

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Juliani Room, Wellesley Town Hall
Wednesday, October 31, 2018, 7:00 p.m.**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Jane Andrews, Rose Mary Donahue, Bob Furlong, Mary Gard, Jeff Levitan, Bill Maynard, Paul Merry, Dave Murphy, Betsy Roberti, Mary Scanlon, Tom Skelly, and Andrea Ward.

Tom Skelly called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

7:00 p.m. Citizen Speak

Charlene Smith of Park Avenue asked why the Advisory Committee minutes are not posted on the website, stating that the “download” option produces only the agenda. The functionality of the website will be confirmed. (*Note: To access minutes on the Town website, click the check mark icon under the “Minutes” column next to the desired meeting date.*)

7:03 p.m. Playing Fields Task Force: Update

Michael D’Ortenzio, Jr., Chair, Playing Fields Task Force (PFTF), and member, School Committee (SC), presented.

PFTF Composition

- Composed of representatives from five sponsoring boards (Natural Resource Commission (NRC), SC, Board of Selectman (BOS), Board of Public Works (BPW), Recreation Commission) as well as user groups representing adult and youth sports leagues
 - Current user groups include soccer, baseball/softball, lacrosse and hockey, among others
 - PFTF is considering expanding the group to capture other users (e.g., tennis)
- PFTF established in 1997 to set common Town-wide practices for use of all playing fields
- In 2004, Recreation took over staffing and sponsorship of PFTF

There was a question as to where PFTF derives its statutory authority: Not part of Town by-laws; creation of the five sponsoring boards.

PFTF Activities

Administer

- Set and collect fees for the organized use of the Town’s fields
- Issue permits to groups to use the fields

Advocate

- Develop and maintain master plan on behalf of sponsoring boards
- Recommend and help oversee field improvement projects.
 - Recent examples include the High School track and field project (including bathrooms/team rooms) and involvement with 900 Worcester Street project

Listen

- Serve as a forum where residents can raise concerns and offer suggestions, and these become conversations with the sponsoring boards

Recreation Department serves as staff for the PFTF; Department of Public Works (DPW) is a key partner with PFTF

Use of Fees Collected

- A few hundred thousand dollars in fees are collected annually, based on the type of use as well as the type of field
- Fees go into one or both revolving funds authorized by Town Meeting (Town Bylaw Article 55)
 - DPW Field Use Fund responsible for general field maintenance
 - Usually what is collected annually is spent annually for maintenance
 - Turf Replacement Fund
 - Currently approximately \$500,000 balance; expected to be zeroed out next summer to replace turf at Sprague
 - Existing funds expected to cover one-half the cost of turf replacement
 - PFTF will ask Annual Town Meeting (ATM) for balance of funds
 - Life of turf is about 10-15 years depending on the usage
 - Sprague turf is at about the 8-year mark
 - Heavy usage and weather have led to need for replacement

A question was asked about the material of the turf: Similar to AstroTurf; because the fields are so close to a school, the type of turf is more playground quality; gets heavy use and rain, but PFTF generally happy with performance.

A question was asked how Wellesley's field use fees compare to those of neighboring towns, particularly for outside groups (not youth sports): Wellesley's are believed to be higher because we charge in increments of 1.5 hours.

- One of challenges is compliance with paying fees
 - Users are supposed to pull a permit to use the field but often the fields are being used without approval
 - PFTF would like to make sure Town is collecting fees, particularly from entities that are operating a business (e.g., lessons/workouts) on the field
 - PFTF does not have someone (e.g., a "ranger") with the authority to go out and confront groups using the fields without permits

A question was asked whether, since there are no fences, equipment could be locked up and authorized users given a unique code: DPW has increased number of storage cubes and, after use, the equipment is to be locked, but it is currently a lock with a single key; unauthorized groups bring in their own equipment; ultimately, need someone with authorization to remind groups to pull permits and pay for field usage.

A comment was made that there is similarity to traffic enforcement and that perhaps PFTF could consider talking to the police to expand role of traffic enforcement officers to monitor the use of the fields and permits, as this unauthorized use results in a loss of revenue for the Town.

There was a question as to whether the field funds carry over balances from year to year: Funds are carried over in the Turf Replacement Fund until time to replace turf (as is expected to occur next year); certain amounts kept in the Field Use Fund for specific projects (e.g., netting at Sprague field).

FY 19 Projects

- Revise governing documents, both the PFTF Charter and the Playing Fields Policy
 - PFTF would like to clean up the documents and bring in new user groups

- Would also like to seek a small appropriation (\$3,000-5,000) from ATM to compensate Recreation for the work they do on behalf of the PFTF (signage, postage, etc.)

