

**AVON TOWN COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
September 22, 2016**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Avon Senior Center by Chairman Zacchio. Members present: Mrs. Maguire and Messrs: Pena and Stokesbury. Also present were Board of Education members Lowry, Blea, Zirolli, Birk, Spivak, Chute, Howard, and Roell.

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Zacchio.

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

13/14-48 Synthetic Turf Field Project: Avon High School

Chairman Zacchio gave an introduction. On behalf of the Council he thanked everyone for coming out tonight. He thanked the Board of Education for coming as well. He commented that tonight's presentation (which is attached and made part of these minutes) will be presented by Brandon Robertson, Town Manager and either members of the Sub-Committee or the Architect around what we intend on building. He added that the Town Manager will give a brief background of the project's life cycle and where we are today; we expect this to be a platform in which we collect more feedback from the community, the Board of Education, and Council to maybe yet again have a second iteration. He noted that the Sub-Committee that met which was appointed by Council had a charge and solved for a myriad of issues that we had handed to them. He added that we have heard from the neighborhood on other issues and concerns and will likely hear questions from the Board of Education, Town Council, and folks that are here. He noted that this is a feedback session, we will be collecting that and go back to Town Manager and staff to come up with something that is reactive to what we hear tonight. He introduced Brandon Robertson, Town Manager.

The Town Manager commented that some of you have been following this process for quite some time now. He noted that this actually goes back to the early 2000s when the high school site and Thompson Road site were looked at and considered for field expansion projects; the more recent history goes back to 2014 when the Town Council appointed a Sub-Committee of the Recreation and Parks Committee to develop a schematic design and cost estimate for a synthetic turf field complex at the property at 99 Thompson Road. He added that property was recommended for a synthetic turf field complex as part of the 2007 Recreation Master Plan process; the Recreation and Parks Sub-Committee pretty quickly completed their charge and reported out to the Town Council in November 2014 with the preliminary site plan and cost estimate and then decided to take another look at the high school property. It had been reviewed back in the 2000s. The Sub-Committee was charged with taking a look at it, developing a preliminary site plan and cost estimate and pretty quickly completed their charge and reported back to the Town Council in June 2015. The project was quiet for a few months as we worked

through our capital and operating budget. On December 7, 2015 there was a joint meeting between the Town Council and the Board of Education where both projects were presented with preliminary site plans and cost estimates for both sites. That meeting was an overview presentation both the Council and the Board of Education received a lot of feedback from the public and subsequently reflected on that feedback. The Council and Board of Education reached consensus that to the extent the synthetic turf field project with lights is going to move forward the preferred location would be the high school. Both the Council and the Board of Education heard loud and clear from the community that there were a number of issues that required resolution, financial in nature, technical in nature, engineering, geo-technical issues, and importantly they heard from the various abutters on West Avon Road and Sudbury Way about their concerns in particularly about what the possible increased use of the facility given the permanent lighting could mean to them and the impact on their properties. Having reflected on all of that, he advised the Council and they agreed that the method we needed to go through to flush all of that was design development. For both sites we had gone through a very preliminary design; his recommendation was to go through 100% design development and at the end of that process have a project that was permit ready should the decision to go forward to referendum be made and the referendum was successful.

