

Town of Sudbury
Park and Recreation Commission
Meeting Minutes
December 7, 2011

Present: Commissioners- Paul Griffin, Jim Marotta, Bobby Beagan, Dick Williamson, Nancy McShea-P&R
Director Guests: Bill Seymour Gale Associates

Minutes from the November 14, 2011 meeting were approved with corrections.

McShea spoke with accounting and informed commission about Cutting field turf replacement fund. Accounting feels that the mechanism is in place to put aside money for turf replacement. Commission would like to have an account that is not the field maintenance enterprise fund account that is dedicated for this purpose specifically.

Marotta wants to know if interest in funds like these compound? How or where does the interest on the money go?

Williamson motion to accept the minutes as amended from November 14, 2011. Second Griffin. Vote unanimous in favor.

Bill Seymour Gale Associates –

Griffin – gave a brief background, looking at possibly doing some projects need to update the Master Plan report to be able to use it as a tool to justify the updates.

Seymour in the best practices on a field: irrigation, rest 30 days in the spring or fall, top dress, fertilize, adjust soil ph, over seed, aerate etc., expect usage to be about 250 events per year – down from the 400 events we previously cited in 2004. We have even dropped it to say the optimal is 225 scheduled events on a well maintained field per year.

Griffin – friends of park and recreation will be paying and contracting to do the work with Gale Associates.

Seymour – I will do up a draft scope and once we have it where you want it to be I will let you know the cost and we can start from there.

Marotta – asked Seymour if he had reviewed the 2004 study? Seymour – yes briefly.

Seymour – when we did the study in 2004 the next target was Davis and rehabbing the middle school and addition of irrigation.

Seymour – our plan is first to do a condition assessment of current inventory.

Marotta it should be noted that the school age population in Sudbury is 50%+ of the total population.

Griffin will you be able to figure whether we need x type of field or whether we just want x type of field.

Seymour – yes the numbers will drive that.

Griffin – per kid use by example what was once 2 practices and 1 game for 8 weeks is now more games and more practices. The event usage per player has increased since the 2004 study.

Seymour – women's lacrosse is the driver on field needs right now – and is also the largest field configuration.

Seymour – Cutting Field and the high school were done about 8 years ago. UMASS Lowell was done in 1999, expected to last about 8 years, at 720 uses per year. The field was replaced at just over 10 years old, would have made it another 1-3 years. Newer Monofilament technology is lasting about 20% longer than those fields and the newest revolution technology that was recently introduced is expecting to last another 20% longer still. Cutting and the high school are both old turf, like UMASS Lowell and made with slit film.

Williamson – probably also want to look at Mahoney, Davis and Melone.

Marotta – need to establish a baseline of demand. Need a maintenance and replacement piece in the updated study. What items warrant a reserve? Can you provide this based on cost life of item etc.? Indicate what the reserve piece pays for.

Seymour – we will complete a field inventory and needs assessment. Base plans are already done. See two needs for budgeting maintenance – deferred maintenance and capital improvements. Specifically 3 areas – 1. Deferred maintenance safety etc. of things you should do. 2. Capital items need to do, add or change. 3. Facility redevelopment – rebuild because current field is not the best use of space, poor solar orientation, parking issues, ADA accessible routes etc. Need to also quantify demand.

Also look at redevelopment or expansion of new or town owned parcels.

Seymour – 2 items to deliver 1. Needs assessment and inventory update. 2. Determination of demand. Will ask user groups what % growth they have seen over the previous 5 years and their anticipated growth over the next 5 years then we modify based on what they perceive appropriate needs are. We also look at relative impact on field space example, T-ball is different than rugby. Determine also the carrying capacity. Will look at a 10 year plan and compare with population trends.

Williamson – noted that there is a difference in how we pay for new facilities versus rehabbing existing, especially with CPC money.

Seymour – we will determine the optimal mix of fields, 3 types 1. Multipurpose rectangular. 2. 90' diamonds. 3. 60' diamonds.

Griffin – extra scrutiny needs to be given to the high school facilities and what could be done there.

Seymour – we would send out a standard questionnaire to all users ahead of meeting with them.

Seymour to send roughed out scope of services, schedule and define deliverables. Also to include a community wide survey- recreation perception survey. What does commission or department want to know?

Discussion about LS fields continued.

Next meeting January 10, 2012 at 6:30 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35pm