Finance and Warrant Committee

10/5/2017

Kevin Preston, Liz O’Donnell, John Heffernan, Cecilia Emery Butler, David Roberts, Marty Lindemann, Kevin Hughes, Susan Fay and Sue Carney present

Meeting began at 6:33

Mr. Preston opened the floor for public comment. There was none. The committee decided to hold off on reviewing minutes until October 10th.

Mr. Kern began his presentation on the proposed Dedham Public Safety Facility, accompanied by Brad Dore, team lead from Dore and Whittier, the firm responsible for the building’s design. His team worked with building committee chair Jim Sullivan and the fire and police chief. Mr. Kern suggested that Mr. Dore describe the building to the committee and referred the committee to a list of “unmet needs” that cover the suggestions of the Police and Fire chiefs. The cost was previously estimated at $43 million. This building has not gone through the planning board process. The estimate was accordingly raised to $45 million for possible costs that come to light in the planning board process.

Brad Dore of Dore & Whittier thanked the committee and began a presentation on the proposed public safety facility. His presentation can be found on the project website. He has been working closely with the chiefs and local committee in the past 2 months, and several community meetings have been held to receive feedback on this project.

Mr. Dore showed the committee the location in question and gave some clarification on the process by which they gather requests from the future users of that site. Because this is a combined fire and police facility, some spaces can be shared, but both departments have several very specific needs. It will come out to just under 50,000 square feet.

Mr. Dore acknowledged that there have been significant concerns about parking on the area. To meet necessary parking demands, they are currently planning a subsurface (underground) parking lot.

Mr. Dore shared a floorplan that was color coded to display what space would be shared between Police and Fire, and how they would use the space. The building has both an underground floor and two stories. This is a 24/7 building, and will have firefighters living inside of it.

Mr. Dore shared the parking and landscaping plans with the committee, and several mock-ups of the proposed area layout. The project is currently proposed to be 49,500 square feet and cost an estimated $45 million. Based on the progress of the planning project, documents for this construction should be completed January 2018. It is planned to begin construction in March with all completion finishing in spring 2020. Mr. Dore then presented a video containing a 3d rendering of the site as currently planned.

Mr. Preston asked for Mr. Kern to speak on the financial impact of this project on the tax levy. Mr. Kern explained that they authorized $28.25 million for the new municipal campus, but only around $23 million was spend on the new Ames building. The town will be asking to repurpose the leftover financing from that project towards this new project. Mr. Kern said that the public safety building is part of a plan that also estimates a new school in approximately 9 years. The town has managed to catch up on a previously poor state of road quality and can now begin spending road money (roughly 1$ million) on this new project. Robin Reyes contributes roughly 2.1 million dollars towards projects like this. These two should cover the costs for the first 3-4 years. Beyond that, there will be a need for additional funds to cover this. Mr. Kern suggested that one way to do this may be to alter capital expenditures funding so the town does not have to debt exclude any of their planned buildings.

Mr. Preston asked if the $1 million being pulled out of road and sidewalks is sustainable, or if we will begin having problems with our roads going forward. Mr. Kern explained that our experts believe it is sustainable. He clarified that we have caught up on our deficit and can try to lower their spending to meet what it takes to maintain their reasonable “PCI,” or pavement condition index.

Mr. Preston asked if other communities in MA who have built combined public safety buildings have similar square footage and cost estimates to our town. Mr. Kern said that they do have some of those comparable projects, and said that he could provide them to the committee in time for the mini town meeting.

Mr. Dore noted that square footage needs depend on the town, and that he does not feel we are out of line with comparable communities, and that they seem to be more efficient than some other buildings. He stated that from the perspective of space efficiency, he expects this to be as good a use of the space as they can make.

Mr. Preston mentioned that they had a projection of the relationship between the debt service and Robin Reyes fund from the senior center project. He requested similar information for this new project. Mr. Kern said that he would be providing it.

Mr. Preston stated that his priority is learning how this expense will affect Dedham’s tax levy.