The Council turned again to the Sub-Committee for the third time with a couple of changes: the membership of the Sub-Committee was expanded to include 7 regular members and 1 alternate including 2 abutters, one from Sudbury, another from West Avon Road, and a member of the Avon High School Booster Club. The Council, since they had been so successful in their prior activities, loaded them up with a pretty heavy charge. There were three elements, one was to meet a Town Council Policy requirement which requires the adoption of a Statement of Need prior to the construction for moving forward with a building project, it was approved back in 2014 by the Council and needed to be updated to reflect the change of site from Thompson Road to the High School. Two other main elements, assess and make a recommendation regarding the base bid and alternates, equipment amenities and site improvements including the infill and turf to be used. As discussed at the March 3, 2016 Town Council meeting the project will include at a minimum a new all-weather main multi-use turf field, track, and field lighting. He noted that for more background on the Council's discussion the March 3<sup>rd</sup> Council meeting minutes which are included on the Town's web site are a great place to go as a lot of time was spent talking about it at that meeting. The other primary part of the charge was to assess and make a recommendation regarding programming, operations, and utilization of the site including but not limited to hours of operation and the impact on the residents in the surrounding area will be considered. The Council approved that charge on April 7<sup>th</sup> and the Sub-Committee under Peter Ponziani's leadership proceeded to meet seven times from May until they completed their work on August 16<sup>th</sup>. On behalf of the Town Council, he thanked the Sub-Committee for all of their hard work. This was a lot of heavy lifting, a lot of detailed work was involved with this. He noted that this is not typically the way we proceed with projects, going for a 100% design development prior to having the project approved at referendum so this was the point where the heavy technical lifting in terms of the site and scheduling proposal were worked out. The Sub-Committee did a great job and should be commended. For many of the members it was their third tour working on this project. The core group had also worked on Thompson and the first try at the high school and together entailed nine meetings so with the seven involved with the last go round at the high school many of the members sat for 16 meetings and did a nice job. Now we have a platform that can provide for further discussion. He introduced Eric Roise, Landscape

Architect with BSC Group who was the technical consultant for the Sub-Committee. You may recall Luke McCoy with BSC Group who was with us for the first two rounds and subsequently left the firm. Eric is going to walk you through the base project and the options and cost estimates that the Sub-Committee has approved. Some of the high points include the type of artificial turf, the infill material that were selected by the Sub-Committee.

Eric Roise continued with the presentation. He noted that the recommended plan that he is going to talk about tonight is the recommended plan that the Sub-Committee vetted out through this process and approved and recommended to move forward with. We went through a number of meetings starting early summer and worked all the way through that to get that recommended scheme. He showed the existing site and the project that went forward that is recommended right now is redoing the whole area of the existing track. At one point that north field hockey field was discussed, when it came down to budget and the end of the project that was lowered on the low end of the priority list; it's still there, we have a cost to it, but cost wise the priority is getting the track and synthetic turf field done. He showed the recommended layout. He noted that part of the recommendation going forward is to provide buffering, both a planted buffer and a solid fence buffer along Sudbury and along West Avon Road. That planted buffer also extends all along the frontage of the school, not only in front of the track but in front of the existing field hockey field to the north. That buffer along West Avon Road is a planted buffer and not intended to be a full 100% opaque screen and you will still be able to see through that but not a full on view of the whole thing as you drive by. On the Sudbury side it will not be a 100% planted buffer, we will use as big trees and shrubs as we can going forward but there is also a solid fence six feet high along that border, mostly because of the neighbors' comments going through the process and to keep kids who are wandering onto the neighbor's property on the school property. He reviewed the project scope. We have alternates if bids come in low to replace the existing bleachers all together. He noted that the current PA system is a bull horn system the new system would be more of a designed, engineered PA system so the sound will be more controlled. He highlighted the base project alternates. Because of the existing track and existing site we are constrained between the existing bleachers and the parking lot and baseball field; that width of the track restricts what sports you can play inside the field: football, boys lacrosse, field hockey; girls lacrosse is less than the optimum width and soccer is at the minimum national federation width which is acceptable to play on and meets regulations but for those two sports any playoffs or big games would be played at a different spot. The lighting system we are proposing is one of the state of the art systems, very focused on the field, very efficient as far as where the light is put and not put.

One of the major things we did with the Sub-Committee was talked about the major materials being used on site: what your track surface is and what your turf system is, both are hundreds of thousands of dollars decisions. He reviewed the running track project scope; the mat is the middle of the road system and put on probably 95% of the tracks in the state. He reviewed the synthetic turf project scope which was discussed at length, a number of meetings that just talked about synthetic turf. A lot of folks are concerned about the crumb rubber, the material that is used in 90% of the systems, there are environmental concerns which have not been proven but there is a lot of federal government studying going on right now and hope to have answers by the end of the year. We came up with a system that combines a pad and a shorter knap turf system. If anytime in the future that crumb rubber is deemed environmentally unsound or a health hazard that infill can be vacuumed out of the field and put in whatever system they have decided on at

