

# Community Center Building Committee

## Meeting Minutes

January 18, 2021

Remote Participation via Zoom Host Ford Spalding, Chair Community Center Building Committee

Following guidance issued by Governor Baker regarding the open meeting Law, this public meeting will be held remotely, and individuals wishing to participate may do so by utilizing Zoom conferencing technology. To join the meeting by video conferencing using a computer or tablet, please click the link, and enter the meeting.

<https://zoom.us/j/97113707180?pwd=K0RzcUowNm11NXNlTkZhbm5wRDdMz09>

**Meeting ID:** 971 1370 7180. **Password:** 565901 To join by telephone only, please call 1-646-876-9923.

**Members Present:** Dave Billings, Luciana Burdi, Ford Spalding, Barry Goldman, Ruth Townsend, Sam Cole, Terry Sobolewski

**Absent:**

**Building Team Present:** Phil Palumbo, OPM - Colliers Project Leaders (CPL), Teresa Wilson, OPM - CPL, John Bates, OPM – CPL, Deborah Fennick, Principal Architect - Fennick McCredie Architecture (FMA), Jon Richardson, Project Architect – (FMA), and Fatemeh Malekzadeh, Architect – (FMA)

**Town Liaisons:** Bob Springett, Selectmen

**Absent:** Karl Warnick, Dover Building Superintendent, Cam Hudson, Warrant Committee, Chris Dwelley, Town Administrator

**Citizens:** Linda Pettit, David Green, Jean McDonnell, and Sierra Bright

**Call to Order**

At 6:03pm Ford Spalding opened the meeting by calling it to order.

**Approval of Minutes:** January 11, 2021 meeting minutes were approved unanimously by roll call vote at 6:05pm.

**Approval of Invoices:** Invoice from Colliers in the amount of \$7,366.67 was approved unanimously by roll call vote at 6:06pm.

---

### **CBA Evaluation Metrics Discussion**

Teresa Wilson (Colliers) reviewed the steps to creating a CBA matrix, while emphasizing the importance of the initial discussions, defining the criterion for evaluating each factor and looking at the cost of each alternative as the last step of the evaluation process.

As an example, the group reviewed the evaluation of different types of canoes through the CBA evaluation process.

### **Discussion of CBA Subcommittee Work**

Teresa and Jon (FMA) reviewed the work done by the CBA Subcommittee to date noting that this work is focused strictly on reviewing the design alternatives in a big-picture, high-level manner as the design is only in the feasibility study phase.

So far, the group has discussed a list of evaluating factors including “Compactness/Optimize for Expansion”, “Advantageous Adjacencies”, and “Resiliency: Co-location of Shelter Spaces” to name a few. To demonstrate for the building committee, they have begun inserting these factors into the CBA matrix and applying them to each of the architect’s (4) design options: (N2: Split Level, N3.1: 2 Story, R1: Vertical Lobby, R3: Save 1910). Using colored diagrams to help illustrate, they have created presentation slides that list the benefits identified for each option as they relate to the factors that the group identified as critical for project success. The Subcommittee’s intent is to further review in detail the factors for success with the building committee, obtain a consensus from the group on the factors to use for evaluation, then present them to the community.

During the presentation, the building committee noted the apparent value of using the CBA matrix as a means to clearly identify the choices and guide discussions.

Some Building Committee members questioned the importance of something like “Compactness/Optimize for Expansion” as a factor for success, noting that the goal of this effort is to capture the programmatic priorities now rather than be overly concerned with future additions. Furthermore, with the parking requirements still not solidified, and likely underprovided as shown, one might question the possibility of any substantial program expansion as the size of the site will not allow it. Other Building Committee members disagreed, stating this factor is actually paramount and needs consideration. After discussion, it was decided that, rather than coming to conclusions at this stage, FMA and the committee will view the results from the CBA matrix as a means to track/score advantages of each scheme in an overall analysis. Furthermore, all of these factors, i.e. Future Expansion, Advantageous Adjacencies, etc. are meant to prompt conversations that are important to have at this stage. Therefore, the committee should not be concerned the results would qualify/disqualify any of these design options from future consideration.

The building committee asked if sustainability has been considered as a factor for success in this CBA process. FMA noted that roof mounted PV panels are a consideration, but in this project, sustainability will largely be addressed through efficiency as opposed to regenerative energy systems. Examples include insulation values of the building envelope and analyzing the most efficient HVAC systems.

In an effort to include such important factors without the matrix becoming overwhelmingly large, the subcommittee agreed to look at possibly moving some factors to either the prerequisite category or the Schematic Design Phase in order to make for a clear/concise feasibility study CBA analysis.

The subcommittee agreed to distribute a copy of the current “Factors and Criterion” matrix to the Building Committee for review on an easily legible 11x17 format.

