The Community Preservation Committee (the “CPC” or the “Committee”) convened a regular meeting, duly noticed, on Monday, October 5, 2020 at 7 p.m. via the videoconferencing platform Zoom. CPC members present were Stephen Ober, Chair; Barry Tubman; Ken Newberg; Nina Danforth; Nathalie Thompson; Sue Zacharias; and Steve Wagner. CPC member Marcy Dorna was absent. Recreation Director Chris Fitzgerald, Assistant Recreation Director Sharon Locke, Recreation Commission Chair Eric Rosenthal and Recreation Commission members Melissa Crocker and Maija Cirulis-Gooch were present. Finance Committee member Bharath Venkataraman was present. Weston Media Center Videographer Alanna Muldoon and CPC Administrator Tracey Lembo were also present.

Steve Ober read a statement explaining the need for a meeting conducted by remote participation in light of the emergency orders issued by Governor Baker in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic, noted that the meeting was being recorded, and invited public comment.

**Public Comment**

None.

Mr. Ober reported that the CPC had not circulated applications for Special Town Meeting (“STM”) in the fall as originally planned because of the uncertainty as to whether a STM would be held. Mr. Ober explained that at the beginning of September, the Select Board (“SB”) had asked that the CPC solicit applications for a STM should it be held and that the SB’s decision on whether to hold a STM might depend on guidance from the Department of Revenue (“DOR”) regarding an issue with the Recreation Enterprise Fund (“Rec Fund”). Mr. Ober reported that the CPC had received 2 applications for STM, one of which would be discussed tonight and the other of which would be discussed at the CPC’s next meeting on October 19th. Mr. Ober noted that it was possible that the CPC would consider proposals for STM which would be deferred to Annual Town Meeting.

**Application for FY21 Administrative Funds – Housing Production Plan ($25,000):**

Ken Newberg explained that because the Housing Trust (“Trust”) now had a firm proposal from a consultant, he was presenting a request for funding to complete a Housing Production Plan (“HPP”) which was $5,000 less than the previous request approved by the CPC. Mr. Newburg reported that the Trust’s request exceeded the dollar amount of the consultant’s proposal in order to cover any additional meeting time and that any funding not used would be returned. Mr. Newberg explained that the Trust had not been able to begin the HPP before the end of FY20 because of the pandemic and that previously appropriated funds had reverted back to the CPA Fund.

Mr. Newberg reminded the CPC that an HPP was a legal document and a planning tool that communities use to identify opportunities for development, to identify friction points, and to set goals for development. Mr. Newberg reported that municipalities needed an approved HPP in order to claim safe harbor [under MGL Chapter 40B]. Mr. Newberg indicated that the Regional Housing Services Office had done some early data gathering and that a Steering Committee planned to begin its work this month and complete its work by March.
Mr. Ober asked if the Trust was troubled that it had received only 1 response to its RFP for an HPP consultant; Mr. Newberg indicated that they were not because the sole respondent was well qualified and had proposed a reasonable rate. Mr. Ober noted that the timeline in the HPP application showed completion just prior to expiration of the existing HPP. Mr. Newberg suggested that delays were due to the pandemic and could not be helped. Steve Wagner expressed satisfaction with the qualifications of the consultant noting that it had prepared HPPs for many MA towns.

VOTE: Mr. Ober entertained a motion to approve $25,000 in FY21 CPC administrative funds to complete a Housing Production Plan. Mr. Newberg made the motion, which was seconded by Ms. Danforth. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote with Marcy Dorna absent.

Application for Potential FY21 Special Town Meeting – Memorial Pool Renovation Design Funds ($250,000):

Melissa Crocker reported that the Recreation Department ("Rec") had been unable to open Memorial Pool (the "Pool") this past summer disappointing many. Ms. Crocker noted that the Pool had been a great place to gather for many decades. Ms. Crocker indicated that the need to replace a 1993 filtration system along with public feedback obtained during the process of developing a Recreation Master Plan were driving the Pool renovation project. Ms. Crocker indicated that the request was for design fees for a project with the following goals: 1) replace the filtration system, 2) improve accessibility for disabled residents, 3) modernize the check in area, 4) add amenities to improve the overall recreational value of the Pool, and 5) expand the concession area.