Mr. Heffernan asked what parking shortfall created the need for subsurface parking. Mr. Dore answered that by zoning laws they came to roughly 90 spaces short. With the subsurface plan they now come to 22 spaces short.

Mr. Heffernan asked what subsurface parking costs. Mr. Dore estimate $50,000 per space for underground parking compared to $5,000 per space for aboveground parking. There are 88 subsurface parking spaces proposed. Mr. Dore estimate $4.6 Million dollars of costs associated with the underground parking alone.

Mr. Kern clarified that the parking is not included in the estimated square footage of the building, so that can affect the calculation of construction costs per square foot.

Mr. Kern explained that they pursued the possibility of other options beyond the subsurface parking, but ultimately settled on underground parking as the best solution. Mr. Dore said that because they are treating this as a Municipal Campus, when they talk about parking they are also talking about the new Town Hall.

Mr. Heffernan asked about the LEED certification rating they were looking for, and what benefits may be associated with that. Mr. Dore answered that they were shooting for LEED silver, and that this will increase future operation efficiency, lowering long-term costs. Because this is a full-time usage building, there are livability concerns that increase the environmental impact of this building.

Mr. Heffernan asked if the same benefits could be achieved with a lower rating of LEED certification. Mr. Dore answered that they looked at the cost/benefit ratio to hit the correct level of certification that is most efficient for the building.

Mr. Heffernan asked what the cost difference between the Silver certification and lower certification level was. Mr. Dore estimated a 2-3% cost difference.

Mr. Lindemann asked about the parking space breakdown of the underground area. He asked if there was any public parking in the underground. Mr. Dore answered no. Mr. Lindemann asked if those 88 spaces were available to municipal employees who were not using the Public Safety building. Mr. Dore answered no.

Mr. Lindemann asked, given that it was only used by Fire and Police, how many spaces they needed. Mr. Dore explained that while the number 88 may seem high, there is a level of “shift overlap” when some employees are coming in and some are going out.

Chief D’Entremont explained that there are 23 town-owned vehicles, and that during the shift change in the morning the police use up 55-60 parking spots. Sometimes they need to “cage in” spaces for “large evidence” like a car while it is waiting to be searched.

Mr. Lindemann said that the public seems to have concerns about the high number of parking spots being used by the public safety officials. The concern he has heard repeatedly echoed is that this is a massive expenditure that has very little flexible utility. He has also heard concerns about the integration of design of this building with the municipal campus, and how that related to the design review process.

Mr. Dore answered that they have gone through the design review board and been approved. The design team has been hearing public concerns and attempting to address those concerns as best as possible with their design.

Mr. Lindemann asked for specific elaboration on what design elements been changed to address these concerns.

Mr. Dore displayed an image of the proposed 3d render, and explained some of the change that have been made. The material for the police station has been changed, and the shape of the windows has been modified to better match the aesthetic of the campus. Many of the design elements of the aesthetics in this building have been designed to fit in with appropriate design elements of nearby period buildings. The building will be 41.25 feet at its highest.

Mr. Lindemann said that an architect told him that there would be individuals specifically looking at the integration between the two buildings on the municipal campus.

Mr. Kern answered that the design review board voted 3-1 in favor of approving the layout, and that the dissenting opinion said their vote was negative due to lack of green space. A third party review firm works with the planning board to help them with all of their reviews.

Mr. Dore explained that they have met with that third party reviewer several times in an informal capacity.

Mr. Lindeman asked if aesthetic considerations would be covered at the site plan review.

Mr. Kern explained that they hired the firm Dore and Whittier for schematic design, and that the firm has already gone beyond that definition.

Mr. Lindemann suggested that there is a public sentiment that building design in Dedham does not take an eye towards overall aesthetic consideration as multiple buildings fit together.

Ms. Carney raised concerns that the suggested material of the police building looked inexpensive or may be covered with stucco. Mr. Dore answered that they priced it around constructing it out of large-format limestone.

