

Board Summary/Actions

Nothing this month

Community Center Committee Meeting

February 20, 2017 – Town Office

Attendees: Lynda Gingerich, Rick Lambert, Jon Silvermoon, Charlie Ruff, Shane Harvey, Laurel Goerger, Crystalyn

Via Go To: Jim Goettler, Sandra Bauer, Ann Rogers

Not in attendance: Thomas Brandt, Paxton Hoag, Thom Lanfear, Anna Scott

Facilitator: Charlie

Scribe: Lynda

Meeting convened at 6:05 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of January 2017 Minutes
2. Report back on vacation process – Shane
3. Revisit the parking for the community center
4. Sandra's motion
5. Wells and water tanks – Tabled. Unclear on what needs to be discussed for this topic.
6. Scribe role – Tabled. Anna will be making a motion but was not able to attend.

Committee Business

Do we have a quorum? Yes, we have a quorum.

Approval of Previous Minutes

Lynda – I'll move to approve the January 2017 minutes with the addition of August and December in the respective two motions. Sandra seconded.

Motion passed as amended by Lynda – Jon and Charlie abstained

Road Vacation/Parking

Shane, Charlie, Jon, et al. – To get the county to vacate the road we need to give the county a deposit of \$3400 to apply. The county runs a tally for the process of the vacation and at the end either gives you a refund or you get a bill for additional costs beyond the \$3400. Also, if any neighbors oppose the vacation, then a hearing would be held. If that happens, a deposit of \$4800 is required. There is only one effected neighbor, Jason Mann although there should be no negative impact to him. May need to widen the road to code in order to do the vacation.

Sandra – Is the reason for doing this because of the upgrade to the road required for the site of the CC?

Charlie – The County is asking for an upgrade to the road, regardless of the Community Center.

Jim – What is the cost for the whole process and what is the budget?

Shane – We have not had an estimate yet but it will probably be substantial. The far side road was 30K, although there is no road there and this is an improvement.

Charlie – This came out of the traffic impact analysis for the SUP, not out of the work for the CC.

Jon, Jim et al. – Even if we were not doing a CC, I would still advocate for the road vacation. It's a public right of way and we can't put a fence across it at any time including during the fair. It's not a CC budget item but a general operations budget item although there may end up being some additional cost due to the community center.

Ann – Will have to meet the standards, but vacating the road is essential.

Charlie – The vacation process is parallel to the community center effort and would be happening even if the community center never existed.

Parking

Lynda – Thom sent out a map showing the distance between DUG's Green and the proposed CC site. Parking must be within 800 feet and the map shows the area that meets this requirement. There is potential parking in DUG's Green. For the site plan permit application, the committee needs to decide if we want to put the parking in DUG's Green or scattered throughout Alice's as it shows in the Pivot report.

Sandra – When we discussed that before, we were not sure if DUG's Green would be an option that the Board would allow. We were able to come up with 100 spaces but do we need find that other than in DUG's Green.

Crystalyn – If we change our mind later, can we use other places for parking?

Lynda – I believe that Thom said that we should be able to.

Jon – If we're talking about using DUG's Green we should involve LUMP so they are aware before this goes to the Board. If we expect to rent this out, the further away the parking is, the more it may factor in people wanting to rent it out, especially when it's wet. We should consider impact to parties external to the fair wanting to use the facility.

Charlie – In terms of site planning permit, during the Pivot report, we were able to demonstrate that we could meet the parking requirements with existing sites with minimal upgrades. We could have parking in both existing sites as well as DUG's Green, with different parking for different events. I don't think we need a board motion about whether we can park in DUG's Green or not.

Jon – Should go to LUMP

Charlie – Needs to go to LUMP for improvements to meet the code.

Rick – I thought we were looking at Dug's Green to get parking where trees do not need to be cut.

Charlie – I don't know if we can tell exactly how many trees would need to be removed.

Ann – there might be tree removal for road vacation as well.

Fundraising/Budget

Sandra – It's been awhile since we've checked in with the board. There's been a lot of information and feedback. I think it's appropriate to go to the board for direction, especially as there's been a lot of turnover on the board. As we get closer to resolution on some of these applications, it would be useful to have feedback from the board. There's been a lot of work on a Pivot based project. Would like to get Pivot to come up with another couple options to take to the board that are at a lower budget.

Charlie – Just going off the Pivot report is a couple iterations old. There was a process where we held a charrette and the output was to shrink the square footage. 12/1/14 was the last interaction we had with the board. 2600 SF of indoor space. 1400 SF of auxiliary support space. 3000 SF indoor kitchen. 1250 SF outdoor kitchen. 3000 SF outdoor covered space. That was approved by the board.

Jon – The Board approved the square footage (as outlined above for the purposes of the site plan permit) but never approved a price tag. There was never agreement about what that square footage would cost. The piece that is missing is the \$ per square foot of the building. I've always heard that we won't know that until we design the building.

Charlie – The combination of indoor and outdoor covered space makes it difficult to determine a per square foot cost. We did use a \$200 per square foot number as an average as a way to talk about it.

Sandra – I put numbers in a spreadsheet that includes the Pivot numbers as well as other estimates in order to see if there are ways to save money. There was a discussion of a \$2 million dollar budget that everyone agreed with during the last meeting, but after the meeting it did not seem that people agreed at all. In the end it's not our job to figure out what the budget is. If we are all confused, then let's go back to the board and talk about it.