Ms. Crocker reported that replacing the Pool filter installed in 1993 was the most important goal of the project since it would likely fail between 2023 and 2025. Ms. Crocker explained that a properly functioning filtration system, required by the Board of Health ("BOH"), was needed to remove dirt and debris from the Pool, to allow for a better distribution of Pool chemicals helping to combat bacteria and water borne illnesses, and to allow residents to have a healthy recreational experience. Ms. Crocker indicated that the project would improve accessibility to the bathhouse and concession areas for disabled residents. Ms. Crocker noted that improving the check in area would allow residents, particularly working families, to purchase badges, guest cards, etc. and to sign up for swimming lessons outside of business hours. Ms. Crocker reported that the project was intended to improve the recreational value of the Pool by adding water features suggested by residents (e.g., a water table, splash pad, or slide) and incorporated into many newer pools in surrounding towns. Ms. Crocker recalled the popularity of an outside vendor which had provided concession items during a single Pool event in 2019 and suggested that expanding the concession area as part of the renovation project would respond to many resident requests.

Ms. Crocker stated that the Recreation Commission ("RC") was in the process of forming a citizen’s committee to: 1) assist in getting feedback about what residents want to see at the Pool, 2) assist in gathering support for the project, 3) help consider Pool amenities, and 4) consider fundraising opportunities to assist with costs. Ms. Crocker noted that though the charge of the citizen’s committee had not been finalized, several residents had expressed interest in joining. Ms. Crocker emphasized the RC was the ultimate decision maker, not the citizen’s committee, with regard to Pool renovation plans.

Ms. Crocker reminded the CPC that in FY20 a feasibility study had been conducted with CPC administrative funds and reported that the consultant, Gienapp Architects, had produced 2 plans: 1 with a new bathhouse
and 1 without. Ms. Crocker explained that with the BOH’s blessing, the RC had elected to move forward with the plan which did not include a new bathhouse because a new bathhouse would add $2 million to project costs currently estimated at between $1.9 million and $2.2 million. Ms. Crocker indicated that the $250,000 design fee request was based on 10% of estimated costs with contingencies and had been developed in consultation with the Facilities Department and the Permanent Building Committee.

Eric Rosenthal commented that the bathhouse issues related to the number of required showers and toilets for the volume of water at the Pool instead of its usage and that the BOH was willing to waive bathhouse requirements because of this. Mr. Rosenthal noted that pools in surrounding towns had well developed amenities for young children (e.g., splash pads) and that maintenance costs at the Pool were significant and increasing because of its age and need for renovation. Mr. Rosenthal reported that the cost to replace the Pool filter was $500,000.

Chris Fitzgerald noted that the BOH had waived the requirement for additional showers beyond the 6 outdoor showers currently at the Pool and suggested that residents used the Pool more like a beach (i.e., for lounging) than like an indoor swimming club. Mr. Fitzgerald reported that the Pool had had a popular water table aimed at preschoolers which had deteriorated and been removed 5 years ago and emphasized that the project would likely include the addition of 1 or 2 amenities discussed by Ms. Crocker in order to maintain the current atmosphere but increase the fun value of the Pool. Mr. Rosenthal reported that the Finance Committee was aware of the aging nature of the Pool and its need for renovation.