Ms. Fay asked where the public could get access to the images and video from Mr. Dore’s presentation. She asked what the impact on traffic would be of this new project, given the difficulty of the intersection near Route 1.

Mr. Dore explained that the connection between the two municipal parking lots should allow for better on-campus flow for the municipal structure. The dispatch of the fire department is now on Bryant Street. This decision was made based on the gradient variation between that road and Union Street, which turned out to be a nonviable choice. Signage will be erected in that area to stop traffic when a dispatch is occurring. Their traffic engineer is currently working on the lighting layout at the impacted intersections. They do not estimate this to have much impact on the nearby intersections.

Ms. Fay raised concerns with the Eastern Ave/Bryant Street intersection. Chief Spillane explained that Bryant Street is not often used for fire engine dispatch, because there are better options available for navigation.

Ms. Fay suggested the designers consider how they can use design elements to encourage citizens who are already nearby to walk instead of drive. She raised concerns with the area behind the existing town hall that has some aesthetically unappealing attributes that may create a jarring visual situation.

Ms. Emery Butler asked if this building was being constructed considering future improvements and with room to grow into the 21st century. She raised concerns that the population of Dedham will be on the rise, requiring additional police and fire personnel. Chief Spillane answered that yes, the building has room to contain an increase in public safety staffing.

Ms. Emery Butler asked if there would be solar panels on this building. Mr. Dore answered that it may turn out that the panels may not work out on a cost-benefit level, but that is being considered.

Mr. Hughes asked if the building would extend from Union Place to Washington Street. Mr. Dore answered that the site covers that distance but the building wont fill the entire site. Mr. Hughes asked what would happen to the firehouse after the new construction was finished. Mr. Dore answered that it would be demolished to expand parking

Mr. Roberts asked about other metrics of the current estimates for the buildings. Mr. Kern promised that he would explode out those values when providing the committee with their information spreadsheet.

Mr. Roberts asked what further costs could arise outside of the construction costs that are estimated. Mr. Kern clarified that costs like OPM, Design, and FF&E are not included in construction costs. In terms of comparability, our site has some significant costs associated with it, which may adversely affect how it compares to other projects in similar towns.

Mr. Dore clarified that the soil qualities and other site attributes have made the construction more complex

Mr. Roberts asked what the square footage of the complex would be, including the subsurface level. Mr. Kern agreed to include it in the documentation he put together.

Mr. Dore clarified that the $45 million estimate includes construction and the other mentioned costs.

Mr. Hughes asked where the 60+ police changeover employees were parking now that will require this underground parking area. Chief D’Entremont answered that the police are currently parking haphazardly in the area around the station

Ms. Carney asked how many expenses we could expect beyond the estimated $45 million. Mr. Dore answered that when they look at a property they can be conservative, and generate estimates that will almost definitely be correct (or over), or be optimistic and make estimates that may come out too low. He prefers to estimate conservatively, meaning he expects his value to be correct or if anything, too high. They accomplish this by putting cost-buffers in their estimate assuming worst-case scenario issues. There are several 5% or 10% buffers built in to cover unexpected contingencies. Their geotechnical studies have checked out as much area around the building as they can, but not the earth directly beneath the current town hall.

Ms. Carney asked how large the Medfield public safety station was. Mr. Dore answered 39,000 square feet. Mr. Kern added that the Norwood station is 52,000, Needham is 56,000, and Natick is 51,000. Mr. Dore agreed to provide the committee information on how we compare.

The presentation was concluded.

The Blue Hills Regional Technical High school took the floor to present their plan for advanced site repairs.

Mr. Quaglia began the presentation with financial background information. The project has an overall cost of $84 million dollars with a 51 percent state reimbursement rate. This value is high when compared to similar school construction projects. Their project doesn’t have much disallowed for reimbursement.

