

Community Center Building Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 1, 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/91841018416?pwd=UStjMUFMU2l5Q0dLWlRHSXNtNU1iUT09>

Meeting ID: 918 4101 8416 **Password:** 882885 To join by telephone only, please call 1-646-876-9923.

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

Absent: Sam Cole

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, Warrant Committee, Cam Hudson, Warrant Committee, Mark Ghiloni, Director of Dover Parks and Rec. Dept., Chris Boland, Chair of Dover Parks and Rec. Dept, and Gordon Kinder, Warrant Committee Chair & Janet Claypoole, Director Council on Aging

Absent: Chris Dwelley, Town Administrator, Karl Warnick, Dover Building Superintendent

Citizens: Sierra Bright, Joanne Connolly, Linda Pettit, Jean McDonnel, and Peter DiSanto

Call to Order

At 6:02pm Ford Spalding opened the meeting by calling it to order.

Approval of Minutes: January 25, 2021 meeting minutes were approved unanimously by roll call vote at 6:03pm.

Approval of Invoices: The committee approved FMA's invoice of \$24,000, the final billing for the Feasibility Phase. The invoice was approved unanimously by roll call vote at 6:04pm.

Concept Design Discussion

FMA started the discussion with the typical overview of the schedule, reminding both the Building Committee and the community members present that the Feasibility Phase features major space layouts and massing studies along with providing reliable cost estimates. During Schematic Design (2) selected options, (1) renovation and (1) new construction will be further defined with more detailed plans and elevations along with accurate cost estimates.

FMA reminded the group that the project's budget is \$13 million total, including both hard and soft costs. The estimates done during Feasibility have shown that the previously agreed upon

“preferred” 18,000GSF option exceeds the available \$13M. They explained that the aspect contributing most substantially to the cost is the needed site work. Elements like replacing the existing septic system, an underground water storage tank and pump house for the fire suppression system. Thus, it is these functional requirements that are driving the costs, rather than expensive custom design features.

Another interesting finding from Collier’s cost analysis is the impact that demolition costs have as it relates to demolition vs. new construction options. Selective demolition is a feature exclusive to renovation projects and is more costly than total building demolition. Therefore, the absence of selective demolition in the new construction options makes them more cost efficient. Furthermore, the (2) renovation options vary in terms of how much selective demo they require, thus making one more cost efficient than the other.

After considering all of the information in the cost analysis, it was concluded that the most effective way to address the cost issue is by reducing the square footage of the building. FMA pointed to specific areas where they are proposing to reduce space including utility spaces (fire pump and mechanical rooms), restrooms, circulation areas, storage and specific program areas. They also showed the group an analysis of an idealized building schedule relative to the proposed program. The conclusion is that a 15,000GSF option is the “sweet spot” that will meet all of the project’s criteria, be within the \$13M budget and maintain what FMA referred to as the project’s “ultimate goal” of creating a flexible space that serves a wide variety of community needs.

After review of the newly proposed 15,000GSF option, members of the Building Committee noted that despite the obvious challenge of squaring the project’s ambitions with limited financial resources, FMA appears to have created a successful solution and should be commended for their efforts. It was also stated that when comparing to the existing Caryl facility, the advantages to the community that this new proposal presents are clear.

At this point of the meeting, the Chair asked to hear questions from the community members present:

Q1) Is the kitchen intended to be a warming kitchen only? A full functioning kitchen would allow COA to take advantage of certain grants.

BC Response – A full kitchen is still a possibility and during Schematic Design that can be explored. FMA stated that they do have a kitchen consultant onboard and the desire to produce meals at this facility is understood.

Q2) Will reducing space for storage present an issue?

BC Response – The committee is still exploring the possibility of off-site storage.

Q3) The need for a large recreational space is underrepresented.

BC Response – The committee has had many conversations about a full gym. However, the budget is simply not there to support it.

Q4) Will a Fitness Studio at 1000SF hold a class size of 25-30 including storage space to hold equipment?

BC Response - The idea is to have other flexible spaces to help accommodate other needs. 1,000sf might not fit 25-30, but the intent is to have other flex spaces to support more people as needed.

Q5) Data from 2018 to 2020 shows fitness programs have grown tremendously, including Pickleball, and the space needs to be large enough to grow these programs.

BC Response - The budget constraint plays a role, but all current options hold (1) full pickleball court. The project does not have the space for more than that.