Responding to Mr. Newberg, Ms. Crocker indicated that the existing bathhouse would remain. Nina Danforth asked why renovation plans were being developed before the citizen’s committee was formed and given a charge. Ms. Crocker envisioned the citizen’s committee starting in the next couple of weeks but suggested that the project’s timeline called for architects to begin their work so that construction could start in September 2023 and end by April 2024. Ms. Danforth spoke against increased concession offerings, in part because of the trash they would generate. Ms. Crocker suggested that the RC could look into the issue; Mr. Rosenthal noted the current prevalence of pizza deliveries which generate a lot of external waste. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that Pool members had expressed interest in the ability to purchase small meals and that the frequency of trash pickup could be increased. Ms. Danforth pointed out that 10% of the high end of estimated construction costs was $220,000, not $250,000 as requested. Mr. Fitzgerald reiterated that the request was based on the advice of the Facilities Department; Ms. Crocker noted that any unused appropriation would be returned to the CPA Fund.

Mr. Ober remarked that the timeline Ms. Crocker had outlined reflected dates which were one year later than those contained in the project application. Ms. Crocker indicated that she had misspoken and that the dates in the application were correct (i.e., September 2022 construction start and April 2023 construction completion). Responding to Mr. Ober’s next question, Ms. Crocker and Mr. Fitzgerald reported plans to open the Pool for the next 2 summers without significant repair costs but acknowledged that the situation could change.

Barry Tubman asked if there were targets for the proportion of funding to come from the Town, the CPA Fund, and private donations. Ms. Crocker and Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that there were no funding objectives at the moment. Mr. Rosenthal noted the Pool’s long history and broad appeal and expressed discomfort with setting an expectation for private funding since he believed that the Pool was a Town staple that needed to exist with or without private funding. Mr. Rosenthal reported that the level of private donations made to
other Rec projects would account for only a small percentage of this project.

In response to Mr. Wagner’s question about funding sources, Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that Rec was approaching the CPC first but would explore other sources (e.g., Town general funds and/or fundraising) if necessary. Responding to further questions from Mr. Wagner, Mr. Fitzgerald stated that architectural services for the project would be bid and that there is a capital plan developed in concert with the Facilities Department for the Pool. Mr. Rosenthal explained that while it maintained an annual operating budget that allowed for certain timed maintenance issues at the Pool, it was not self sufficient and relied on financial support from the Town to provide services. Mr. Rosenthal noted that some towns provided all of the funding for their recreation departments. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that Rec generated revenues equal to 70% of its budget and that the Town provided the other 30%. Mr. Fitzgerald reported that Rec set aside $15,000 - $20,000 annually for Pool maintenance, that any excess revenues were held as retained earnings which could be applied to the Pool, and that lost revenue due to the pandemic had depleted Rec’s retained earnings balance. Mr. Fitzgerald reiterated that Rec’s capital plan was developed with help from the Facilities Department and that necessary capital expenses would be paid out of retained earnings or the Town’s capital fund if retained earnings were not available.

Mr. Wagner expressed support for adding amenities and enhancing disabled access to the Pool, but thought that replacing the Pool filter should be a Town expense. Expressing support for the Pool but noting that she did not know many in her age cohort who used it, Sue Zacharias asked for data stratifying Pool usage by age segments which she suggested be gathered at the Pool entrance. Ms. Crocker provided anecdotal evidence of Pool usage by Weston’s elderly residents. Mr. Rosenthal reported that the Recreation Master Plan indicated that the Pool was supported strongly by members of all generations and expressed support for broadening the Pool’s appeal to older residents (e.g., by better configuring lap lanes). Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that some data on usage by age was available through Pool attendance logs which he would look at in greater detail. Mr. Newberg spoke in favor of the Pool renovation noting that it was a popular meeting place for younger families. Mr. Wagner and Ms. Danforth suggested incorporating slides showing existing conditions and proposed changes at the Pool when the project was presented to the CPC at its Public Hearing on October 26th.

