BOARD OF SELECTMEN

* MINUTES *

October 22, 2014

7:00 p.m.

A meeting of the Board of Selectmen, held with representatives of the Board of Selectmen, Finance Committee, Conservation Commission, Planning Board, School Committee, Park and Recreation Commission and Permanent Public Building Committee was convened by Chairman John Bulian at the Needham Town Hall. Present were Mr. Maurice Handel, Mr. Matthew Borrelli, Ms. Marianne Cooley, Mr. Daniel Matthews, and Town Manager Kate Fitzpatrick.

A summary of the discussion and a list of those in attendance are contained on the attached document entitled "Meeting Minutes, Needham Town Master Plan, October 22, 2014.

9:00 p.m. Motion: Mr. Matthews moved that the meeting be adjourned. Second: Mr. Borrelli. Unanimously approved 5-0.





MEETING MINUTES

	WILLIAM WING ILS			
Project:	Needham Town Master Plan	Meeting Date:	October 22, 2014	
Time:	7:00 PM	Meeting Location:	Powers Hall, Needham Town	
		Job No:	21314	
Meeting Number:	All Boards Meeting	Report By:	WRH, JMS, DH	
Attending:	Board of Selectmen			
	Marianne Cooley	Parks and Recreation Co	mmission	
	Matthew Borrelli	Tom Jacobs		
		Matt Toolan, FWG		
	Moe Handel, FWG	Cynthia Chaston,		
	☑ Daniel Matthews	Mike Retzky		
	Finance Committee	Permanent Public Buildi	ng Committee	
	John Connelly, FWG	Stuart Chandler		
	Louise Mizgerd	Irwin Silverstein		
	Rick Zimbone	∑ John Keene		
	∠ Lisa Zappala	Natasha Espada		
	□ Dick Reilly			
	Rick Lunetta	<u>Needham Staff</u>		
	Louise Miller	Kate Fitzpatrick, Tov	n Mgr., FWG	
		Chris Coleman, Ass't	Town Mgr., FWG	
	Conservation Commission	Paul Buckley, Fire De	ept., FWG	
	Cory Rhoades	Philip Droney, Police	Philip Droney, Police Dept., FWG	
		🔀 Tony DelGaizo, DPW	Tony DelGaizo, DPW, FWG	
	Artie Crocker, FWG	Bob Lewis, DPW, FW	Bob Lewis, DPW, FWG	
	□ Paul Albert	Rick Merson, DPW,	₹WG	
	Peter Oehlkers	Steve Popper, Public	Steve Popper, Public Facilities, FWG	
		🔀 Hank Haff (HH), Pub	lic Facilities, FWG	
	Planning Board	Dave Davison, Ass't	Town Mgr., FWG	
	Sam Bass Warner	🔀 Lee Newman, Plann	ing + Com Dev, FWG	
	Marty Jacobs	🔀 Alexandra Clee, Plar	ning + Com Dev	
		Patty Carey, Park &	Recreation	
	School Committee	Dan Gutekanst, Scho	ool Supt, FWG	
	Aaron Pressman	🔀 Anne Gulati, School	Fin. Dir., FWG	
	Heidi Black	David Roche, Buildir	ng Dept.	
	Susan Neckes	NOTE		
	Joe Barnes, FWG			
	Michael Greis			
	The state of the s			



Others	HKT Architects
Steven Rosenstock, Precinct B	🔀 Janet M. Slemenda, FWG
Holly Clarke, Precinct B	Bill Hammer, FWG
Gloria Greis, Historical Commission	□ Doug Hartig, FWG
Richard Hardy, Historical Commission	
Charles Nelson, YMCA	
Paul Good, YMCA	
☑ Janet Jankowiak, YMCA	
☑ John Gallo, Mitchell Area Resident	
▼ Vasso Mathes, Hillside Parent	
Molly Pretorius Holme, Hillside Parent	
Sophia Buckley, Hillside Parent	
Lesley Murray, Hillside Parent	
Ien Leonard-Schaffstein, Hillside Parent	
Kristin Bold, Hillside Parent	
∑ Jodi Rooney, Resident	
Anna Lubarsky, Resident	
X Allison C., Resident	
Emily Roach, Parent Talk	
☑ Jeffrey Heller, Solid Waste & Recycling Com.	
Carol Thomas, Library Trustee	

Item

- Action
- 1.01 The object of this meeting was to update the Board of Selectmen and all members of other Town Boards on the status of the Facilities Master Plan. Janet Slemenda of HKT summarized the project sites, five primary categories of work, and the overview of the process: Workplan + Visioning, Programming, Site + Building Assessments + Master Plan Strategies, Site and Criteria Matrix (used to define which sites were most suitable), Option Development (preferred site based on the criteria), Development of Probable Costs (along with a timeline for the sequencing of the projects with budget and logistics for a five year plan and beyond), Presentations to Boards + Community and Final Report.
- 1.02 Janet Slemenda introduced project schemes and probable costs: School and School Administration, Department of Public Works, Police / Fire Departments and Parks and Recreation and Conservation. Next, an expenditure forecast, timeline scenarios, and project interconnections were presented. This concluded the presentation from HKT Architects. The slide show is posted on the town web site.
- 1.03 The Board of Selectmen opened the floor to questions or comments from board members.

