

West Boylston Parks Facilities Committee (PFC) Meeting Minutes – January 29, 2015

PFC attendees: Patrick Crowley, Robert Dunne, Gary Flynn, John Hadley, Patrick Inderwish, John Owanisian, Christopher Rucho,

Other attendees: Anthony Drappi, Christine Drappi

- Chairman Inderwish opened the meeting at 7:00PM.

Motion: A motion by Mr. Rucho and seconded by Mr. Hadley to approve PFC minutes of January 13, 2015 was approved.

- Discussion ensued concerning the Goodale Park funding provision contained in an environmental bond bill:
 - Agreed to continue encouraging letter writing campaign to key decision makers through use of Town Administrator's Blog, Goodale Park user contact list from previous meetings, and local cable access channel.
 - Matthew Beaton (Mass. Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs) and Lt. Governor Karyn Polito identified as key contacts.
 - Suggested incorporating drawing of approved plan into letter writing campaign.
 - Messrs. Hadley and Rucho agreed that a letter from West Boylston Board of Selectmen would be sent at appropriate time to bond bill decision makers.
 - Discussed the possibility of inviting Secretary Beaton to a future PFC meeting, however this would need to be discussed with Representative O'Day
 - Agreed to follow-up with Rep. O'Day regarding status of bond bill and determine next steps.
- Discussion turned to next steps in terms of information expected from BETA Engineering:
 - Assorted questions for BETA:
 - What rule of thumb was used for calculating number of parking spaces?
 - Status of survey completion (we will need a digital copy and two hardcopies).
 - Geoprobe and test pit schedule.
 - Streetlight and potential road widening considerations.
 - Executive summary should contain funding sources that include local, state, federal and various grant sources.
 - When can we expect to see construction cost estimates?
 - We will need to ensure completion of tasks as defined in RFP scope of work.
- Mr. Inderwish then solicited comments from committee members concerning their views of Goodale "Concept Plan 3" and "Concept Plan 5 – edit":
 - Mr. Owanisian: Plan 5 favored open space, but compromised HS and LL baseball field dimensions. Plan 3 better served active recreation, but it was unclear how passive recreation features such as walking trails could be integrated.
 - Mr. Rucho: Plan 5 somewhat compressed field dimensions. Plan 3 would be easier to develop (vs. plan 5) if using a phased approach.
 - Mr. Crowley: "If we do it, let's do it right", expressing preference for Plan 3. Indicated that WB Parks and Recreation Director had asked if a 2nd story could be added to pool design and/or if a storage/meeting room could be created for the recreation department.
 - Mr. Dunne: Expressed concern regarding number of retaining walls plan 3 would require, suggesting "massive terracing" would be necessary. Unsure if access could be obtained to HS access road. Plan 3 includes expansive outfield dimensions that the HS coach is not requesting. Questioned need for nine lane

track in plan 3. Disappointed with BETA's representation of plan 5, indicating this could have been more fully developed. Suggested LL outfield dimensions could be improved by pushing A field home plate closer to street and B field home plate up into sloped area. Suggested that plan 3 build out would be considerably more costly than plan 5.

- Mr. Flynn: Indicated that both plan 3 and plan 5 were maintenance intensive that may require additional resources for on-going maintenance.
 - Mr. Hadley: Likes the LL fields in their current location. Indicated the track and multi-purpose field should be relocated to pine grove. Expressed preference for plan 3.
 - Mr. Inderwish: Talked about the possibility of creating retention basins. Plan 3 has passive recreation possibilities that could be further developed. Expressed runoff concerns with sloped area as depicted in plan 5. Suggested that the number of parking spaces in both plans may be excessive. Handicap accessibility is a must and the hill in location of current grandstand is a significant safety issue. The HS Baseball straight-away center field dimension in plan 3 could be reduced to create additional passive recreation space.
- Mr. Dunne suggested BETA should be requested to update plan 5 (including relocating home plate of LL fields) before a vote was taken by the PFC approving either plan 3 or plan 5 – there did not appear to be consensus that an update to plan 5 would alter overall preference of the plans.

Motion: A motion by Mr. Crowley and seconded by Mr. Rucho to approve Concept Plan 3 as proposed was approved (Mr. Dunne voted no, all other members approved).

- Discussion turned to what could be expected to be presented at the May 2015 Town Meeting, with indication that at this point it was only realistic to present the high level conceptual plan and a summary of the process/meetings leading up to selection of plan 3.
- Mr. Dunne questioned whether the approved plan required review or approval from the public or other town boards before it is presented at town meeting. Consensus from the committee indicated further input from other town committees or the general public was not necessary and that a town vote was not required, since money is not being requested from the town.
- Agreed to following date/time for next PFC meeting with meeting to include BETA Engineering representatives: Thursday, February 19 at 7PM.
- **Special note:** “Concept Plan 3” and “Concept Plan 5 – edit” will be posted with the approved minutes as separate attachments.
- There being no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn the meeting was approved at 9:01PM.