Major CBA Factors

It was explained to the group that a subcommittee focused on applying the CBA (Choosing Based off of Advantages) process has met (5) times in order to establish an objective ranking system for the (4) design alternatives. The intent for this meeting was to highlight (5) of the decided factors to show the Building Committee and the community members present.

Factor #2 Program Adherence to Ideal – “Save the 1910 (R3)” scored highest (100) due largely to the size of Fitness, the size of COA and its location within the building.

Factor #4 Compactness/Expansion – “Two Story (N3.1)” scored highest (95) due to the program being most compact and allowing for the most possible site expansion.

Factor #7 Creates the Heart of the Community – FMA noted this factor is somewhat hard to define, but the criteria is a central gathering space for casual meetings/networking, that should be near the entrances, brightly lit, and well situated in relation to the program. “Save the 1910 R3” scored highest (85).

Factor #8 Daylighting and Views to Outside – FMA noted the importance of maximizing southern exposure to take advantage of low sunlight in winter and of shading the high sunlight during summer. “Two Story (N3.1)” scored highest due to its shallow floor plate (allowing more southern sunlight through the building) in addition to having the most program exposed to sun, views and outdoor access.

Factor #9 Relationship to Town Center – This factor considers the height, massing and the character of the building and how it relates to the surrounding context, particularly with the Town Hall across the street. “Save the 1910 (R3)” scored the highest (90) because of how the 2-story mass engaged Springdale Ave. and how the character of the 1910 portion relates to the neighborhood’s historical context.

CBA Evaluation

FMA presented the CBA rating matrix and the overall rankings of the (4) design options. “Save the 1910 (R3)” ranked the highest, (705) and “Two Story (N3.1)” ranked close behind (685). These results effectively identify (1) renovation and (1) new construction option as the favorites, and presumably meets the goal for bringing one of each type of option (reno+new) into Schematic Design.

Community Comments

At 7:12pm the Chair asked for comments from the community:

Chris Boland - Noted that Recreation space was a high priority on the previous survey rankings. A 3,000sf Recreation space would likely be the minimum required to meet the public’s desires. (2) Pickle Ball Courts would be preferred over the (1) currently proposed. There is concern that this factor might impact the town vote and potentially put the project at risk.

Sierra Bright – Noted the Dance space may be too small as they are proposing to reduce it to 1,000sf? She also requested that the COA be located on the south side of the building for maximum sunlight and views.

Joanne Connolly – Expressed the need for COA to be well lit with natural light. She noted the existing space is often full at 1300sf and is concerned about reducing its size.

Peter DiSanto – Expressed concern about whether this project could be fully addressed during a typical town meeting where there is often many topics to cover which tend to be rushed.

The Chair noted that this project would likely be presented in a special town meeting with this being the only topic, thus giving ample opportunity to fully communicate to the public. He also commented on the benefit of having this town meeting in the Spring vs. the Fall so as to save roughly \$200,000 of escalation costs.

The committee agreed that they should continue forward with this process, targeting a Spring meeting to save costs, but should also continue to be looking for opportunities expand the Recreation Space in order to satisfy the expressed needs/desires of the community.

At 7:26pm, Terry Sobolewski made a motion to formally approve the 15,000SF Option #4 with the condition that as the team proceeds into Schematic Design, any additional square footage made available by cost savings and design should be allocated to Recreation Space. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Other Business

The Chair noted there is a good chance of having a town meeting in June. Much of this however, is dependent on Covid-19 and how it impacts restrictions on public meetings. He reiterated the importance of getting as many people to attend as possible to maximize support for the project. He plans to work with town representatives to organize this event.

The Chair (Ford Spalding), noted that he, Terry Sobolewski and Ruth Townsend have met with the Gym-Proponent group (Jessa McIntosh and Megan Newmarker). They discussed with them the process for pursuing this additional scope. After discussion, the Gym-Proponent group is deciding not to pursue this effort. Thus, as of this meeting, no one is actively planning to pursue the additional town warrant and the requisite funds needed above \$13M for additional Recreation/Gym space.

Adjournment

At 7:37pm Ford asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.

Power Point Presentation link to Town Website: <https://ma-dover.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/1268/2021-Community-Center-Building-Committee-February-1-Committee-Meeting>

Next Meeting: Monday, February 8, 2021 @ 6:00pm
February 10th, 2021 Community Forum

Respectfully Submitted,

Ford Spalding
Chair Community Center Committee
