

# TOWN OF LINCOLN

LINCOLN TOWN OFFICES  
16 LINCOLN ROAD  
LINCOLN, MA 01773  
781/259-2601



---

## Minutes

### Community Center Building Committee

July 26, 2023, 7:00 pm

Remote format: Zoom Meeting

#### Attendees

##### Board Representatives (voting members)

Susan Taylor, Ellen Meyer Shorb, Rob Stringer, Dilla Tingley

##### At-large Members (voting members)

Sarah Chester (Chair), Krystal Wood, Alison Taunton-Rigby, Tim Christenfeld

##### Ex-Officio Members

Abigail Butt, Jessica Downing, Brandon Kelly, Dan Pereira

##### Liaisons

Wendy Kusik, Peter Von Mertens, Andrew Glass, Kim Bodner, Craig Nicholson, Kathryn Hawkins

##### ICON Architects

Ned Collier, Mark McKevez, Ana Cheng,

##### Minutes Taker

Edwin Tam

##### Others

Lynne Smith, Sally Kindleberger, Linda McMillan, Sara Mattes, Jessica Downey, Anne Sobol, Terry, Tom Casey

The meeting started at 7:02 pm.

#### 1. Welcome & introductions (Sarah Chester)

Sarah Chester welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda. She stated that once the committee members had opportunities to discuss the topics, then the floor would be opened to members of the public. She requested that, when the floor was opened, speakers wait to be recognized and limit themselves to two minutes to enable everyone to have an opportunity to comment or ask questions.

#### 2. Architect's Report / Review of Project Schedule (ICON)

Ned Collier and Mark McKevez reviewed the site strategies and schemes to date, per the 100/75/50% options, and presented Massing and Adjacency Schemes. See

<https://lincolncommunitycenter.com/documents/massing-and-adjacency-schemes-presented-on-july-26-2023/>

- Past few meetings and comments have helped ICON shape the site strategies. Per June's preliminary cost data, Pod renovation is around \$3M, and the remaining is for new construction.
- Scheme 1 is 100% new construction; Scheme 2 is 75% new + Pod C renovation; Scheme 3 is 50% new + Pod B and Pod C renovations.
- No cost estimate yet for these schemes; need the process to get further along.

## **2.1 100% Courtyard Scheme**

- Single story concept with courtyard.
- LEAP, COA, and PRD all have their own green space.
- Green arrows show connecting to outside.
- Single story eliminates elevator.
- PRD and activity room are located on the southern end.
- Multipurpose, kitchen, and fitness room are located on the northern end.
- Square footage is stated on the above.

## **2.2 100% Bar scheme**

- Potential second floor space activity and PRD space on the southern end; fitness is on the northern end.
- Green spaces are the same.
- Two stories, has an elevator
- Multipurpose will be on the first floor, northern end of building; and COA&HS will be on the south side; kitchen will be right next to multipurpose room.

## **2.3 100% Path Scheme**

- Arrows show green space for PRD, COA&HS and LEAP.
- Hartwell Building will be on the south side.
- First floor: COA&HS and activity room on the north side; multipurpose and kitchen on the southern end.
- Second Floor: PRD and Fitness are located on the northern side; the southern side is just roof deck.

## **2.4 75% Courtyard Scheme**

- LEAP keeps as is
- Multipurpose, kitchen and fitness on northern area; PRD, COA&HS and activity on the south side.
- In between is open space, there is no interconnect for these two areas.

## **2.5 75% Bar Scheme**

- Green space for LEAP. COA and PRD are the same.
- First floor: Multipurpose, kitchen is located in the northern end; COA&HS on the southern end.
- Second floor: Fitness is north side; activity and PRD on the southern end.

## **2.6 75% Path Scheme**

- First Floor: COA&HS and activity are in the north end; South side are kitchen and multipurpose.
- Second Floor: PRD and fitness are located in the north end. South side is just the roof deck.
- Pod C remains.