**CPA Fund Financial Information**

Indicating that full blown financial projections would be discussed at the next CPC meeting, Mr. Ober reviewed spreadsheets detailing information on the CPC administrative account and on CPA Fund project appropriations which had not yet been fully spent. Mr. Ober highlighted the most pertinent figure on the administrative spreadsheet showing the remaining expected balance after approval of funds for the Housing Production Plan. Responding to Mr. Ober’s questions, Tracey Lembo reported that she typically asked proponents of projects for which there had been no draw on appropriations for over a year to: 1) vote to return the remainder of the appropriation or 2) provide a short-term plan for using the remainder of the appropriation in writing to the CPC. Ms. Lembo explained that she had most recently contacted project proponents in March; Mr. Ober suggested that a check in was appropriate at this time.

Mr. Newberg reported that the Trust hoped to use Home Ownership Opportunity Funds to subsidize a Habitat for Humanity Project at 0 Wellesley St., land which the Town had gifted to the Trust. Mr. Newberg explained that there was some question as to whether the Town Meeting appropriation allowed for this use and that the Trust would update the CPC on its plans to: 1) use Home Ownership Opportunity Funds at 0 Wellesley St., 2) ask Town Meeting to repurpose Home Ownership Opportunity Funds, or 3) ask Town...
Meeting for additional funds solely for 0 Wellesley St. Mr. Newberg indicated that the Trust had plans to use the Home Ownership Opportunity Funds but had not yet been able to execute these plans.

Mr. Wagner noted that remaining funds in the cemetery project accounts would be used for tomb restoration. Responding to Mr. Ober, Mr. Wagner reported that 120 Summer St. was encumbered by several liens but that the Historical Commission was still trying to devise a way to purchase a preservation restriction (“PR”) on the property and that he would check into the status of the proposed PR at 71 Lexington St. and make sure the money was returned to the CPA Fund if it could not be used. Mr. Wagner and Ms. Lembo agreed to ask about the status of the retainage at the WAIC project.

Ms. Danforth reported that the Tree Advisory Group was meeting later in the week with the Department of Public Works to see if the Case Park Project could be revived.

2020 CPC Plan
Mr. Ober noted that the 2020 CPC Plan had been circulated early in the previous week to allow time for review and then invited questions or observations.

VOTE: Mr. Ober entertained a motion to approve the 2020 CPC Plan. Mr. Wagner made the motion, seconded by Mr. Tubman. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote with Ms. Dorna absent.

Minutes of the April 27, 2020 Public Hearing and Meeting

VOTE: Mr. Ober entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2020 meeting. Ms. Zacharias made the motion, seconded by Ms. Danforth. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote with Ms. Dorna absent.

Next Meetings
Mr. Ober indicated that in March, the CPC had scheduled its next regular meeting for October 19th and its Public Hearing for October 26th. Mr. Ober suggested that this schedule was somewhat dependent on the likelihood of a STM being held, which he understood to rest, in part, on a decision by the Department of Revenue regarding the Recreation Enterprise Fund. Mr. Ober explained that the remaining CPC meetings scheduled for October might not be held if the SB definitively decided not to hold a FY21 STM. Mr. Ober noted that should the October 19th meeting be held, the CPC would discuss CPA Fund projections along with a design fee request from the Elderly Housing Committee for an expansion of Brook School Apartments.

Mr. Newberg noted that the Affordable Housing Trust (“Trust”) hoped to present its plans for a Habitat for Humanity project at 0 Wellesley St. using Home Ownership Opportunity Funds at the CPC’s next meeting. Ms. Lembo suggested that if it were determined that Home Ownership Opportunity Funds could be used for this purpose, Mr. Ober, in consultation with Sarah Rhatigan, might decide that the Trust could update the CPC whenever its next meeting occurred.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

___________________
Tracey A. Lembo
CPC Administrator
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CPC Meeting
October 5, 2020
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1) Chair’s Statement
2) Housing Production Plan:
   a. Application for $25,000 in FY21 Administrative Funds
   b. Quotation for Consulting Services for Housing Production Plan Update – JM Goldson LLC dated August 24, 2020
3) Memorial Pool:
   a. Application for $250,000 in Design Fees
   b. PowerPoint
4) CPA Fund Financial Information:
   a. CPC Administrative Funds Spreadsheet
   b. Existing CPA Fund Project Status Spreadsheet
5) September 2020 CPC Plan:
   a. Draft September 2020 CPC Plan (clean version)
   b. Draft September 2020 CPC Plan (with changes tracked from September 2019 CPC Plan)
   c. September 2020 CPC Plan Appendices 1-7
6) Draft Minutes of the April 27, 2020 Meeting
Memorial Pool Renovation Project

Weston Recreation
Memorial Pool Renovation Project

The Memorial Pool has been a popular gathering place for Weston residents since the 1970’s.