1.04 Question — Sam Bass Warner: A parking garage at the current police/fire station #1 would be sensible. SBW commented that a scheme with a garage was shown at an early Facility Working Group (FWG) meeting. It is possible to design such a structure in a modern way and one that is not visible from the street. A 4-5 story parking garage, 2-3 levels above grade, and community building (with pool) could wrap around the site.

Answer — Janet Slemenda: Other options for the Police / Fire Station included a parking garage and an office building, and these were priced and will be included in the appendix of the report.

1.05 **Question** - Janet Bernardo: DPW at Greendale Avenue seems like a logical first step. What does the property owner think?

Answer – Kate Fitzpatrick: The boards agreed at the outset that all property would be discussed, and that discussion would not imply that that the board having jurisdiction was in agreement.

1.06 **Question** — John Connelly: Was there a logic to the order of presentation?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: There was no predetermined order. Because the town has been accepted by the MSBA to start a feasibility study a decision on the schools is an appropriate place to start.

Question — John Connelly: Why is the midpoint of construction is used for construction cost?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: Mid-Point of Construction is used because contractors do not look at costs in the year that the project is bid but look further into the project timeline of construction, the mid-point, so that they can account for cost increases in materials or labor. Each project shown was estimated in 2014 dollars and the next ten years was projected. Then each project was looked at for the timeline of design and construction to determine what year the project might be built and the mid-point of that was selected. Bill Hammer added: Contractors themselves always estimate to the midpoint of construction in their bids to account for union contracts. These estimates are conservative and should be. This is standard practice.

Question — John Connelly: What role has priority played? Pricing and financing are incomplete without debt analysis.

Answer — Steve Popper, addressed later in meeting: The intention of the report is to provide physical and costs aspects that affect direction. Debt ratios are a long-term discussion. The financial information contained in this report will not address debt ratios or ability to pay.

Question — John Connelly: Kate said that all property is on the table. Why is Cricket Field not on the list as a possible school site?

Answer — John Bulian: Not all sites are on the table. The Park and Recreation Commission and the Board of Selectmen took it off the table. Cricket Field is not being considered.

Answer — Cynthia Chaston: We have many playing fields, and cannot look at every playing field as a potential school site.

1.07 Question — Rick Lunetta: Why do we not have a project that consolidates community needs into a single source facility? Why not combined use? Was that considered?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: Projects included in this Master Plan, by nature, are stand-alone projects. The DPW and Police & Fire most probably should be singular. The FD / PD is best located in the center of Town and a DPW is less compatible with this siting in this study. School administration was considered as a singular structure but on the same site shared with the PD / FD.

1.08 **Question** — Louise Miller: In reference to the temporary school, what other options or sites have been explored?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: We are using the information documented in the school studies completed by Dore & Whittier. DeFazio parking lot is the only site large enough to accommodate this program.

1.09 **Question** — Irwin Silverstein: Where is the proposed footprint of the Hillside School footprint to go?

Answer — Steve Popper: We relied on the Dore and Whittier report using essentially the same footprint if the school is located at Hillside. DeFazio is the only logical place for a potential relocation of the Hillside School.

Question — Irwin Silverstein: Will the new school be a 6th grade school? What happens to the Hillside population?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: The school population will be redistricted.

Answer — Michael Greis: A 6th grade school is one option. Redistricting is necessary either way.

1.10 **Question** —Rick Zimbone: If we put the middle school at DeFazio Park, we would not use Hillside?

Answer - Michael Greis: Yes, just as a swing space.

Question — Rick Zimbone: How do we factor in prioritization of projects?

Answer - John Bulian: We will work with the boards and committees once the financing plan is drafted.

Question - Rick Zimbone: What about reuse of the Steven Palmer building

Answer — John Bulian: The board has not taken any action with this property. The owner of Steven Palmer Senior Center has not volunteered to sell. Its lease is getting shorter each time we explore it as an option.

Answer — Kate Fitzpatrick: The current lease will not expire until 2027. Because there is over a decade on that lease it was not explored in the report.