## **2.7 75% Addition/Renovation Scheme**

- LEAP, PRD and COAHS, all have green space.
- POD C remains and needs renovation.
- COA&HS and Multipurpose are on the north end; PRD in the middle; Fitness and activity are located on the south side.
- Multipurpose facing Pod C.
- Add 3,000 sq ft between pods.

## **2.8 50% Addition/Renovation Scheme**

- LEAP stays.
- Ground Floor: COA&HS, kitchen and multipurpose are on the north side. PRD in the middle. Fitness and activity are on the southern end.

## 2.9 General

- Canopy is 10,000 sq ft, slope toward the sun.
- Maintenance space – we will take a deeper look, especially space for delivery truck to turn around that near the Pod C area.
- Locations for Maintenance are 3 possibilities: (a) within Hartwell, (b) add to Hartwell, (c) next to Hartwell.

### *Questions & Comments*

- Rob: Any elevator to 2-floor building?
- ICON: Yes, by code.
- Peter: This is difficult to follow, any possibility to send this information ahead of time so we can study it first?
- Question: Hope to look at the room size before accepting the proposal, which rooms go to what building and for what activities.
- ICON: We are still in the conceptual stage. We go with the previous programming document on size requirements
- Alison: I don't believe we have discussed the size and space.
- ICON: We have had this discussion on multiple occasions, and we will continue to have this discussion.
- Alison: We only have a rough discussion. Second comment, the Community center people on one side and activity on the other side, in between there is long corridor, it does not appear they can mix.
- ICON: This is the kind of feedback we need; this is your observation of the outcome.
- Alison: For the programs and size, are we building the community center based on the list?
- ICON: A lot of work put in by a number of people to generate the information.
- Krystal: LEAP basically stays the same, right?
- ICON: In some schemes, yes.
- Brandon: 100% and 75%, we are not doing anything on LEAP, right?
- ICON: For 100%, 2 of the Pods are removed. For 75%, new construction and LEAP renovation.
- Susan: Except for the 100% Scheme, can we assume all school programs are untouched? Hartwell and Magic Garden will not be renovated, we are not touching LEAP. Do we have access or drop-off to LEAP?
- ICON: Except 50%, there are some renovation and site development.
- Susan: Before adding any new things on Ballfield Road, make sure we bring it to the school's attention. We understand COA&HS and PRD need space, but it cannot be at the sacrifice of school or school programs. Parents need to access to kids. LEAP is on its own, other parents need to access to Magic Garden.
- ICON: Please explain.
- Susan: We need parents' guidance.
- ICON: 100% is more straight forward. 75% Scheme, a little struggle, our resources are spreading too thin, including renovating the pods, need some sacrifice. For 50% scheme, we can understand Susan's reaction.
- Susan: COA&HS needs functional space, some way to present a community center within the school community. We need a way to say it, so people understand. Parents will come out and vote. We need a version that is aimed to this voting bloc.
- ICON: We are not advocating any scheme; we will produce 3 cost levels.
- Dan: We did not see the Strats place.
- Susan: It is a mind-set, we have to look at it from the parent's view, not just COA&HS 's view.
- ICON: We need to put a summary to understand each scheme and site development.
- Krystal: How is this affecting my kids? How do I pickup my kids? If they understand it, they will support it.
- ICON: We need to look at the narratives.
- Susan: Kids are on bike and parents picking up kids, what are the bike lanes and pedestrian path, if there is safety issue, parents will vote it down. There are 2 groups: 90% parents driving cars to drop off kids, and the others are on bikes or walking to school. We need to address safety for both of these groups.