that point; it can be organic, sand, coated sand but adding that pad in allows you to do that without ripping out the whole field in the future. The coated crumb rubber material is not created for environmental reasons, but temperature reasons to keep the field temperature low. Every artificial turf field has a problem with the heat in the summer. He reviewed the athletic lighting project scope. These are not the systems that light up the whole neighborhood; the actual lenses in the lower right are computer designed to focus on the field and keep the light on the field; unless you stand right under the fixture you will not really see any glare. They are very user friendly, control them by clocks and the Athletic Director can control them by his cell phone. It is not NFL stadium filming lighting level, rather a normal high school lighting level. LED lighting systems are coming into the market and are another upcharge with a better buffering as far as focusing the lights on the fields; will not get the buy back for an LED lighting system. He reviewed the project budget for the recommended layout. He noted that in the upper left hand corner of the track a wall is being proposed so parking spaces will come out temporarily. The base budget is \$3,483,000 which includes a 15% contingency; at this point in the design process we can carry a 15% contingency all the way through. As we get the design plans more developed that will go down to 10% and would suggest holding that contingency through design and control that if we hit rock or something goes terribly wrong that is where the contingency money comes in and you do not have to go back and approve more money. We are redoing the whole track, whole field, all the field events, working right up against the baseball field, rebuilding a piece of the parking lot and replacing it, and also improving how pedestrians get in and out. He reviewed the alternates (options items budget). We have potentially a lot of new equipment so we need a storage building which is being proposed. He reviewed the budget summary.

The Town Manager commented on the cost and that those are construction and construction administration cost and does not include cost for bonding; most likely a project like this because of the cost would have to be bonded so on top of these you would have to include legal fees, rating agency presentations, referendum materials, conservatively another \$250,000 for those related costs.

The Town Manager the second major part of the Sub-Committee's charge was making recommendations with respect to the programming and usage. He recognized Tim Filon, AHS Athletic Director, Myles Altimus, Facilities Director for Board of Education, and Ruth Checko, Director of Parks and Recreation. The four of us spent a lot of time doing the leg work, looking at different scenarios that formed our final recommendation to the Sub-Committee that they approved with some minor revisions. He noted that the recommendation from the Sub-committee was not unanimous, it was a majority, but a few members were not in favor. The Board of Education Administrative Policy 7020 – Use of School Facilities governs the use of Board of Education buildings and grounds and used that as our framework when we thought through the governance of this facility. We identified three different user groups of which one is User Group A, your marquee night events including spirit week events, varsity games, high school football games, and felt most likely up to 15 nights events would be required per year to accommodate those uses. We also approved an additional 4 for a total of 19 nights to protect ourselves from upside risk. He learned a lot about scheduling for athletic events and CIAC conferences and the worst or best case scenario depending on how you look at it, if all of our teams make the playoffs we could conceivably require 19 night uses per year. He highlighted other uses under User Group A. Lights would stay on until 10:00 p.m. as it provides lighting for

safe egress for the site to clear out. He reviewed User Group B and noted that events would end earlier. He reviewed User Group C and would be available for their use as available. We look at about a dozen other communities that have these types of facilities to understand what land use restrictions their respective Planning and Zoning Commissions placed on the use of these facilities, how those restrictions are working. We looked at the lighting at Sperry Park and AMS Tennis Courts and any complaints which we have not received any and the usage patterns. The base bid, the options, the usage, the operations, and the Statement of Need completed the charge that was assigned to the Sub-Committee by the Council.

The Town Manager emphasized the importance of the expansion of the fields at Fisher Meadows. Many of you know that this project has a very long history and goes back to 2004 when funding was projected in the capital improvement plan for design for these additional seven playing fields. It was recommended in the 2007 Master Plan and construction documents were completed in 2011. The recreation infrastructure in Avon is unique. Most of our infrastructure, most recently the Library, has built out to accommodate what we refer to as full build out population projections and our recreation infrastructure has not caught up to that yet. The Director of Recreation and Parks looked at past demographic work that has been done, particularly in the 2007 Master Plan and the projections still call for seven to eight additional playing fields. Even if the facility at the High School should move forward, which no decision has been made yet to do that, if it were approved at referendum and were built, this project would still be needed. That concludes the presentation. He turned it back over to Chairman Zacchio.