The Subcommittee has a meeting on Friday, (1.22) where they will be provisionally scoring the design alternatives through the CBA matrix scoring. A minimum of 10 days would be needed to schedule and prepare for a public forum. Therefore, the Feb 3<sup>rd</sup> target date may need to be pushed back.

### **Discussion of Cost Estimates**

FMA’s estimator performed an estimate based on diagrammatic drawings provided. All options came in over budget. FMA’s plan is, and always has been, to design to budget. They noted that items like a fire pump house for the fire suppression system and the replacement of the septic system, are relatively expensive, and unique.

The Building Committee discussed and agreed that these estimates should be communicated to the community with a breakdown of construction costs, soft costs, etc. so it is clear where the

estimates line-up with the \$13M total project budget. They should also include a narrative from the estimator describing his approach on the rough estimating of each scheme and explanations to the cost variances. FMA will send Ford Spalding the cost breakdown for him to share appropriately.

### **Review of the FAQ Document**

Ford has incorporated the edits from the Building Committee and would like to complete and release the document ASAP. He recommends it be issued prior to speaking with the Gymnasium proponents so it can be used as a reference for them on how to move forward adding scope to the project.

At 8:01pm Ford entertained a motion to approve the FAQ Document. A discussion ensued where some alterations, some considered minor and (1) major were recommended by the committee. The major recommendation was to delete the “extraneous” section at the end of the document. Some committee members disagreed, claiming it was too important, and thus, did not support the proposed amendment. Subsequently, a roll call vote was asked to approve only the “minor” edits discussed, leaving the final section. There were (6) yes votes and (1) no vote.

### **Survey for Community Input Regarding Gymnasium Topic**

Sam Cole explained that approx. 6 weeks have passed since (40) people responded to the most recently issued community survey indicating their interest in a Gymnasium. Since then, there has been no effort to look into this further. Sam recommended sending a new survey out, fully explaining the range of possible addition sizes (3,000sf-8,000sf) and costs, in order to better gauge public interest prior to heading into the Schematic Design phase.

The group responded by recommending that perhaps (2+/-) weeks of community engagement was needed prior to another survey.

There was discussion on whether the community engagement and surveying process should be in the hands of this Building Committee, or if it should instead be the responsibility of the Gym proponents, as it is, in essence, a separate project that would be under a separate town warrant. There are (4) gymnasiums currently in town. One step might be for the proponents to investigate the amount of use these existing facilities receive. Some members claimed that having the Gym proponents do this might skew the survey results and even give some community members false hope on the feasibility of adding a Gym, Pool, etc.

At 8:21pm a motion was made to have Colliers/FMA conduct a survey in the next (2) weeks to gauge public interest in adding a Gymnasium to the project scope. During the vote, a discussion then ensued about the timeframe and the exact content of the survey, i.e., (2-3) weeks for a survey? Added costs for the Gym?

It was decided that it would fall on the building committee’s shoulders to engage the public on this topic and that (2) weeks of direct outreach/conversation would be more beneficial than a survey. Perhaps a survey could be created after first obtaining results from the community.

At 8:51pm, there was a motion to have the building committee engage with proponents of the Gym and the public within the next (2) weeks, meanwhile pausing on Schematic Design until the issue is resolved. The committee would return in (2) weeks and decide the next step. The motion was seconded, and a roll call vote decided (5-2) in favor of the motion.

Following this vote, some of the committee members raised concern over stopping the Schematic Design process to wait for stakeholder feedback. It was noted that this part of the previous motion was unclear during the vote and changed the vote results.

At 8:58pm, Ford motioned to only engage with the community over the next (2) weeks on any “Add Alternate” (otherwise known as added project scope), then the committee would reconvene in (2) weeks to discuss and decide on next steps. The motion was seconded, and a roll call vote decided on (4 yes, 3 no).

### **Other Business**

No other business discussed at this meeting.

### **Citizen Comments**

Sierra Bright asked what the citizen’s process is for having input on the design. The committee responded that input is asked for at committee meetings and town forums. Also, during schematic design, each space will be studied in more depth and there will be ample opportunities for public feedback.

Jean McDonnell expressed concern over the apparent size of the COA in the feasibility plan options. She noted there is no other senior center space in town and the designers should prioritize appropriately accommodating for a full range of needs. The committee responded stating the plans are only preliminary and much more study is forthcoming.

### **Adjournment**

At 9:07pm Ford asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.

---

**Power Point Presentation link to Town Website:** [-2021-Community-Center-Building-Committee-January-18-Committee-Meeting \(civicplus.com\)](#)

**Next Meeting:** Monday, January 25, 2021 @ 6:00pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Ford Spalding  
Chair Community Center Committee

---