- Kathryn: These are important issues.
- Peter: Magic Garden and/or Strat's place revamping should not be part of this discussion. The Community needs to decide the expense of Strat's place. Magic Garden should be taken out of the discussion.
- Sarah C: Let's focus our discussion on the schemes for tonight. Strat's place will be addressed soon in a separate discussion. If the CC ends up taking MG's playground next to B Pod, then the CC needs to address where it will be moved.
- Tim C: I think Susan T has a good point, when we talk about 100%, 75% and 50%, what are the tradeoffs for savings? If we don't renovate LEAP, we need to be realistic on less expensive plan.
- Alison: We have 3 pieces to deal with: (1) Leap, include renovation or not. (2) Maintenance. (3) CC shape and design.
- Susan: We need to be pragmatic, may need to make some sacrifice and put some weight on some programs.
- Tim C: We need cost decisions; we need to be clear on existing programs.
- Tim C: We are not doing away with LEAP and Magic Garden. LEAP cannot stay in its current condition for long.
- Alison: LEAP is an essential program for School, and it is their decision on whether to renovate it. What is the cost to renovate?
- Susan: Maybe we can put together a column stating the price and tradeoff. We also need traffic plan, drop-off and pickup.
- ICON: Important things for us to get to where we need to go; we need cost to attach to it, only then we will get some answer.
- ICON: Feedback is important, but something needs to be constant. We cannot respond in real time. We heard Susan raise some of her concerns, and what things are left out, but we need to narrow down some of the schemes. Do PRD and COA&HS adjacent to each other work? Does PRD on the second-floor work?
- Peter: LEAP is an integral part of this whole thing; how do we renovate LEAP to make it more useful or how it may fit into a larger space?
- ICON: We need direction from the Committee on LEAP.
- Peter: LEAP, do they stay or go into the new building
- ICON: Committee directs ICON, is LEAP in or out? Should this be a parallel project? Approximately \$3MM to renovate.
- Susan: Need to know all the costs. LEAP is not falling down tomorrow. We need to know what is out there, we need this on the table.
- ICON: This is a complex project, no longer just CC, there are new construction, renovation, site development, maintenance building.
- Rob: Include LEAP or not, we need to understand what do we give up, cost of renovation. Are we doing the entire site? How much do we have to spend to renovate? Maybe we can have private dollars offset it. These are difficult decisions and we need to be open.
- ICON: Town needs to decide on the tradeoffs. We are here to give options. LEAP will be good for several years; Community can decide whether to leave it out for now.
- Sarah C: What we need are 3 options, each with a story and tradeoffs so the community can understand.
- Kim: We need narrative and tradeoff.
- Tom: I am troubled by this conversation. It looks like COA&HS is at the expense of LEAP and PRD. My concerns are the tradeoffs.
- Linda: The discussion is disappointing. The town wants a community center we can go to, but what I am seeing is PRD put together with CC, LEAP, and after school programs.
- Sarah C: We need to give feedback to ICON.
- Rob: We need to give feedback and the public needs to give feedback.
- Dan: I will record all the comments and group them together for ICON.
- Alison: Can it share with the Committee members?
- ICON: We need to hear this from the Committee.

- Susan: What is the policy on the open meeting law? We need to have a working meeting. How many committee members are needed for a quorum?
- Sarah C: We have 9 voting members.
- Dan : If there is a desire for us to meet, we can arrange it.
- Susan: It will be a working session, not just open meeting.
- Dan: As long as public is aware of it. We can post it as public meeting.
- Susan: This will give is a chance to hash out a few things. The meeting is open to others as observers. We need this working session now, otherwise we will not be ready in September.
- Ellen: Can this be in-person meeting?
- Alison: Can we start next week?
- Abby: I appreciate hybrid meeting rather than just in-person meeting.
- Sarah C: I will send out the schedule for a hybrid meeting.
- Dan: I will collect all the comments for ICON and the committee.
- Dan: What is the intention of the working group? Any votes or just collecting feedback?
- Alison: It will be a discussion; it will get us to a better place, probably no voting.
- Abby: Space, ideas, thoughts, all this information is in front of us. Don't undermine all the work that has already been done.
- Alison: We are only looking to discuss and understand better.
- ICON: 3 narratives on the 100%, 75% and 50% , these drive the square footage. Committee puts forth the 3 stories. The working group helps to get closer on the tradeoffs.
- Sarah C: Send your thoughts to Dan P as a basis of our discussion and narratives. We have talked about this many times, it is time to shape the narratives on 3 schemes, and enable ICON to work.
- Lynne S: Great suggestion by Alison to have the working group, as a resident, it gives ICON direction; like to make it simple, may be without LEAP; and consider it down the road, just go with 50% on COA&HS and PRD; otherwise, things just keep changing.

