects should be explored. The current septic system can handle the expansion as can the boiler room with some modifications. The pool is 30 years into its 50-year life-span and needs some repairs and renovations but is essentially in good shape. The architects will also examine existing HVAC to keep some and improve others, e.g. solar support. The major differences between Scenario 1 and 2 include: elevated indoor track, group exercise area, more new building less maintenance.

After discussion a motion (Mr. Beeler, seconded by Mr. Ryan) was made to approve moving forward with further developments of layouts, costs, and financial impact for Scenario 2. Reasons were: more flexibility, good floor plan, more fluid ground and upper levels, SC meets state suggested space of 4-5 sq. ft. per participant, and includes the cost of an indoor running track and therapy pool.

Forthcoming will be a program plan, space utilization plan (including the costs of keeping current programs available), and operational costs assuming a 70% building usage with 110 hours per week, and 365 days of operation. A film was shared with the committee that illustrated a successful recent project (Glenview Park District Park).

The end of January will hold a meeting to receive and review the fleshed-out program design from the architects and consultant. Ms. Brown will keep other Town Officials aware of the progress, presenting updates, recommendations, and timelines.

The full meeting including slides will be posted on town website. Ms. Brown will develop a rough draft of what the Task Force has accomplished to date and a timeline for a final product. The future meeting date will be determined in discussion at an upcoming meeting.

Minutes: The minutes of October 4, 2017 were approved.

Meeting adjourned 9 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Markuson, Secretary