A question was asked whether the revisions to the Charter and Playing Fields Policy would need ATM approval: No ATM action required for revisions; the five responsible boards would approve the changes.

- Settle on path forward for bathrooms at Hunnewell Field: Bids came back and were far over the appropriation. A solution was developed to use mobile bathrooms with high quality interior finishes; outside would be “dressed up” to look more like a permanent building; wouldn’t sit on trailer; examples are currently installed at the aqueduct; request for public feedback sent out via Town website.
 - Need to determine whether this is something we need to bring back to ATM for approval as a material project change; want to obtain feedback from public first to see if this solution is acceptable before we to return to ATM; otherwise might just walk away, re-assess project, and get on Town capital plan for long-term investment in brick and mortar building

There was a question seeking clarification that these are the bathrooms at Hunnewell Field, not the High School field: Yes, but if these mobile bathrooms work out, then perhaps we could use them at the High School football field, as well.

There was an additional question whether similar mobile bathrooms could replace the port-a-johns at Sprague Fields, which have very high usage: Ultimately port-a-johns are inexpensive and the easiest solution; the problem with the original brick and mortar proposal has been cost escalation; estimate came in at \$1.5 million; extrapolating that cost for all fields creates a financial challenge for the Town; that led to trailer solution, which is much more feasible and, if it works, could be expanded to other fields.

There was a question about the numbers for the trailer option: Fits within DPW appropriation, which was around \$300,000 for six fixtures.

A question was asked whether composting toilets had been considered: Budgetary challenges when looking at anything beyond the typical toilet option.

- Acquire team rooms for the Track and Field: This component also came in over expectations. PFTF plans to reissue the RFP and loosen up some of the restrictions with the hope of bringing the cost down to more manageable levels; if unable to do so, may need to put this on the Town’s capital plan for a long-term project, as well
- Install lacrosse wall at Sprague Field: Weston has one; PFTF needs to get a sense of the right size, whether they are loud, and the impact to the neighborhood; this would be funded privately by lacrosse groups, as well as with field fund leftovers; PFTF working with DPW

A question was asked as to where the line is drawn between SC and PFTF regarding control of these projects: Determined on a project by project basis; PFTF is not in charge of making final decisions—the sponsoring Board makes the decision and funds are transferred to DPW for construction.

A question was asked as to the structure of the PFTF, as it seems that the representatives of the sports organizations/user groups outnumber (and may have more control than) the elected Town board members who serve on the task force: PFTF has no teeth without approval of sponsoring boards to whom the PFTF reports; the bulk of the fees are paid by the user groups, so vision of PFTF was to get everyone on the same page talking together within a common framework; everyone has a seat and voice at the table, but everything done in concert with sponsoring boards.

There was a brief discussion of the history of the PFTF, its structure and checks and balances. PFTF has no authority to spend money without the approval of the elected officials.

A question was asked whether PFTF has oversight of indoor recreation space in town: PFTF's primary focus is on fields and outdoor recreation; group has debated whether it should expand to "playing facilities"; however, there is much more involved in managing indoor space.

A follow-up question was asked why the local hockey association is one of the current user groups: Initially when PFTF was formed, there was discussion that fields and outdoor basketball courts could be used for outdoor rinks in the winter; PFTF was also involved in discussions on 900 Worcester Street use, which does include hockey rinks.

- Finish design of Hunnewell Field softball improvements and receive construction funding from ATM: PFTF will be returning to Advisory to seek those funds

There was a question whether there are still plans to renovate Lee field, as well as Hunnewell Field: Yes; intent is to renovate both; analysis of whether fields are currently in the correct location; once the best location is determined, then will talk about the design and orientation of the fields; Lee Field is to the left of the tennis courts and Hunnewell Field is to the right of the tennis courts.

7:50 p.m. Permanent Building Committee re: Town Hall Exterior Project

David Grissino, Member, Permanent Building Committee (PBC) and Steve Gagosian, Design and Construction Manager, Facilities Management Department (FMD), presented.

During Town Hall exterior project, "latent" conditions have been uncovered that were not anticipated; need to proceed carefully financially.

