

APR 7 10 58 AM '14

**UNDERWOOD POOL PROJECT**  
Belmont, Massachusetts

**BELMONT UNDERWOOD POOL BUILDING COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**

February 26, 2014

Chenery Middle School, Belmont – Community Room

**Attending:**

**Warrant Committee Members** – Not introduced

**Underwood Pool Building Committee (UPBC)** – Anne Paulsen (Chair), Ellen Schreiber, Adam Dash (Vice-Chair and Warrant Committee)

**Also in attendance** – Peter Castanino (Director of DPW), Gerald Boyle (Director Public Works), Tom Scarlata (BH+A), Deborah Marai (PCI)

**Call to Order:** See item 2. below.

1. **Warrant Committee Meeting was called to order**
2. **Introduction to Underwood Pool project**
  - Anne introduced herself and UPBC member Ellen Schreiber, UPBC Vice-Chair and Warrant Committee member Adam Dash, UPBC Town liaisons Peter Castanino and Gerry Boyle, designer Tom Scarlata and OPM Deborah Marai.
  - Anne Paulsen reported that the meeting has been posted as joint UPBC and Planning Board meeting, however there is no UPBC quorum.
  - Anne Paulsen said Adam Dash will present the Underwood Pool project.
3. **Presentation of the Underwood Pool Project**
  - Background
    - Board of Selectmen voted in favor of Feasibility Study option 1 to keep the pool in its current location
    - Town meeting voted funds for Schematic Design and creation of the Underwood Pool Building Committee
    - Through public process, UPBC hired Pinck & Co. as Owner Project Manager
    - Through public process, UPBC hired BH+A as the designer; BH+A was also the designer for the Feasibility Study.
    - There have been 3 public input meetings which have helped to inform the design; much of the input pointed to a multi-generational pool
    - After a lot of work, now have Schematic Design
    - Pool received one-year waiver to open last year, it is unknown if a waiver would be granted again. If the current pool is not replaced to correct the health, safety and accessibility code violations, it might be lost.
  - Documents previously circulated by the UPBC to the Warrant Committee include Schematic Design presentation and comments from meetings with the Historic Commission and Conservation Commission agent. New documents circulated tonight include Underwood Pool attendance numbers, membership sales from 2004 through last year and fiscal year 2011 through 2013 expenses.
  - Schematic Design
    - A. Site plan showing existing conditions and constraints
    - B. Proposed overview of Underwood site:
      - Replace the pool in its current location

- Address areas outside of the pool area (this scope was part of design process including public input, was not part of Feasibility Study)
  - ❖ Weed out the tree line on Cottage Street of dead/dying trees and enhance with new; fill in tree line on Concord Avenue
  - ❖ Proposed path on the park side of Cottage Street so people could park up at the Wellington School; when pool is in maximum usage, there is surplus parking up there and easily/safely get to the pool
  - ❖ Keep existing small parking lot on Cottage Street but make safer with curbs and prevent cars from going up Cottage Street the wrong way to enter
  - ❖ Proposed drop off area on Concord Avenue
  - ❖ Have been told not to touch skating area
  - ❖ Proposing to cover top of culvert (used as existing path) to create more lawn area inside the pool
- C. Project Goals:
  - Replace a failing pool and non-code compliant bathhouse
  - Create a multi-generational pool
  - Code compliant, pleasant restrooms and staff facilities
  - Respect and preserve historic value of site
  - Improve park access
  - Improve circulation & safety
  - Enhance connections to surrounding community
  - Outdoor amenities to encourage community participation
- D. Close up of proposed Underwood Pool site:
  - New fencing
  - 2 pools
  - 2 bath houses, east and west; east bathhouse is access/control point
  - Expanded lawn area
  - Adam Dash acknowledged some neighbors have expressed concern with the design, but noted that there are many constraints to consider on the existing site – avoiding further disruption of wetlands setbacks, not putting the pump house near the wetlands areas, not building on the culvert, not touching depressed skating area, keeping the vista from Concord Avenue up the hill open, avoiding the expense of building into the hill.
- E. Pools
  - There are issues at the existing pool with high ground water levels and pressure. The proposed plan raises the level of the site to assist with accessibility issues and also allows the bottom of the pool to be at a higher elevation.
  - The one pool vs. two pool option is something the Committee put a lot of thought into. It was decided to go with the redundancy of two pools, which would best prevent the entire pool from being shut down if an incident were to occur. Two pools require two pumps, the expense is more than one pump but not double.
  - The proposed pool area is smaller than the existing pool, but is more usable and is right-sized for the site and population. These are fairly simple pools.
  - Shallower Pool: The pool closer to the east bathhouse has a zero depth entry which gradually gets deeper, an area that is good for shallower play or teaching new swimmers, a slide, spray jets and a sitting area in the center. This pool is curved, reminiscent of the existing pool.

- Deeper Pool: The pool closer to the west bathhouse has a large area with flexibility for use as lap lanes, play, paddle or lessons, a separate shallower play, and a separate compliant diving area.