Chairman Zacchio opened the floor to anyone who has questions. He had a question for the Sub-Committee regarding the use of coated crumb rubber and one of the concerns that we have had in the community since the start is the use of crumb rubber and there has been national attention about it and its possible link to health risks. Coated crumb rubber is different than that. He asked someone to explain how that is different and what other options we looked it and why coated crumb rubber is better. Kathy Zirolli added that there are several kinds of crumb rubber so what exactly are we talking about and how would it compare to surrounding towns as Simsbury just updated what theirs was. The Town Manager responded that at our joint meeting on December 7<sup>th</sup> we had the Director of the Farmington Valley Health District come out and speak to the crumb rubber issue generally but comments were really directed to the raw crumb rubber. Eric Roise responded that during our deliberations about what type of turf system we were going to go with we did talk about the various alternative infill systems. The traditional turf infill system which they call a second generation turf which is what you see on most fields today; that system is a 2.5" nap carpet with a combination 60/40 of crumb rubber and sand which goes directly on a gravel sub base and drains vertically into the drain system and gives you the all-weather properties of a synthetic turf system. That system has been used since the early 1990s and a lot of the concerns recently have been because of the crumb rubber and has gotten some bad press but there is no scientific data to back up the claims made against the crumb rubber. The EPA has been asked to do a study on crumb rubber and is ongoing with results expected in a year or two; they are looking at the health effects or any negative qualities of the bare crumb rubber. Crumb rubber is made from recycled tires which are ground up into pellet and along with sand provide traction and the resiliency needed for safety purposes on the turf. One of the big things with turf now is a head impact and making the design so that you are limiting concussions and limiting injuries. That crumb rubber has been studied extensively since 1990 when it came out for both health and environmental effects. One place he encourages

everyone to go to if they are interested in these issues is The Penn State web site; they have a clearing house of various studies done on crumb rubber and second generation style synthetic turf. Because of the issues and uncertainty behind crumb rubber as it is we also looked at the various different systems. All require a resilient pad put under the turf because you want to provide the resiliency for the head impact and injuries and provide a shallower depth turf and shallower depth of infill in the turf because the alternative infill systems are so expensive and under demand right now so to limit the quantity that you put in the field is important and why you put in a pad. The systems we looked at included sand; South Windsor is one field that put in all sand with a pad; sand is not preferred, lacrosse does not like sand as the ball goes dead so that was not considered. We also looked at Nike Grind, proprietary product and very hard to get because everybody wants it, it is made of ground up sneakers, made up from a number of different colors and looks terrible so this was not considered. Another alternative was organic infills, have been pushed forward in the last year and a half; Bristol is putting in two right now, Westchester County has a few, Greenwich County has a few, in all of the East Coast there are two fields that have been in for a few years in the Washington, D.C. area. Two major drawbacks to organic infill fields is that you have to keep 30% moisture content or it will dry up or lose your warranty which makes it difficult in the winter when you can't use your irrigation system and because they have moisture in them when the temperature goes down they are as hard as a rock. For that Thanksgiving game where you potentially have freezing temperatures the field might not be playable. It's not proven, has not been around as long, it grows weed, and being able to hold the moisture in the field to be able to hold the warranty. After all of that argument we came back and talked about coated infill, the SPR rubber that everyone is concerned about, coated usually with a food grade acrylic or magnesium product that is intended to encapsulate the crumb rubber. That encapsulation was not originally designed for the environmental issue, but for the temperature issue and to keep the fields cooler. However as the environmental issue has gone forward manufacturers have said we are encapsulating the negative qualities of the SPR crumb rubber and it is not escaping the field as it would be for traditional crumb rubber.