Discovered Latent Conditions

- Extensive deep mortar deterioration – testing 8" deep and finding dried up mortar
- Structural damage (rotting) to all low roofs
 - Some of the wood is improperly supported
 - Roofs are bearing on the ceiling and not connected structurally
- Concealed asbestos containing caulking found under replacement caulking
 - Initial test of the caulking was of the top level (more recent caulking)
- Steel reinforcing damage at chimneys
- Lintel damage at West Portico

Questions were asked whether these conditions should have been discovered in advance and, since Town paid money to have initial testing and assessments done, there is any warranty/bond/assurance to cover the failure to identify these conditions: It depends on how far the testing goes before starting a project; deep mortar was hard to discover until the work was started, and it only occurs in certain places and not all the windows; a certain amount of advance investigation is needed, but some conditions are deeply hidden and it would be very costly to do destructive work (e.g., on masonry) to identify them; however, conditions are more pervasive than hoped.

A question was asked if the funds sought here are being requested from Advisory or ATM: These are unused funds that are still in the design budget; article at ATM will request to transfer funds from the design bucket to construction bucket.

Additional costs – Phase 1

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Masonry | \$134,000 |
| Structural Roof Repairs | \$ 52,000 |
| Asbestos Abatement | \$168,000 |
| Extended General Conditions (2 months) | \$123,100 |
| OPM (1 month) | \$ 8,000 |
| Clerk (1 month) | \$ 6,500 |
| Architect (1 month) | \$ 13,000 |
| Additional Haz. Mat. Monitoring | \$ 10,000 |
| FMD Support | \$ 5,000 |
| Total Additional Costs Phase 1 | \$519,600 |

With respect to the extension of general conditions, the contractor will need to be on site longer and there are additional costs.

PBC has applied what is known from Phase 1 to Phase 2 to develop additional projected/anticipated costs.

Additional Projected Costs – Phase 2

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Masonry | \$ 93,000 |
| Abatement (Great Hall Windows) | \$ 16,500 |
| West Portico Lintel Reinforcing | \$ 30,000 |
| Extended General Conditions (2 months) | \$123,100 |
| OPM (2 months) | \$ 16,000 |
| Clerk (2 months) | \$ 13,000 |
| Architect CA (2 months) | \$ 26,000 |
| Total Additional Projected Costs Phase 2 | \$317,600 |

Contingency Analysis

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Additional Costs (Phase 1) | \$519,600 |
| Additional Projected Costs (Phase 2) | \$317,600 |
| Total Costs | \$837,200 |
| Original Contingency | \$883,146 |
| Available Reserve Given Revised Costs | \$ 45,946 |

PBC is requesting moving available funds from the design budget (\$331,999) to replenish the construction fund.

The project contained a significant contingency budget, which was good planning; however, will use almost all of that; PBC concerned about leaving reserve low, so would like to use the excess design funds (\$331,999) to replenish the contingency.

A comment was made that PBC should be prepared for questions at ATM about why these conditions weren't discovered during testing before the renovation began.

A question was asked as to the date of the last renovations: There were renovations in the 1980s and 1990s; the mix of mortar used during those renovations was too hard and wouldn't allow the building to breathe, so moisture has been trapped behind those areas for the last 20 years.

A suggestion was made that the ATM presentation include a photo of what mortar is supposed to look like compared to the deteriorated mortar.

A comment was made that, in the original write-up for this project, historical information was included and that perhaps it would be helpful to provide evidence of old repairs prior to FMD and the type of project management provided in those days because it is very different from today's oversight. At the time, the assumption was that we were doing the right thing and the best job. The consultants on this project are renowned for their work in historical buildings; however, to reveal all conditions prior to renovation would have required extensive destructive work. Many conditions were not expected. For example, when peeling back the cooper on the roof, the new sheathing had been installed over rotted areas of the roof. During testing some soft spots of mortar were discovered, so deep pointing was provided for in some areas; however, more areas were found during the renovations. The problems start at the gables and work down.

A question was asked whether the problem of the pulverized mortar is common in buildings this age or unique to Town Hall: It has been found in other buildings of this era; it is a little worse at Town Hall due to a combination of neglect and, when addressed, it was not addressed correctly; current contractor has a very specific and time-consuming operation to make sure mortar is at the right temperature to set and bond; the contractor has done work in upstate New York on historical buildings and wants to come east for more projects, so they are motivated to complete this project correctly.

A question was asked whether, given the number of surprises discovered in the building, it is safe for use during the renovations: Structural engineer reviews conditions and works in concert with the architect; asbestos is being removed in a controlled manner; contractors are being careful since Town Hall is a highly used building and will stay open throughout the process; finding and fixing problems so they won't be an issue for continued use of the building; safety is first priority.

A question was asked whether people knew in the 1980s that mortar needed to breathe: Wouldn't say it was common knowledge, but would have been known; this team and contractor are being very diligent; we have found some sins of the past (whether people not understanding or choosing not to execute it the way it should have been); this is a 100-year project for this building; recognize that we are stewards of this very important building

A question was asked about the other Town Hall projects in the pipeline, such as capacity and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, and whether we will be re-doing work during these projects that is currently being done: With one exception (possible replacement of a window with a door), the current renovation work on the envelope is distinct; future projects will address comfort and access concerns throughout the building.