1.11 Question — Cindy Chaston: What decisions come first?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: The next five years includes deciding whether a temporary or permanent school is to be built at DeFazio, and the timeline scenarios presented suggest what could happen after that.

Answer — Kate Fitzpatrick: Needham has already appropriated funds for school feasibility. The Hillside School decision will determine future plans, and have a domino effect on many subsequent projects.

- 1.12 Question Louise Miller: Will the school cost at DeFazio Park include paving?
 Answer Steve Popper: Yes, the feasibility study cost includes paving at DeFazio Park.
- 1.13 **Question** Sam Bass Warner: What processes were used for considering locations for a new pool?

Answer — Steve Popper: Previous reports explored these options. We are not going to open up the conclusions of these studies unless circumstances dictate. They stand on their own merits.

1.14 Tom Jacobs commented: The temporary school at DeFazio Park has the benefit of a permanent gym, paving, and swing space. For the record, \$20 M for a temporary school is not throwing money out the window.

Question — Tom Jacobs: There seems to be an advantage at the RTS site for a DPW. Years from now, we may look back and say why we did not put the DPW there?

Answer — Moe Handel: There are traffic, topographic and site limitations reasons that made RTS not as desirable for the full DPW.

- 1.15 Matt Toolan commented: In the actual feasibility studies that will be carried out later where more sites can be explored. These may not be the final sites, and this is a high-level analysis.
- 1.16 **Question** Stuart Chandler: Is there a critical path for these projects in relation to regulatory, federal or state government stipulations that we have not addressed?

Answer — Steve Popper: Several jurisdictions are involved. State legislative approval is necessary for building at some sites including Parcel 74. The final report will identify these.

Answer — Kate Fitzpatrick: Environmental rules are becoming stricter and may impact the operation of the DPW at its current site.

1.17 **Question** — Matthew Borrelli: Is there an additional cost associated with reappropriating temporary schools for different uses?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: There are no specific cost amounts noted at this time, but adjustments for some spaces, such as science labs, would require additional funding.

Question — Matthew Borrelli: Is there a phasing plan for the DPW?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: We have begun to discuss this with Rick Merson, Steve Popper and Hank Haff. Preliminary phasing plans would suggest that the early phase would address problem areas for the DPW: fueling, wash bay and vehicle storage.

1.18 Question — Dick Reilly: How do decisions get made going forward?

Answer — Kate Fitzpatrick: The report will include alternatives, and a financing plan will be developed. If costs and debt ratios are too high, then the people will help decide what is important. Final financing carries on through the first couple of projects.

Answer – Marianne Cooley: The first few projects will happen, and then other projects will arise. The report is for guidance.

1.19 **Question** — Marty Jacobs: With the DPW, is there an operational cost savings or impact on the neighborhood being included in the studies?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: No, that would occur in a future phase; neighborhood concerns and operational impacts were part of the criteria, and premiums costs for items such as fencing and heavy planting to buffer the neighborhood were included as part of the cost estimate.

Question — Marty Jacobs: Why is 6% the factor for escalation for the first two years, then 3.8%? Where did these numbers come from?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: A professional estimator developed this Opinion of Probable Costs and based their opinion on experience, qualifications and best judgment. Looking at market trends and after discussion with Facilities staff members the 6% and 3.8% numbers were agreed to. It is possible that these numbers could go higher, especially this year.

1.20 **Question** — Matthew Borrelli: Is the Pollard School square foot estimate number from a previous study?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: Yes, and it has been escalated. (The Final Report of the Comprehensive Facilities Assessment for the Pollard Middle School – 8/22/2011).

Questions – Has Park & Recreation discussed a public/private partnership in the context of the community center?



Answer - Matt Toolan: There is the possibility of a public/private partnership but the biggest issue is the amount of available land.

- 1.21 Daniel Matthews commented: The first five years typically go as planned. People should not assume they will be asked to vote on a 15 year plan. Each project will have feasibility studies, voting, and consider orders of magnitude. We need to be mindful that early decisions limit what we can do later on. This is a framework and each project will have its own process. There is a logical progression. We will be asking, 'does it make sense to build a school at DeFazio Park, and if so, temporary or permanent? Then what if anything will we do with the DPW?'
- 1.22 **Question** Aaron Pressmen: Do we have a partner for a public private partnership? How did Nike come up as a possible site?

Answer — Janet Slemenda: The Nike site, which is under the jurisdiction of the School Department, was a designated site to be studied during this effort. Nike was not looked at for schools, as previous studies determined that it was not the best place for a school. The Nike site was looked at for a School Administration Building the DPW and a Community Center.