Mr. Quaglia said that this project has been in planning for many years, and its price has increased as they chose to comply with ADA regulations and other increases that have occurred over the years. It took 5 Statement of Interest applications for the MSBA to express interest. This project is in a special category between full project and accelerated repair. The timeline they were placed on prevented them from having schematic designs finished in time for spring. The constants in this project are attempts to be prudent and sensitive to cost. There are no costs in this project that are unnecessary. They chose renovation over new construction due to lack of available land and because their current building is in excellent structural shape. Many of the major systems are either failing or can be considered at the end of their useful life. This project is designed to breathe several decades of life into this building. Some of the ramps in the building need to be changed to meet ADA requirements.

Most of the work on this project is interior. A large expense appeared in the area of life-safety systems such as fire alarm, fire suppression, and early warnings. Their PA system needs to be replaced altogether. A new security system, as their current cameras are not digital. The building also needs a new phone system.

HVAC and plumbing upgrades are the largest cost in the project. There is a heat loop around the facility that needs to be replaced entirely. The windows are integrated into the heating project and cannot be altered without running into the heating system. The new HVAC system will need to meet new codes regarding ventilation and the movement of fresh air.

The electrical system is currently in dire need of repairs. The power supply needs to keep up with the proliferation of desktops and a 1 to 1 laptop usage system. Their power system now needs to draw much more power than it was designed to. Every one of their emergency generators has either failed at some point or is in a state of increasing disrepair. There was a catastrophic electrical failure that created a large expense just 2 years ago.

The size of the building/perimeter will not be changing. The appearance of the exterior may change as the windows are replaced and some of the construction materials are replaced or renovated, but no new areas will be added to the building.

The roof is only being 2/3 replaced to help save money. The 1/3 that is not being replaced is going to be re-warrantied.

Mr. Quaglia assured the committee that the renovation will also bring educational benefits. The school is hoping to replace their network infrastructure entirely. This is to allow for IT and comparable technical fields of study to be taught. Their needs for online testing and bandwidth usage are expected to increase massively in the near future, so the network needs to be improved by then.

Temperature regulation systems in the building coupled with the old windows have been creating significant temperature issues. For 2 out of the 3 last winters, the heating elements in the office areas have failed. This has led to pipe failure, flooding, and other usability issues. The athletic spaces for both PE during the day and afternoon sports are also being renovated.

Mr. Erskine of Braintree took the floor. He explained that the building is having elevators added to the lower levels to increase ADA accessibility. Some of their doors need upgrades to be ADA compliant. Signage needs to be improved to be more accessible. Security concerns are being addressed to ensure student safety.

Mr. Moore acknowledged that the cost of the project would be high. He asked that the committee keep in mind that the building is 50 years old and in dire need of repair. Furthermore, the longer this project waits, the more expense will accrue. He reminded the committee that their partnership with the MSBA will go a long way. The cost per student for Dedham in the first year will be $1700.

The MSBA has approved $43 million dollars for this project. This is a very high rate of reimbursement. The district has already spent $3 million for their feasibility work and other preparatory studies. This project is fully funded through December. The net cost is roughly $38.6 million dollars among all the towns involved. Their model has used $40 million dollars as the borrowing model. They have worked with Southwest Financial and expect a 3% interest rate. Their initial phase of borrowing will use bond anticipation notes to fund the project through July. The district will be covering those costs. Then, bonding will cover the costs until January 2019. By that time, much of the work should be finished. They will then borrow again an estimated $18.5 million. At the very end, the district will have to take out a final bond in anticipation of reimbursement from the MSBA. 2020 is the first major expense to the involved towns. Mr. Moore referred the committee to information in the packet they had been handed.

The district will be putting money towards debt repayment. The average bond repayment in each year is $2 million dollars. This is divvied among the towns. For this first year, the cost will only be $138,000 to Dedham. After that, it will be $183,000.

Mr. Moore showed the committee that the town’s share of the cost is determined by average enrollment rates for Dedham. This will be re-calculated every year using the most recent 4 years. He referred the committee to prior enrollment statistics. This could lead to the estimated cost to Dedham changing, but not drastically.