A question was asked about the original design appropriation and whether it is common for one-third of that budget to be left over, and what ordinarily would be done with those funds: Original line items, such as the design contingency, were not touched in the design budget; also did not spend as much on the contractor as originally anticipated.

A comment was made that every year at ATM when a project is completed, there is an article that transfers funds to other Town projects.

A comment was made that many times Advisory questions high contingencies in a project; this time the contingency prevented us from going back to ATM to ask for additional appropriation.

A question was asked about how long mortar should last if done correctly: Can find that out from the architect; this work will endure.

A comment was made that perhaps the Town Hall needs to go on the capital plan.

PBC will need to come back to Advisory with the actual language for the warrant article.

8:24 p.m. Minutes Approval

Andrea Ward made and Betsy Roberti seconded a motion to approve the October 10, 2018 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

8:25 p.m. Liaison Reports/Administrative Matters

Schools/ Jane Andrews

- MSBA board met today; Wellesley formally invited into Module 2 (team formation) for Hardy/Upham project
 - Project team formation to be completed by May 2019
 - Town chooses OPM
 - MSBA selects designer, but Town will work with MSBA on this selection
- Hunnewell project update: Village Church has offered its education space as possible swing space and this is being investigated
 - Several options will be presented in January and will include swing space options
- Schools will be coming to Advisory on November 28 with a general review of the past year and some adjustments needed to last year's (FY19) budget
- In December, Schools will develop their FY20 budget, will be reviewed in January and voted by SC the first week of February; Schools will return to Advisory in February to present budget
 - During the 3rd week of December, Advisory Schools sub-committee will participate in detailed budget discussions with SC
- New Assistant Superintendent of Finance and Operations, Cynthia Mahr, implementing new budgetary accounting program that highlights more information about personnel costs
- Two additional items regarding prior years' budgets:
 - FY17 turnback of approximately \$557,000 in encumbrances
 - FY18 reversion/turnback (approximately \$900,000)
 - Many unfilled teaching assistant positions for in-district Special Education (SPED); Dr. Lussier expressed need for more position control
 - Expenses: Transportation expenses have increased significantly for both the regular bus contract and Special Education (SPED) transportation; also some high residential placement tuitions
 - Question how much should be carried forward in encumbrances and how much funding should be put aside for SPED contingencies as opposed to budgeting less conservatively

- Adjusting the FY19 budget
 - SPED circuit breaker FY19 reimbursement based on FY18 claim rate; FY18 claim rate significantly less than anticipated (\$6m vs. \$7m), so reimbursement down by about \$450,000
 - SC has decided to reduce some of the set asides for SPED and will bear the risk of the unknown in the budget; will look to supplemental funding if needed

There was a brief discussion of SPED financing and preparation of the school budget.

A question was asked as to how Wellesley's circuit breaker claim rate compares to other towns and whether we are a magnet district for SPED services: Advisory members were encouraged to bring these and other SPED/Schools questions to the November 28, 2018 meeting, at which SC will present a general overview.

- SC gave formal written guidance to the Superintendent for the FY20 budget; language was added seeking to insulate the general education budget from the potential variability of the SPED budget
- Enrollment: Increase of 56 students beyond projections for this year (though still an actual decline of 45 from the prior year); expecting some enrollment decline next year

COA/Bob Furlong

- FY20 budget will include requests for an additional small vehicle, kitchen items and AV work
- COA always looking for more engagement from the community

There was a brief discussion about the use of FMD staff as Owner's Project Managers (OPMs) on Town projects—e.g., the financial benefits thereof and existing constraints on departmental bandwidth/availability.

There was a brief update that the Delanson Circle 40B project had been scaled back in terms of units and parking spaces.

Next week (11/7): Representatives from John Hancock (as well as Planning Board and Department) re: Wellesley Office Park project and 40R overlay district; also, overview from Town Information Technology Department.

9:00 p.m. Adjourn

Jeff Levitan made and Jane Andrews seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Items Reviewed During the Meeting

- *Playing Fields Task Force Update to Advisory Committee*, Power Point Presentation, October 31, 2018
- Town of Wellesley Playing Fields Policy (October 29, 2018 Draft)
- Playing Fields Task Force Charter (October 29, 2018 Draft)
- *Town Hall Envelope Project, PBC Presentation to Advisory Committee*, October 31, 2018