#### F. Bath Houses

- Current bath house is not code compliant; insufficient toilets and showers, not handicap accessible.
- Broke up massing of building requirements into smaller, residential scale buildings.
- West Bath House: There are wetlands and the Wellington Brook to the west; part of existing pool, patio and bath house are in wetlands buffer. Conservation Commission advised that constructing a new bath house within the footprint of the existing maintains the existing conditions; therefore, West bath house is located approximately in footprint of existing bath house. West bathhouse contains toilets, showers and changing areas, storage and lifeguard room.
- East Bath House: East bath house is located on Cottage Street and contains the remainder of required toilet and shower fixtures. East bath house has entry/control point facing Concord Avenue/proposed drop; it was determined to be important not to have actual entry facing Cottage Street. There is also a first aid area and lockers.
- Filter: Adjacent to the east bath house but separated by an outdoor area is the filter building; it is important to raise filter above grade to prevent current issues of flooding/required pumping and maintenance.

#### G. Images Pool and Bath Houses

- Windows and clerestory, ventilation
- Roofs plan for solar, but solar is not in current budget

#### H. Proposed Funding

- CPA funding 2013                               \$298,000
- CPA funding 2014 – Proposed       \$2,000,000
- Debt Exclusion Amount                       \$2,902,000

#### I. Total Project Cost

- Schematic Design Estimated Total Project Cost                       \$5,200,000
- Total Project Costs includes:
  - ❖ Estimated construction costs, including escalation and contingencies
  - ❖ Soft costs, including designer and OPM fees, testing, Printing, etc. and contingencies
  - ❖ Furniture Fixtures & Equipment allowances, including contingency
- Two construction cost estimates – one by estimator hired from BH+A, one from estimator hired by OPM
- Why cost increase from Feasibility Study number
  - ❖ Feasibility Study looked at option to build pool up the hill or in current location
  - ❖ Did not consider improvements outside the pool fence; the proposed project shows improvements to existing parking and tree lines, adds a walkway along Cottage Street, expands the grass area inside the pool, brings existing power lines underground.
  - ❖ 2 pools vs. 1 pool is a factor but not a main cost driver
  - ❖ Additional contingencies in the Schematic Design estimate
  - ❖ No OPM or Clerk of Works fees in the Feasibility Study number
  - ❖ No escalation in Feasibility Study number; no proposed project, unknown when escalate to

- Profit/Loss: Peter Castanino provided information on pool revenues from fiscal years 2011-2013. The last 2 years are a bit of aberration: lost the diving board in fiscal year 2012, which impacted use of pool; also, the publicity about the one-year waiver to open the pool drove down usage.
  - Profit in 2011, lost money past 2 years
  - With waiver to open pool last year, need money needed to perform required work to allow pool to open last summer
  - Revenues – anticipate more memberships with new facility; cost of membership is rec dept decision
- Operating Costs: the designer provided estimates on operating costs of the new pools as compared to the existing pool:
  - Pool water costs are expected to not change
  - Pool electricity is expected to increase
  - Chemical costs are expected to decrease
  - Pool maintenance requirements are expected to be the same or decrease
  - Pool staffing is expected to be the same; the project was designed with this in mind, but it is really up to the Recreation Department as to how the pool is staffed
  - The building are bigger (more fixtures, etc.), but will be new and designed with efficiency
  - There will be no need to do off-season checks on the pumps (pulling new pump house above grade)

#### 4. Questions

- Chair thanked Adam Dash and the UPBC for the presentation.
- Question: What is “other” listed on the fiscal year 2011-2013 information?
  - Peter Castanino: Supplies, all other things takes to run pool (tools, equipment, valves, electricians and plumbers to keep pool running), paint
  - Do you expect this number to decrease?
  - Peter Castanino: Yes, part of maintenance that will decrease.
- Question: Would proposed lap lanes be regulation for competitive swimming?
  - Tom Scarlata: Yes.
- Question: Thank you, excellent presentation; what is “camps” listed on the fiscal year 2011-2013 information? Cost of camp programs?
  - Peter Castanino: Just amount attributed to the pool.
- Question: Have you asked the T about moving the bus stop to put the drop off there? Might be a safer situation. There are 3 bus stops in close proximity.
  - Anne Paulsen: Have had a conversation with the State Rep about moving the bus stop, but no response yet; not sure if there is another place to relocate that stop. Have also heard from people in the neighborhood that it is difficult to pull out onto Concord Avenue when the bus is in that spot, so it might not be good to have cars there with potentially more frequency.
- Question: Is someone here from the Recreation Department to verify that staff requirement costs will not go up?
  - As part of process, pool manager has reviewed the design, came to some meetings; she can monitor and take care of pool safely with number of guards staffed now.
  - Adam Dash said that maintaining staff levels was considered during design.
- Question: This would be a new facility with many more amenities, seems it might be appropriate to increase pool fees. If it were the case that the pool membership generated a bigger surplus, is there a way to earmark it for servicing the debt?

