



PROJECT TOTAL \$3,213,100.00

Site preparation would include removing the existing natural grass and prepping the site. Construction of the main field inside of the track's cost is based on the square footage. The construction number is less for the field hockey field because the size is less. Mr. McCoy continued that he would use the base material below for the 8 lane track, repave and resurface with new material for all lanes to avoid trying to tie in old with new. Site improvements would require ADA walkways with a retaining wall, drainage and reseeding. Mr. Ponziani questioned the need for ADA walkways if there were no bleachers there. Mr. McCoy said that you'd need them anyway for access to the fields from the parking lot. Mr. McCoy noted that drainage and site work for the fields were included in the field numbers. Mr. Donovan asked if we moved both bleachers to the same side could we save some money. Mr. McCoy said not necessarily as he was putting a cost per seat number to it \$250/seat for visitor, \$350/seat for home which includes the press box. Track and field events costs includes the drainage below, base, paving and the track surfacing. Field equipment would allow you to maintain the fields or you could enter into contracts with third parties which could be more costly, ranging from \$3,000 to 7 or \$8,000/year. Owing equipment would require 4 hours of maintenance of every 3-4 weeks using your own staff. The scoreboard is included with this cost item. Lighting for the main field was included and could be phased but did not include lighting for the field hockey field. Mr. McCoy concluded that the 15% contingency allowance was typical of this conceptual stage of the project. Total project cost of option A is \$3,213,100.00.

Option B is similar but would include all of the bleachers on the baseball side (1,000 total). The track would move closer to the street meaning the entire thing would have to be rebuilt because of shifting it. Drainage and buffers would also be considered. Pushing the track closer to the road could result in some issues with the Planning and Zoning Commission even though we'd be replacing an existing structure. Placing the bleachers and press box near the baseball field will result in foul balls hitting the structures periodically. Mr. Ponziani asked how long the process of going to the P & Z Commission would delay the process. Mr. McCoy guessed that it could take possibly 2-3 meetings or 2-3 months. Mr. McCoy presented the costs for option B:

1. Site Preparation	\$ 100,000.00
2. New All-Weather Main Multi-Use Turf Field	890,000.00
3. New All-Weather Secondary Turf Field (Field Hockey)	656,500.00
4. New 8-Lane Track	517,500.00
5. Site Improvements (walkways, retaining walls, and (drainage improvements)	75,000.00
6. Home Bleachers and Press box (1,000 seats)	300,000.00
7. Track Events (Long/Triple Jump,Pole Vault,High Jump)	100,000.00
8. All-Weather Turf Field Equipment and Scoreboard	70,000.00
9. Sports Field Lighting	250,000.00
10. Escalation, Contingency and Allowances, (15%)	<u>443,850.00</u>
PROJECT TOTAL	\$3,402,850.00

Mr. McCoy continued that the site preparation number is larger because of the larger area that will need to be demoed and moved. The two field numbers will remain the same. Site

improvements will increase as well because of the additional work needed. The location of the shot put will move. The bleacher and press box number is a little more because of a different construction type. Scoreboard and maintenance equipment would be the same. This option's cost would be \$3,402,850.00 with an approximate delta of \$200,000.00 between the two. The difference with the Thompson Road site is in adding infrastructure, parking, renovating the Butler building, include bathrooms, concessions and storage, and general earthwork.

#### V. COMMUNICATION FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Donovan reminded that the Athletic Director Greg Ferry had previously asked if there was any room for additional storage. Mr. McCoy suggested a popular storage/team room combination pre-fab building that could be used that would not impact neighbors or the setback and could be located in both options. Mr. Neagle asked if storage could be placed under the bleachers. Mr. McCoy said it'd be a more expensive option. Mr. Droppo asked the approximate price of the Thompson Road project. Mr. Donovan said between \$5 and \$6 million. Mr. McCoy said the Thompson Road design would add two full sized fields, additional parking, concourse/playground, bleachers, Butler building with concessions, bathrooms, storage and team rooms, lighting of the main field and a walking path. Mr. Droppo asked about the 65 yard soccer number. Mr. McCoy said that 55 was the minimum for federation rules but the larger number would accommodate all of your varsity, tournaments or CIC or CIAC games. Mr. Jadovich asked about javelin. Mr. McCoy said you would use a rubber tipped stick on the turf field and that it gives you a different feel and suggested rubber tipped use for both natural and turfed fields. He added that he preferred javelin outside of the track to avoid potential injury by athletes crossing the field and noted that it takes up a lot of room.

#### VI. COMMUNICATION FROM AUDIENCE MEMBERS

Flo Stahl – 2 Sunset Trail asked if there were two turf fields in the Thompson Road plan. Mr. Donovan noted there was one. Ms. Stahl continued that the high school plan reflected two turf fields which increases the price. Mr. Jadovich explained that he wanted the extra turf field added at the high school to lessen the transition and disadvantage made between practicing and playing on a natural to a turf field for the field hockey players. Mr. McCoy noted that you'd be gaining two fields at the Thompson Brook site. He continued that a turf field would give you additional playing hours vs. a grass one. Mr. Ponziani added that they wanted it priced because it could always be pulled out at a later date.

Joan Shumway – 34 Coventry Lane – noted that presently there were 6 lanes on the track and how would that change the plan to keep it like that and questioned the lighting and if that would reduce the cost or scope that much. Mr. McCoy said the number of lanes wouldn't affect it that much with cost or scope. Ms. Checko offered that wouldn't it be cost effective to add two as long as you were redoing it anyway. Mr. Donovan noted that the 8 lane would enable us to hold more events as well.