Mr. Moore referred the committee to data on recent costs for comparable projects. When compared to similar projects, we are getting a significantly higher rate of reimbursement. The longer they delay, the MSBA contribution will not change but the cost will increase. Mr. Moore emphasized that the building really needs to become ADA accessible.

Mr. Quaglia stated that this project is best done all at once rather than breaking it into separate projects and doing them one at a time. By doing their bonding as a large group, they save money and they get to take advantage of the reimbursement.

Mr. Preston asked about the $500,000 from the first year. He asked if this money could wind up not being paid, thus increasing Dedham’s share in the future. Mr. Quaglia estimated that that money should be locked in for at least 5 or 6 years depending on possible emergency situations.

Mr. Lindemann asked what would happen if most towns agreed but some towns rejected the proposal. Mr. Quaglia answered that regulations require they present this project to all involved towns. If a town wishes to support the project, no action is required. If a town has a town meeting or town councils, those municipal bodies decide whether to approve the project. Mr. Quaglia said that if there is not unanimous support, the project fails. If it is voted down it does not fail outright, as they can elect to enact “16-N” which allows them to go to a district-wide ballot which requires only a simple majority.

Mr. Quaglia suggested that if they were to experience a town refusing to participate in the next few weeks, their school committee could call for a district-wide vote within 45 days to arrange an election. They would have to complete this by mid-December to keep the project moving along its planned progress route. If it has to be delayed a year, the cost is estimated to escalate by 5%.

Mr. Roberts asked for specifics on the MSBA funding mechanism. The approval to request town funding was in late august. This began a 120 day clock to secure this funding. Districts such as Minuteman can be given an extension based on municipal needs.   
  
Ms. O’Donnell asked what would happen if a district-wide ballot voted yes. Mr. Quaglia answered that the state would mandate that the money be spent as per the vote.

Mr. Lindemann asked about information on the handout. He asked if the state, during its reviews, confirmed that these repairs were necessary. He asked who was responsible for reviewing the necessity of their requests. Specifically, if there were reviewers from MSBA who were evaluating this. Mr. Quaglia explained that the MSBA relies heavily on the consultants and experts who are brought in for the project. Dore and Whittier are responsible for part of this, as well as another design firm. They are currently being paid out of district funds.

Mr. Quaglia explained that their project had a facility study done some time ago that analyzed system conditions and estimated costs. This was used to establish a roadmap for the future.

Mr. Lindemann raised concerns that the committee does not seem to have much oversight in this procedure or even much capacity to reject it. Mr. Quaglia assured him that he has focused in on making the minimal necessary changes with a focus on needs rather than wants.

Mr. Preston checked that this had already gone through the district school committee. Mr. Quaglia answered yes.

Mr. Roberts said that the MSBA carefully scrutinizes projects before providing their funding. Mr. Quaglia agreed.

Ms. Carney asked if the heating system being replaced is the original heating system from 50 years ago. She asked if the building had undergone significant renovations since then. Mr. Quaglia explained that the building was constructed in 1964 with a significant addition in 1975, but there have been no major renovations since then. Ms. Carney stated that the cost of this project and the educational value to our students is something she strongly supports. She did raise a concern that the project cannot increase the student capacity for this facility. She expressed that she considers this to be a bargain for its relatively low cost to our town.

Mr. Preston explained to the Blue Hills representatives that they have been undertaking benchmarking and other comparative measures for Dedham’s various departments. He asked for them to consider what measures they believe they should be evaluated by and what schools they expect to be compared to.

Mr. Quaglia suggested they develop their measures for their public school system then hand that along to them.

Mr. Preston asked that the committee be provided data about nearby towns and other technical schools that have undergone similar projects. Mr. Moore agreed to provide some of that information. Mr. Quaglia offered a synopsis that contains information about expenses they have chosen not to undertake. This concluded their presentation.

Mr. Stanley introduced Jim Maher, Chairman of the Parks and Rec commission. He explained that the Manor Fields park project offers a great deal to the community. Pat Maguire, lead architect from Activitas, was introduced.