- David Kane reported there have been discussions about creating stabilization funds, have pool of money for maintenance down the road.
- Question: There was an inquiry about the proposed construction schedule and if additional CPA funds would help this project.
  - Adam Dash indicated the idea was to get the project planning underway and hopefully get for a waiver to open the pool for summer 2014. If the ballot question passes, proposal is for construction to take place September 2014 through June 2015.
- Question: The bath house construction is simple building system, why the increase from Feasibility Study estimate? Why are the OPM fees so high? If this is such a simple project, why do we have to spend so much money on it?
  - Adam Dash said the OPM fees are money well spent to insure quality of project and construction.
  - A member of the Warrant Committee added that an OPM is required by State law as of 2004. Fees were not covered in Feasibility Study estimate, but Permanent Building Committee caught this, and 2013 CPA funds for Schematic Design phase covered the cost of the OPM for that phase.
  - Anne Paulsen added that the Clerk of Works component is important to insure oversight during construction.
- Question: Is there any more data on the pool usage?
  - Peter Castanino said a survey was conducted last summer, but to his knowledge this is the only data they have; it is assumed last summer's usage was less than previous years.
- Question: Usage is most important number. Why is pool designed to accommodate 646 bathers per Code when we don't have that number using it?
  - Adam Dash noted that the UPBC has pared the pool down from the original design. There are Code requirements to calculate the bather load for the different areas – diving, lap lanes, and so on. This bather load is then used by Code to determine the plumbing fixture requirements, which is a big driver in how big the bath houses need to be.
  - Ellen Schreiber added the existing pool is larger than the current design; the bather load for the existing pool is over 900. This is an issue of what the regulations say the legal capacity is, not how the pool is actually used. Legal capacity assumes a 15 square foot area per person.
  - Tom Scarlata added that the design responds to program desires and multigenerational needs. The design is conscious of having areas for lessons. Also segregates areas for different populations – lessons, dive, slide. The area shown with lap lanes is flexible - can be lanes or can be used for other activities; programming to be determined by the Recreation Department.
- Question: Is there a way to think of pool size as related to population density?
  - Tom Scarlata said he does not have the numbers with him, he could get this information to the Committee.
  - Ellen Schreiber reported that the UPBC conducted an on line survey with over 500 respondents. The response to membership questions point to a 60-70% increase in membership. Responders said older children no longer use pool with no diving board, and that existing pool mainly used by families with small children; there were requests were for elements to keep older children interested, elements for adult use, better bathhouses, better pool (fleeing away from existing conditions); Ellen proposed that a multigenerational aspect should lend to longer family memberships.

- Question: The cost of the project increased due to scope changes and OPM fee. The Board of Selectmen voted unanimously to support project, yet there is only 5% contingency?
  - Deborah explained different contingencies and escalation included in the estimate, and the process for SD estimate. Both the OPM and the designer had independent schematic design construction estimates performed, and the estimates were reconciled. The construction estimates include:
    - ❖ A design/pricing contingency: Used to account for the status of the design and documentation, and this amount is typically absorbed into the project as the process develops. The percentage of this contingency goes down as the design develops and construction documents are completed; once the project is bid, there is no design/pricing contingency.
    - ❖ Escalation through the mid-point of construction: This is for potential construction pricing increases that happen between the estimate and actual construction. Again, once the project is bid, the escalation amount goes away.
    - ❖ Owner's construction contingency: This amount is set aside in the construction budget for change orders resulting from unforeseen conditions, coordination issues or owner requested added scope. This money is the Owner's, not part of the construction contract. It is carried through the construction process, and if not used will be money not spent on the project.
  - The total project budget includes estimated soft costs and FF&E (furniture, fixture and equipment) in addition to the estimated construction costs. Contingencies are included for soft costs and FF&E as well to account for unanticipated items.
- Question: Tax payer cost?
  - Floyd Carmen, Town Treasurer, reported the proposed debt exclusion of \$2,902,000 would mean an increase in \$48 for the average single-family home (\$782,700); the calculation is \$6.11 in taxes for every \$100,000 of home value. The increase in taxes would be on a declining bases (prime payment declining interest), 15 year amortization.

#### **5. Warrant Committee Vote**

- It was decided that the Warrant Committee would wait until the next meeting to vote.
- If anyone on the Committee has additional questions, get them to Adam Dash and the UPBC will respond to them.

#### **Next Meeting Date:**

- Tuesday, February 27, 2014 @ 7:30 p.m.

#### **Upcoming Milestones:**

- Thursday, March 13, 2014: Public Meeting
- Tuesday, April 1, 2014: Town Election Day / Debt Exclusion Vote
- Monday, May 5, 2014: Town Meeting

#### **Attachments:**

- Presentation (similar presentation from Board of Selectmen and Planning Board meeting)

Respectfully Submitted, Deborah Marai, Pinck & Co. Inc.