

Community Center Committee Additional Meeting

November 3, 2014 – Town Office

Attendees: Hilary Anthony, Charlie Ruff, Thom Lanfear, Anna Scott, Lynda Gingerich, Tom Brandt, Jon Silvermoon (arrived at 7:27p)

Not in attendance: Andy Strickland, Kirk Schultz

Facilitator: Thom

Scribe: Lynda

Meeting convened at 6:40

AGENDA

Revisit the Board motion that chartered this committee – place on agenda for next time

BOD Recommendation

- Clarification on the traffic engineering portion of the SUP
- Understanding of the definition of working numbers

FFN Article - Feedback

Programming portion of charrette

Revisit the Board motion that chartered this committee

Reviewed the BOD motion that formed the committee – *Establish a Community Center Committee to investigate the building of a community center on site.*

Hilary – there was a subsequent motion to investigate to 2million dollar 2000 SF building.

Thom – I thought there was a motion to establish an upland kitchen. Hilary – Yes, that’s an old one. It was committed to.

Anna – That is a directive for the Board. My goal in bringing this up was to review what the direction for this committee was. We’ve done a lot of work and I feel we’re at a point where we’ve finished investigation by having the working numbers.

Hilary – I think we should look very carefully at the details and that we have not finished investigating.

Anna – The board has to decide if they want to apply for the SUP. We’ve investigated the concept as much as we can. If this committee is going to continue to work we need a new direction.

Hilary – I think our investigation includes everything it would take to apply for an SUP and we have not finished that yet.

Lynda – what else needs to be done to apply for the permit?

Thom – We need a site plan. We have to investigate the traffic and parking. We couldn’t get to parking until we had an idea of the space size. We also need septic and water requirements detailed out a bit further. The septic could be a large area and we haven’t talked about where that would be. Also, we need a designated person to shepherd the permit through the process.

Tom – The Board will probably want an idea of cost as well.

Anna, Hilary, etal. – We need to look at what our charge was and make sure that we are staying with that, but it would be good to provide a report to the board. To specifically say to the board this is what we’ve done and these are what we’re planning for the next steps.

Post-Charrette Board Report

The committee reviewed the draft document that was intended to be both an article for the FFN and a report for the board.

Charlie, Thom, Hilary et al. - Discussion around whether to include cost assumptions in the report when we have no hard numbers to go on. We have assumptions but nothing concrete. We could compare the size and what percentage reduction that is, but that's all. We do know that the Pivot has square footage cost included that we will not necessarily use, such as zero net energy and green certifications but we don't know the true impact. It would be good to give people an idea that the cost is coming down but we don't want to imply that there was ever any thought that we would build to what the pivot report provided. We can use relative numbers to show the decrease in size but without any concrete numbers for cost it is difficult to include that.

Working Numbers

Anna – Why are we using the term working numbers for the output from the charrette? Why are we not using recommended numbers? (Note: This was a motion from the previous meeting). We have specific numbers. Is it just a matter of semantics?

Charlie – it was not unanimous at the last meeting to say they were a recommendation, but I would be fine with that.

Anna moved and Lynda seconded to recommend these sizes to the board of directors:

Indoor: 2600 sq ft meeting space. 1400 sq ft auxiliary support space. 4000 sq ft total.

Kitchen: 3000 sq ft indoor and 1250 sq ft outdoor kitchen. 4250 sq ft total.

Outdoor covered: 3000 sq ft.

Hilary – the main difference is we're saying this is our recommendation instead of working numbers?
General agreement to this question.

Vote passed 6-0.

Note: Jon Silvermoon arrived after the vote and will be submitting a minority report to the Board.

Traffic engineer & other requirements for SUP

Thom – when the fair is happening the traffic is governed by what goes on for the event. But the rest of the year is what we need to think about. There are different figures of number people per cars between the planning department and the traffic public works. Now that we have square footage we need to talk to a traffic engineer. Are the cars all coming at once or do they trickle in throughout the day? If everyone comes at once, what does that do to the entrance at Aero and Suttle. The county might require a traffic impact analysis if we use that entrance. If we come in at Bus, it might be different. I suggest we talk to a private traffic engineer so we can get an idea of what we're looking at before going to the county.