Mr. Maher introduced the schematics of the proposal for the reworked manor fields area. He explained that some of this space will be made available as a snow dump. An agreement with abutters led to 4 acres being removed from this park. This is the second engineered park that Dedham will have. This park will be able to get around the typical problem of parking that we have had in the past. 10 of the 24.65 acres are buildable, the rest is green space.

The project is not eligible for Robin Reyes funds. It will also require a 2/3 vote at town meeting and to be voted in at a special town election. This project was developed in response to a town poll that elicited some overwhelming requests, such as walking trails, a dog park, and tennis courts.

Mr. Maher called attention to some information that had been handed out to the committee. He explained that work will probably not be able to start for some time, as a special election is required.

Mr. Preston asked if it was feasible to do a phase-in of this project over several years. Mr. Maher answered that the groundwork needs to be done all at once, even if you were not to do the rest of the construction at once.

Mr. Roberts asked about costs of mitigation, landscaping and fencing. Mr. Maguire estimated that their current estimate ($14 million) should cover that. He said that there was a 10 percent contingency.

Ms. Emery Butler asked if there were grants or other funding sources available for this project. Mr. Maher answered that while some did exist, most grants were denied for this property. Our population density is not high enough to qualify for many green space projects.

Ms. Emery Butler asked if the proposed 5 tennis courts would be enough for the Middle and High schools. Mr. Maher answered that they spoke with the tennis coaches and it would be sufficient.

Ms. Emery Butler asked about field rental and when the lights would turn off. Mr. Stanley answered that they give local school and youth groups first priority but do plan to rent after the town needs are met. He assured Ms. Emery Butler that the lights are improved and more focused, so they will not create distracting light for the neighborhood.

Ms. Carney asked about the costs associated with concession stand and restroom building, and where it would be located on the facility. Mr. Maher referred her to that information on the handout. It is described as a support building and is expected to cost $257,000. Mr. Maguire told the committee that some of their estimations came from actual costs on comparable buildings.

Mr. Lindemann asked about the parking layout. Mr. Maher explained using the map handout where parking will be accessible. Mr. Lindemann asked if the area just beyond the project was suitable for overflow parking. Mr. Maguire assured the committee that they have worked with the conservation commission and planning board to design the parking situation. They have had a traffic engineer look at parking demand and planned for possible tournaments or other high-demand requirements.

Mr. Lindemann asked why this was being discussed in the fall instead of the spring. Mr. Maher answered that by doing this sooner we can save a bit on costs.

Mr. Driscoll spoke to the question of town meeting policy. He reminded the committee that both Spring and Fall town meetings are intended to be completely equal in terms of stature and terms of what can be passed.

Ms. O’Donnell asked if the Parks and Rec master plan had been published. Mr. Maher answered that it is not yet finished. Ms. O’Donnell noted that it felt odd to try to handle this ahead of publishing the master plan. She asked about youth sport usage statistics. Mr. Maher explained that this is all information contained within the master plan. Ms. O’Donnell asked if this had a connection to the rail trail. Mr. Maher answered no.

Mr. Preston asked about the estimated impact on the tax rate. Mr. Kern confirmed that their estimates came from the town leadership.

Ms. O’Donnell asked if the paths would be paved. Mr. Maher answered that there would be boardwalk in some of the swampy areas. Mr. Preston asked the total cost of the walkways in this project. Mr. Maguire showed the committee how to calculate it by adding up the information in their charts. The number came to roughly $1.4 million. Mr. Preston compared the distance of walking trails to the proposed rail trail project which is significantly cheaper per walking foot.

Mr. Kern explained that the rail trail project would be eligible for significant state and federal assistance, with the town paying for the design process.

