

GROTON SENIOR CENTER – Building Committee Meeting			MEETING MINUTES
Town Hall, Town Manager’s Office		APPROVED 11/20/17	
November 13, 2017 – 7:30AM			
ATTENDEES:			
Name	Present	Role	
John Amaral	Y	Building Committee	jamaral@omniproperties.com
Ed Cataldo	---	Building Inspector	ecataldo@townofgroton.org
Michelle Collette	Y	Building Committee	mcollette@townofgroton.org
Peter Cunningham	Y	Building Committee Chair	brecca@charter.net
George Faircloth	Y	Building Committee	fairgeorge@verizon.net
Gary Green	Y	Building Committee	ggreen@freetobegreen.com
Mark Haddad	---	Town of Groton, Town Manager	mhaddad@townofgroton.org
Annika Nilson-Ripps	Y	Building Committee	annikanr@gmail.com
Kathy Shelp	Y	Senior Center Director	kshelp@townofgroton.org
Melissa Gagnon	Y	NV5, Owner’s Project Manager	melissa.gagnon@nv5.com
Steve Moore	---	NV5, Owner’s Project Manager	steve.moore@nv5.com
Italo Visco	Y	NV5, Owner’s Project Manager	italo.visco@nv5.com
Gregg Yanchenko	Y	Helene Karl Architects, Architect	hka2@npv.com

Peter Cunningham called the Building Committee meeting to order at 7:35AM.

1. Approve Meeting Minutes

George F moved to approve the 11/02/17 meeting minutes; Michelle C seconded the motion, per the following two (2) amendments:

- a) George F noted that on Page 3, 4th bullet item, “with the \$4M budget” should be corrected to “within a range of \$4M to \$4.5M budget.”
- b) Peter C noted that on page 4, 2nd bullet item, last paragraph, “with is the 9th addition” should be corrected to “which is the 9th addition.”

The vote was unanimous with (7) in favor, (0) opposed and (0) abstentions.

2. Design Evaluation

- Site Selection - Peter C distributed an email with a ruling from Town Counsel, dated 11/13/17, with regard to use of the adjacent site at 159 West Main Street in Groton. Per this ruling, it appears the subject property is not usable for the new Senior Center. Without approval by the State legislature, Gregg Y believes that the team should focus on the current site and live within the existing constraints, whereas the goal is for the project to go out to bid in March.
- Parking - The anticipated building capacity is 160 people. The current design has 59 parking spaces, at 10'x20' each. Kathy S and Michelle C expressed concern with the limited number of parking spaces and believe that more than the requisite number of parking spaces is needed. Kathy S noted that once a week, at least 70 parking spaces will be needed and in that instance, overflow parking will be needed. It was noted that the Senior Center is a polling station; the use of the facility needs to be considered and managing parking on the side of the road with delineated spaces may need to happen. Peter C noted that subject to Nashoba approval, leach fields can be located beneath parking lots. Gregg Y noted that if the leach fields are able to be used for overflow parking, geo-grid and grass could be installed which would look nice and would not be muddy. Two-way travel in the parking lot is recommended, in lieu of a loop pattern and a drop off area/lane, separate from circulation, is important.

Annika NR expressed concern that there may be too much parking in front of the building and the perception may be that the site is being developed as a parking lot. John A noted that bylaws will need to be checked, although islands in the parking lot may be required, which would reduce the number of spaces. Gregg Y agreed that approach is critical and there is a plan for trees in the parking lot.

- Site Access – Gregg Y noted the paved access road is 18'-0" wide. The survey will need to be checked for the right of way. NV5 inquired whether secondary access and 360 access would be needed. John A noted that the Town may not require full circulation around the building. Michelle C recommended that Gregg Y talk with the Fire Chief re: requirements which may affect building orientation.
- Overall Building Size - There was discussion about appropriate size for the new building. Concern was expressed that the Townspeople were told the new facility would be between 9,000SF and 11,000SF and the current design is at 12,000SF. It was noted the target will be to design the building to be as efficient as possible, as close to 11,000SF, with fitting all required program. NV5 reiterated that there will be three (3) cost estimates performed along with opportunities for value engineering.
- Two-Story Option - If the building is two stories, in lieu of one story, the footprint would be smaller, which would offer more flexibility with the site. If two stories, the building will require an elevator which could cost \$150K, plus additional maintenance costs. Also, there would be additional building costs for elevator space plus two (2) means of egress (staircases). Gregg Y noted that in the event the elevator is down, the facility could lose short term program function.
- Building Orientation – The feasibility to reorient the building was discussed so the back of the building can be seen from the road and recreational land can be accessed from the fitness room.

Gregg Y reported that multiple studies have been done that looked at alternate orientations. Annika NR asked for the committee to see prior studies. Gregg Y will forward.

It was noted that siting the building closer to the access road has an inherent disadvantage - if there is any type of accident, access to the building will be blocked. In addition, the building is currently oriented to face due south, maximizing solar orientation which is an advantage for snow/ice melt at the main entrance. If the building is turned, the front of the building would face due north, which would not optimize natural solar lighting. There was a consensus among the Committee that maximizing natural light and making the building as energy efficient as possible is a high priority. The main spaces should have increased natural daylighting which would cut down on energy use. The front side of the building should not be shaded.

Visibility of service area/dumpster will need to be considered when siting the building. Gregg Y noted the current building orientation hides the service area from public view.

- Cost of New Building vs Add/Reno - Gregg Y noted that the cost of a new building would be approximately \$400K to \$500K more than an addition/renovation. If the building is two stories, there would be an additional cost of \$200K for elevator and stairs.

Although a formal vote is tabled until the next meeting, Michelle C noted that the architect should move forward with designing a new building. Annika NR also noted that the design should move towards new construction.

- Options Analysis Matrix - As a discussion point, NV5 prepared and distributed a draft of the matrix with rough criteria and rankings. Melissa G will forward the Options Analysis Matrix to the Building Committee for feedback prior to the next meeting. The intent of the matrix is to help guide the Committee in the decision-making process.
- Architect Contract – Peter will follow up with regard to the status of the Architect’s contract.

3. Next Meeting

The next Building Committee meeting is on Monday, November 20, at 7:30AM.

John A proposed a sub-committee meet this week, prior to the 11/20/17 Committee meeting, to work through issues raised today – specifically program, cost and accessibility. A meeting was scheduled for this Wednesday, 11/15/17, afternoon at 3:00PM. The goal for the 11/20/17 meeting will be to have 100% agreement on new construction vs add/reno and the building location.

4. Meeting Adjourn

Motion: At 9:00AM, George F made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by John A. The vote was unanimous with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,



Melissa Gagnon, NV5

[End of 11/13/17 Meeting Minutes]