Lynda – Regarding the \$2 million from last meeting, we did talk about it but I didn't agree that we should as a committee tout this as the number. I'm not convinced that it is the right number. I want to build this as cheaply as possible while still meeting the necessary requirements. But I don't know what that number should be. I don't think we're there yet. I'm more concerned about getting the site plan permit. If we want the Board to discuss how much they want to spend, fine. But as a committee member, I don't feel we have the knowledge or facts to advocate for a price before we start the design process.

Charlie – After the initial Pivot report came out, there was a thought that the committee was advocating for \$4 million building which was not true. I think by not limiting what we asked for, Pivot did set us back in talking about the numbers. The Pivot report included everything we could wish for and included things like Leeds Certification that are very expensive but that no one is advocating to include at this point. At that time, the committee was leery about discussing a price point without even preliminary design being done first. There are so many variables until you get to the design phase that I agree we shouldn't be trying to come up with a price point.

Jim – The conversation last week spun out of my asking what is the budget. The motion is to find out what the Board is going to do. The charrette had people asking for really expensive things that would be nice but came from people who don't have any idea how to raise money. You have to start first with how much you have to spend before you can build anything. We owe it to the membership to ask the board how much they are willing to put up and then designing something around that.

Sandra – The motion I have today doesn't have a dollar figure in it. The value is that we gather information and present it to the Board so we can show them several options. It is too early for any of us to know a number.

Crystalyn – Sandra, I'm hearing you say you'd like to go back and redo the design charrettes?

Sandra – No. I'm advocating asking Pivot to come up with some additional options with budget in mind.

Jon – When this committee made its size recommendation to the Board, I put together an alternate proposal using Pivot's methodology but reducing the size and removing some of the green features. This came out to about \$3.4 M. For me the real question is about the lack of consensus for what the cost per square foot should be. Lacking that, the square foot size is irrelevant because you don't know what you're using to estimate the cost for that size. I don't know what you'd get by going to the Board at this point.

Charlie – I can see value in reengaging with the Board to educate the new members. Getting down to the square footage that we're working with was done with a lot of discussion and thought around what we could reduce. I'm comfortable with the square footage the board approved. I would be comfortable getting more money and a board mandate to go back to Pivot and get more options for the approved size. There are trade-offs for options and it would be valuable to see what those are. I do want us to process and refine what we are taking to them so that we get clear actionable steps out of it. And we should be as close to consensus as possible. If there is dissension on the footage that went to the Board, we should hash that out first.

Sandra – Are you saying this committee would use discretion in determining size? If you developed 2 or 3 projects, size would be one of the variables. It seems prudent and reasonable to say we need to

generate some full-fledged options. I agree we can't go into the project knowing what the price points are.

Charlie – I would recommend options based on the existing version of square footage with a couple variations of that.

Jon – Is anybody thinking we would apply for the permit with a footprint other than what has been approved by the Board?

Sandra – My understanding is you apply with the largest you would potentially build but are not held to that size.

Jon – That's my understanding as well. But I don't know if the conditions attached to the permit are set in stone based on the potential size.

Lynda – I feel pretty strongly about sticking with the square footage that has been approved by the Board to use for the site plan. I would like to go to Pivot with our indoor/outdoor square footage and ask what is the absolutely cheapest that we could build this for given our basic requirements. And then get a few more options that have increasingly more functionality, bells and whistles, like bronze, silver, gold options. We know what the super deluxe is and that we don't want that. But based on what they know about us, what are other options and what would those options cost?

Jim – That's reasonable.

Charlie – I propose an agenda item for next meeting that we talk about Jon's concern about the conditions and start to formulate what we would take to the Board as a motion. Everyone can think about what they'd like to see with other size options. I agree with Lynda. I feel like we did this work with the Board to get to the footprint recommendation. I think that's our working set of numbers. If we can put a dollar value on what the relative cost of each of those spaces would be then the Board can scale it down. You don't have to have options you can just apply the math.

Sandra – I think that's perfect. Would you like me to send you the spreadsheet? You can use it to manipulate numbers and help to think about what to ask when we see Pivot. Some of these things I don't have any idea what they are. I think we would be better prepared to talk to Pivot if we understood the line items on their budget.

Jim – Could we get more granular on the line items of the permitting process?

Charlie, Lynda, et al – They are in the previous minutes. Thom can probably list those as an estimate pretty easily.

Ann – There's planning permit and then the building permit. There's stuff in there that is site preparation planning in between those two. I'm concerned that some of the rules might have changed over the years so I think working with Pivot is good.

Sandra – What's the backup plan if the County says no to our site location?

Charlie – I'm not sure what would cause them to say no on that property as it's out of the flood plain. I'd like to have an agenda item to reach agreement on what we want to take to the Board in our next meeting. Is it just to cost out the existing footprint agreed upon by the Board or confirm assumptions? Or to re-engage with Pivot on a much more focused project.

Jim, Charlie et al – email follow up is OK. Charlie will bring Thom up to speed. To be continued.

Meeting adjourned 7:30pm

Action Items

Jon – Review with LUMP committee the potential parking designation in Dug's Green for site plan. Ask LUMP for their feedback.

Sandra – Send out the spreadsheet she created for looking at different potential numbers

Next meeting will be March 20, at 6:00pm at the town office.

Draft Agenda Items for March 2017

1. Approval of February 2017 Minutes
2. Review document from KPFF and Pivot
3. Board motion
- 4.