### 3. Communications Subcommittee Report

Alison and Tim C presented the benchmark study, posted at

<https://lincolncommunitycenter.com/documents/community-center-benchmarking-data/>

- Sarah C: No town CC is the same in square footage, population, and size of town. Dover and Wayland are the closest benchmarks to Lincoln.
- Tim C: We need to draft document for feedback.
- The latest CCBC Program Planning numbers are posted on the Lincoln Community Center website: <https://lincolncommunitycenter.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/CCBC-program-planning-numbers-June-2023.pdf>
- The edited version of PRD Class, min-max actual numbers, is posted in the Lincoln Community Center website: [https://lincolncommunitycenter.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/PRD-Class-Min-Max-Actual-Numbers-Amended-6\\_28\\_23.pdf](https://lincolncommunitycenter.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/PRD-Class-Min-Max-Actual-Numbers-Amended-6_28_23.pdf)
- ICON: Since we did Sudbury, if the Committee wants to know the escalation for comparison, we have the data.
- Tim C: We need recent dollar value. Dover suspended the project due to Covid and the cost ended \$6.2M higher after Covid.

### 4. CCBC Administration

**4.1 Decision:** Sarah C requested a motion to approve the minutes for the June 28 CCBC meeting pending edits sent to Sarah by Friday at 5 pm. Alison moved and Krystal seconded.

Aye votes: All but one member. Abstain: Tim Christenfeld

**Motion passed.**

#### **4.2 Review of meeting schedule**

- Regular CCBC Meeting: August 16
- September, October, and November: CCBC will meet twice weekly each month
- September 30: Lincoln State of the Town (SOTT), including CCBC presentation
- December 2: Special Town Meeting to select design option

#### **Discussion of SOTT:**

- Alison: We need to put together a working group and work on the presentation; address any comments and start the process now.
- Kim: What is the takeaway of the presentation, then decide what we want to work on. What do we want to tell the public and work backward.
- Susan: Can you join us for this discussion; to inform the public on the 3 options?
- Kim: We need feedback on the parking lot, pedestrians, and the strategy on the options.
- Dan: I'd like to be part of this discussion, put together an agenda. We can have a small group fill in the details.
- ICON: We'd like to have narratives on the 3 options and the tradeoffs, so we need the discussion now.
- Susan: We need Kim B's guidance on the 3 narratives, 1 & 5 options are important politically. We want people to start talking about it and we need clarity on the options.
- Sarah C: We need to start the preparation, need narrative in general, and get ICON's thoughts to fine tune it, so we have a solid approach to the SOTT. We should have 2 working group meetings in August to start the process.
- Peter: Instead of ICON making the presentation, we should be doing the presentation, maybe a team of presenters.

#### **5. Open Comments**

- Sarah C: Send your comments on the schemes to Dan; he will organize and post them online.
- Peter: Can we get ICON's stuff in advance so we can look at it before the meeting?
- Dan: I understand the need to have it in advance, but doing so means they have to stop their work flow; the Committee needs to decide.
- Peter: Very difficult to have an in-depth discussion and have any meaningful input without seeing it before the meeting. I think it will be a more productive meeting if we have the information ahead of time.
- Susan: We need to have the narratives out there before the SOTT so people can start thinking about it.

#### **6. Adjourn**

Sarah C asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting by a show of hands. Alison moved and Krystal seconded. The vote was unanimously passed.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:58 pm.**