Lynda, Anna – how do we make that happen? We have cost implications. It's important we take it to the board.

Thom – we don't have to hire anyone to talk to them in generalities. Having a high level discussion with a traffic engineer would not cost much if anything. I think we can have an investigative initial meeting for free. If the traffic engineer needed to do some research there might be a small fee and we could talk about that.

Lynda – how do we go about having that discussion?

Charlie, Thom – We could talk to Damion Gilbert at Branch engineering.

Hilary et al. – it would be fine to have this preliminary discussion before going to the board with the recommended numbers.

Action Item – Charlie and Thom to set up an appointment to talk with Damion Gilbert at Branch engineering before the next CCC meeting if possible.

Anna – we want to have traffic numbers along with the square footage to give to the board for them to say yes or no to the SUP recommendation?

Thom – No. We still need the site plan. But we can't get to the site plan before we do the traffic. If the County decides we need a traffic impact analysis, it will cost money and we'll need to go to the board for that.

Anna, Charlie et al. – discussed and determined the following next steps and timing for the BOD. Community outreach will be required as well but we will tackle these prior. Archeology recommendation for work plan will also be required but is not necessary for the county permit.

SUP – need BOD approval first to verify recommended size.

Things that need money and will need to go to the BOD:

Traffic and parking (consultant)

Site plan (consultant?)

Grey water, water and septic (consultant)

Timing

2014 Nov. FFN & BOD Report

2014 Dec. Ask BOD to approve recommended size

2015 Jan. Money for consultants to develop a complete SUP

Action Item: Jon will ask Archeology to develop a work plan based on general location determined previously, knowing that the precise building placement may vary slightly.

Jon – As far as process are we not going to develop a business plan?

Hilary, Anna et al – The board has had the opportunity to do that. We can put it on the agenda for the next meeting. But it would come after we've determined the programming and received approval to actual build. Some elements will be required for fund-raising.

Lynda – Is there anything we can do to further explore the water/septic etc. question?

Charlie, Thom et al. – we did pay a consultant to look at this for the Pivot report but didn't get a whole lot of detail. At that point, there was a variety of opinions as to what we would cover as part of the grey water. Now that we have a size number to work with, we can address the grey water/septic for this building specifically. We can go back to Pivot for some follow up.

Anna – Might need to put together a scope of work for this. I'd be happy to help draft a scope of work for any other consultant engineering or architectural services that may need to be voted on by the BOD before we can work together.

FFN Article

Anna – I think the audience for the board report and the FFN is very different. Some of the information might be the same but I don't think we can use the same content for both.

Charlie – If we need new content, unless we can have it by Saturday for the retreat, we will need to push it to December.

Lynda – Could we use the FFN Article and then have an auxiliary section that is specific for the Board? General agreement.

Action Item: Lynda will complete both sections (an article for FFN and an addendum section for the board) specific to each audience in time for the retreat on Saturday (Nov. 8).

Action Items

Hilary to put together comparison between size of Pivot and charrette output, including % differences, then email to group. **DONE**

Charlie/Thom – Set up an appointment to talk with a traffic engineer, Damion Gilbert at Branch engineering, to get a general idea of what our parking requirements might look like. Due date before the next CCC meeting.

Jon to provide the Archeology committee with the community center site and size generally so they can start building a work plan.

Jon to send Lynda the spreadsheet based on the Pivot report to show the cost calculated on the numbers that Pivot provided vs charrette numbers. **DONE**

Charlie – contact Pivot for more information about water/septic/grey water engineering input

Charlie – put motion to approve recommended size on the new business calendar at November BOD meeting. **DONE**

Lynda to finish FFN Article and amend with additional details for a BOD Report at the retreat. **DONE**

Anna – available to help draft a scope of work for any other consultant engineering or architectural services that may need to be voted on by the BOD.

Meeting adjourned at 8:22 pm

Next meeting will be on Nov.24 at 6:00pm

Potential Agenda Item

Review site maps and brainstorm parking.