Kathleen Davenport – 92 Somerset Drive – questioned if the back field could be turfed in the future. Mr. McCoy said you'd have to turf the entire area as you just cannot transition safely from one field to the other and that it would curtail bleacher space if allowing any and that it'd be expensive.

Sarah Roberson – 24 Sudbury Way – questioned the low costs of option A with regard to the drainage number. She pointed to the south side of the track as being a much more extensive drainage issue than what is reflected in the site work. She suggested walking the property to see where it is caving in. She added the buffer costs for the homes should be looked at with regard to continuing the upkeep of the plantings similar to the plan offered by Valley Baptist Church. Mr. McCoy said the costs are buried in the site work and site improvement figures. He noted long term would be under an ongoing capital improvement item.

Bill Reboul – 23 Sudbury Way – asked if you could buffer both sides. Mr. McCoy said his part of the project would be to buffer what is adjacent to the project.

Ms. Roberson asked that buffering similar to that at Valley Baptist be considered by the Town. She continued that bathrooms and sanitation had to be looked at with the increased crowds. Ms. Checko corrected that it would be a BOE's operational concern and not on the Rec side. Ms. Roberson asked that Mr. McCoy cost out bathrooms as part of the project referring to years ago, before the single portalet, the visitors were using her yard as one. Mr. Ponziani said that it was a high school issue. Ms. Checko concurred that it was not a BSC issue. Ms. Roberson summarized that she can't see how you can look at this project and not at the sanitation issue. Ms. Roberson lamented that the scoreboard had just been replace for \$30,000 and doing the project would add another \$70,000 to that replacement figure. Mr. Ponziani urged that none of this had to be done that it would ultimately be up to the Town Council to decide. Mr. McCoy corrected that a large part of the scoreboard figure was for the field maintenance equipment. Ms. Roberson urged that the committee consider the long-term strategic plan of the Thompson Road site as it adds to the community at large which is growing. She added that she like the second field but that it's short sighted.

Dan Neagle – 529 West Avon Road – felt that \$55,000 is not enough for the drainage site improvements and that it's a low area and floods out. Mr. Ponziani asked Mr. McCoy describe the scope of his drainage figure. Mr. McCoy said it was to handle surface drainage in a certain area and not the pipe and swale and erosion items and that this was an ongoing problem on the property for the BOE. Mr. Neagle said you need to bring this up when the project is presented and added that it could be a big can of worms. Ms. Checko suggested talking to the Town Engineer and BOE and let the Town Council decide if it should be a town project or part of this one. Mr. Ponziani restated that the subcommittee was given two tasks: 1 – find the best athletic facility at the Thompson Road site and now 2 – at the high school and to make the best recommendation for each. Mr. Reboul asked who'd pick up the ongoing operating and maintenance costs. Ms. Checko suggested the BOE even though they do share their services.

Nicole Herbst – 110 Thompson Road – asked if this plan would need a referendum also. Mr. Ponziani reiterated that it'd be up to the Town Council. Ms. Stahl noted that it would definitely need a referendum. Ms. Stahl continued that maintenance would be built into the operating budgets and there were always ongoing maintenance no matter what we do.

Dan Neagle – 529 West Avon Road – asked if they looked at drainage on the field hockey field. Mr. McCoy said that field was looked at similarly to the other one.

Kathleen Davenport – 92 Somerset Drive – asked that wouldn't it be prudent to fix the drainage issue now.

Sarah Roberson – 24 Sudbury Way – wanted to clarify that the subcommittee was voting for A or B and that it didn't address sanitation or traffic. Mr. Ponziani said they were tasked to make a recommendation to the Town Council what they believed is the best use for the property. Ms. Roberson continued that the bigger issues would be addressed by the Town Council or other town agencies. Ms. Checko referred to the statement of needs, which the subcommittee is addressing, and was put together by the former Director Glenn Marston and the Board.

Flo Stahl – 2 Sunset Trail – reminded that sanitation was costed out at the Thompson Road project but not traffic. Mr. McCoy noted that bathrooms were not tasked as part of the high school.

Mr. Ponziani asked for a vote to recommend Concept A to the Town Council.

**VOTE:** Mr. Donovan voted to recommend Concept A to the Town Council, to which Mr. Droppo, Mr. Jadovich and Mr. Ponziani concurred unanimously.

Mr. Donovan asked if any changes needed to be made to the cost estimate. Mr. Ponziani said no. Ms. Checko relayed that they spoke to Planning and Zoning and felt confident that when they fine-tuned the details, the buffer screening level will be met. She continued that the drainage will be discussed with the Town Engineer and Town Council as an ongoing issue, that there may be concurrent things to be done. Mr. Ponziani agreed that they were both legitimate issues that need to be addressed.

Nicole Herbst – 110 Thompson Road – asked if the continued maintenance would be given to the buffering on the Thompson Road project.

Ms. Checko noted that the next step would be to present this to Town Council when they meet on May 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. McCoy felt that he would be prepared. Ms. Checko asked if all of the members could be present for that meeting.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

**VOTE:** Mr. Donovan motioned, Mr. Jadovich seconded and all agreed to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 PM.

---

Peter Ponziani, *Chairman*

---

Susan Gatcomb, *Clerk*