Families and residents enjoy gathering each summer for many recreational opportunities.
Memorial Pool Renovation Project

This project is driven by the need to replace an aging filtration system and by public feedback on what can make the pool more attractive to Weston residents. It was also identified as a priority in the Weston Recreation Master Plan.

There are five goals for outcome of the project:

• Replace an aging filtration system to ensure continued proper operation of the pool
• Improve accessibility
• Modernize the check-in area
• Add amenities to improve overall recreational value of the pool
• Expand the concession area
The filtration system is nearing the end of its useful life. The sand filters have been in place since 1993. A 2018 inspection showed that the liner of the filter has begun to be compromised. It was recommended that they be replaced in 5 to 7 years, or between the years 2023 and 2025.
Memorial Pool Renovations

Why is a properly functioning filtration system so important to the use of the pool?

Filters remove dirt, insects, hair and leaves from the pool.

Filters allow for better distribution of pool chemicals which is crucially important in a larger pool like the Memorial Pool.

A better distribution of chemicals allows us to better combat bacteria and water borne illnesses.

A properly functioning filtration system is required by the Board of Health.

Allows residents to have a healthy recreational experience.
Many residents with a variety of physical challenges enjoy the pool daily for exercise. Accessibility from the deck to the pool is up to code, however, improvements are needed for the bathrooms and the concession area. The goal is to provide accessible pathways to all pool amenities.
A modern check in area as part of the expanded concession area would allow:

- Customers the ability to purchase badges, guest cards, etc. at the pool
- Working families the ability to purchase their pool badges; currently many cannot because they cannot get to the Recreation office during normal business office hours
- Residents to sign up for swim lessons directly at the pool
Add amenities to improve overall recreational value of the pool

In recent years, neighboring town pools have added exciting new amenities to their pools, drawing Weston residents to other pools for better recreational value. An amenity could be a slide or a water play feature for younger children. We want to increase the Recreational value for our residents by adding modest recreational amenities.
For many years Weston residents have been asking for an expanded concession area with more variety of offerings. A modest expansion will allow us to serve a small number of hot food items, such as hamburgers and hot dogs or microwaveable items.
In 2019, the Recreation Department hired an outside vendor to offer expanded concessions for one event. The event was successful and public feedback identified this as a desire for the pool.
Citizens’ Committee

A citizens’ committee is being formed to assist the Recreation Commission in the following ways:

• Help garner public feedback to see what Weston residents want at the Memorial Pool.
• Assist the Recreation Commission in gathering support for the project.
• Assist Recreation Commission with considerations for pool amenities.
• Consider fundraising opportunities to assist with cost.
Feasibility Study & Cost

• In FY 20, the Recreation Commission secured $3,000 in CPA Administrative Funds to complete a feasibility study with Gienapp Architects. An expanded bath-house was also considered initially.

• The feasibility study was completed $200 under budget, which was returned to CPC.

• The bath-house was removed because of cost and lack of expressed public need.

• Weston Board of Health has approved removing bath-house from plans moving forward.
Project Costs

The expected cost of the renovation is around $2.1 million.
Memorial Pool Renovation

The Recreation Commission is requesting $250,000 in CPC funds for design fees. This estimate was developed with the advice of the Weston Town Facilities Department/Permanent Building Committee and reflects 10% estimated cost with contingencies.
Thank you for your consideration. We hope that you will support this request.