Houston Lowry questioned whether or not this encapsulation is going to last ten years; the real question is that you fail to discuss using virgin rubber which is of course a possibility so you do not have to use recycle tires and the issue with recycle tires is you do not know what was in the tire and it is whatever tire was on the lot that day. Virgin crumb rubber is another possibility but does not know what the cost delta is but we would not have the additional chemicals in it. Eric Roise responded that is another alternative we considered; it is very expensive; the advantages are that it comes in many different colors. One of the drawbacks is that it has the same makeup that recycled tire would have; the worry being contaminants on the tire that is so heavily processed to get it to that crumb. Mr. Lowry questioned the cost. Mr. Roise responded approximately \$250,000 for a field of this size. Mr. Lowry questioned this is only for the playing field and not the north field. Mr. Roise responded yes.

Kathy Zirolli questioned what coating they landed on. Mr. Roise responded the typical one is a magnesium based coating called cool fill; every manufacturer has their own proprietary coating so it depends on the bid and what we get back.

Kelly Jackson, 11 Michelle Lane, reported that she was on the Sub-Committee. She questioned the width of the fields and if there was a change. We had discussed the reason why there would not be a visitor's side so there would be run out for soccer and for girls' lacrosse and you just

stated that it would not be a preferred width even though we had taken out the visitor's stands. She referred to the plan from their last meeting where it was the preferred width to girls' lacrosse and soccer. She asked if there was a change from the last time they met.

Houston Lowry asked for point of order and if we have opened it up to the public for questions yet. Chairman Zacchio asked Ms. Jackson to wait until the Boards are done asking their questions.

Mr. Roise responded to Ms. Jackson's question. It was not changed; the soccer field is 195 feet wide, minimum high school size and not a preferred width for a playoff game even without the visitor's stand.

Mr. Lowry questioned if we know how long the coating on the rubber lasts. Mr. Roise responded that the coating lasts the life of the rubber. Mr. Lowry commented that the Town Manager mentioned that the Sub-Committee vote was not unanimous and asked what the division was and what the vote was. The Town Manager responded that the two abutters on Sudbury and West Avon Road voted against, primarily because of the number of night uses. Chairman Zacchio commented that he met with the abutters shortly after the vote and collected feedback about what their concerns were; some was around the number of nights proposed, especially during the week, the time the lights might be out, the height of the light poles, mostly around policy issues which are pick up as we move forward.

Mr. Lowry commented that we received in advance of that an inquiry regarding bathrooms, was that considered, what the resolution was and what the rationale was for the resolution. Mr. Roise responded that what we have provided in the design is a pad for port-a-potties; per the CT plumbing code you can provide port-a-potties for a fixed seating for a seasonal use and was the least expensive solution and that is what was provided. Mr. Lowry commented that it was decided on least expensive and what was the next notch up. Mr. Roise responded that would be building a building. Chairman Zacchio questioned if we would have the options to use the facilities and locker rooms as they do today. Mr. Putnam Lowry responded that he did not know, it was a good question. Mr. Roise commented that plumbing code you have to be within 350 feet. Mr. Zirolli commented that for the visiting teams it is an option but for guests that is what we are getting at.

Mr. Lowry questioned if there was any thought given to the idea of putting cameras on the top of these huge poles because coaches will look at us and say, "If we had only spent \$3,000 extra we would have a good camera system." Mr. Roise responded that they were not considered for the top of the light poles but we have considered putting them on the bleachers or around the site at a lower elevation and we will provide empty conduit so that wiring can be run in the future it need be. Mr. Lowry questioned the cost for putting cameras up, perhaps relatively less expensive if you do it all at once and more expensive if you wait for later. Mr. Roise responded that the idea is by putting in conduits you are not having to dig anything but just wire them up, but could not provide costs for cameras. Chairman Zacchio commented that most of the football programs have invested in end zone cameras that are portable; the Avon football families bought one two years ago and it telescopes up about thirty feet, comes with a camera and a recording device and connect it into the huddle program that they use for sending out to colleges or to see pay-by-play action. Most teams bring them but other sports the system that he has seen is above the goal

posts. Mr. Roise commented that he might have misunderstood; are we talking about security cameras. Mr. Lowry responded that not particularly security but for play analysis, recruiting, and that kind of stuff. Mr. Roise responded that right now the existing bleachers do not have a press box and make do with what they do for cameras; should the bleachers get replaced, there will be a press box, a filming platform on top of it, conduit running in, all the electrical connections in that press box and can setup for camera on that press box.