Ms. O’Donnell asked about previous snow dumping problems on fields, since this field is planned as a winter snow dump. Mr. Maher explained that previous snow dumping was done as an emergency whereas this is planned for so will have no negative effect. Ms. O’Donnell asked about estimated maintenance costs. Specifically why there were maintenance costs written in the building plan. Mr. Stanley stated that they do not yet have ongoing maintenance estimates. Mr. Maguire explained that the cost he was asking about was maintenance and costs for equipment like a tractor during construction.

Ms. O’Donnell asked if adding an additional field to our parks & rec maintenance budget would throw us off-balance, since the perception currently seems to be that we don’t have enough in the budget to maintain the fields we have. Mr. Stanley re-iterated that they don’t know the yearly maintenance costs. Mr. Maguire clarified that artificial turf fields require significantly less maintenance than a natural grass field.

Ms. Fay asked how much their operational budget would have to increase by to cover another field. Mr. Stanley answered that he does not believe they will need another employee. Ms. Fay asked if there was a quantifiable savings to having more snow dumping area. The answer was that its will be helpful but not calculably fiscally beneficial. Ms. Fay asked if the park would be open to citizens outside of Dedham. Mr. Maher answered that if you take state grants, it functionally becomes a state park.

Ms. Carney asked if the maintenance costs on the paperwork they had received would be recurring. The answer was no. Ms. Carney raised the concern that the vote for this project was taken back in 2001 and that the first plan had several issues. Mr. Maher explained that the initial plan failed to fully take into account grade variations, zoning concerns, conservation concerns, and other problems.

Ms. Carney raised concerns that the Parks & Rec master plan is not finished and undertaking this project before completing the master plan seems like a mistake. She expressed doubt that this new field could be maintained without requiring an additional employee. Mr. Stanley answered that these areas are not high-maintenance, and may need new seasonal support but should not require any new full time employees.

Mr. Heffernan asked about the site prep work costs. Mr. Maguire suggested that the site prep work needs to be done all at once, and would not work well as a phase based project.

Ms. Emery Butler asked if the master plan would be handed out to town meeting members in time for the fall annual town meeting. Mr. Maher offered to put it online.

Mr. Preston asked if the master plan would be ready in time for deliberations. Mr. Maher answered no.

Ms. Emery Butler asked if there was planned to be an entrance to this park from Cedar Street. Mr. Maher answered that there will indeed be an entrance from that direction.

Mr. Kern mentioned that Mr. Flanagan uses this property to store dirt and he will probably need to do something about that dirt in the future.

Mr. Preston raised 3 concerns: that this is not being presented alongside the master plan, that they don’t know about what costs they may incur, and that because this is not happening in the spring town meeting, they cannot get a clear view of what is happening to the tax rate.

Ms. O’Donnell asked if there was ledge in the area. Mr. Maguire answered that part of the design avoids problems like ledge. There are no contamination concerns that have arisen in the geotechnical studies.

Ms. Fay asked when the vote would happen if town meeting approves this project. Mr. Stanley answered that the vote would occur at such a time that the town would have more than enough time to look at their master plan. Ms. Fay expressed confidence that their current request align with the master plan. She suggested that the Parks & Rec department complete sections of the master plan that are relevant to this proposal and publish them.

Mr. Maher asked if this project were postponed they could request a special town meeting in February for this specific article. This would allow them to lump this vote with the general election.

Mr. Lindemann asked how the Parks & Rec master plan relates to the town master plan. Mr. Maher answered that there is some communication between the two groups but that they have not specifically sat down and compared them side-by-side. He advocated for further delay to get the plans unified.

Ms. Carney noted that their committee’s job is to have certainty in their recommendations to the town meeting. Mr. Heffernan agreed.

Mr. Maher invited the committee to join them for walks around the proposed location to get a look at the area.

Mr. Preston postponed the final article on the agenda be discussed at the meeting on the 17th. Ms. Emery Butler asked about Article 3. Mr. Preston answered that this would also happen at a later date.

The committee reviewed their upcoming schedule.

Mr. Lindemann moved to adjourn.

Ms. Emery Butler seconded. It was voted 9-0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:58