Mr. Lowry noted that on the east side of the field there really isn't room to put in a second set of bleachers because the field is too narrow and asked if that guess on his part is accurate. Mr. Roise responded that there is room for a small set of bleachers, 50-person portable bleacher which you can buy off the shelf anywhere and could probably fit three of them; the asphalt pad for future use should you want to use it for a custom bleacher and get approximately 75 seats in there. Mr. Lowry questioned if Mr. Roise knew what our usual visitor's attendance is. Mr. Roise responded that he did not know.

Mr. Lowry questioned if there was any thought given towards putting the artificial turf in the field hockey section as the primary and then flipping this as the secondary. He understands that field hockey really seems to like artificial turf and there are concerns about it so if people are using the field that they really like there would be less concern. Mr. Roise responded that always the concern with turf is the cost and you want to get as much use out of it as possible; the north field is undersized, shorter than it needs to be and is only sized appropriately for field hockey and you could not get the appropriate sized girls' lacrosse field in there. It was considered but you are going to get the most use out of it and makes the best use out of your existing infrastructure to put it in the track where shown.

Jackie Blea, Board of Education member, questioned that field hockey cannot be played on the football field. Mr. Roise responded that it can. Ms. Blea questioned that the only thing that cannot be played is soccer. Mr. Roise responded that soccer can be played but it is the minimum recommended size. National Federation of High Schools does most of the rules creating for high school level sports and the minimum recommended width is 195 feet and that is what we have; preferred width is 210 feet, when you get to an NCAA sized field it is 225 feet wide.

Kathy Zirolli, Board of Education member, clarified that because we won't have a preferred size soccer and girls' lacrosse will not be recommended to play playoff games. Mr. Roise responded that they can be played on there but it is up to the umpires and officiating when it gets to that level; it is not preferred. Ms. Zirolli added that it is not preferred so it is not necessarily likely. Her biggest concern that she understands from a priority perspective is that field hockey is at a greater disadvantage not playing on turf. She hears that it would be limited on that one field. She questioned that if we say that field hockey is going to be played on the other field because it will fit, how about practice time in terms of being able to practice there where it is currently being used by football; that is a significant concern. Mr. Roise responded that the field will be striped for five sports. Ms. Zirolli responded that she understands and it will be a school issue but significant enough issue that she would like it understood and raised because right now it is called the football field. That is a huge issue from Title 9 perspective and if we are not going to look at the field hockey field; which she is not sure she follows because if we go for a bonding right now the rates are wonderful. She stated that she does not like to throw a lot of money. They have other needs that she is thinking about from a Board of Education perspective like a

space issue for students' academics. But if we're talking about the football field she would like to change the name and make sure we are thinking about our field hockey team as well. Mr. Roise responded that field hockey will love this field and because you will have the lighting and bleachers everyone will want to play on that field and the idea is to give everybody the chance to play on it. As a dad, my kids play on unlit fields and have to get there before dark, he works late hours and does not get there very often; when you get the lights and people coming in the evening you get a lot more folks turning up for these games and the idea is to give everybody a chance to play on them.

Ms. Zirolli made a correction for policy and for the folks that thought the Board of Education has something to do with the bathroom situation, they have nothing to do with it, didn't discuss it, had no part of it and this is their first chance to have a conversation about the bathroom situation. She stated that it is Policy 1330. These are something new that you are talking about for a new use policy, etc. that have to be adjusted and changed.

Jay Spivak, Board of Education, commented that a lot of the people in the community are concerned about the time this whole process has taken and we heard earlier that the 2007 Master Plan pointed out that we needed two synthetic turf fields within Town and here we are years later and you look at our neighboring towns and they have them. He questioned that in terms of construction and referendum what is the timeline that we are looking at. The Town Manager responded that there is a long time to go. We have not discussed with either the Board of Finance or the Town Council any of the financial modeling; this is the first exposure to the work that the Sub-Committee has done. Typically from this point we need to have is consensus from the Board of Education that you are in favor of the project and want it to move forward, the Town Council has to do the same and then staff has to start working with our financial advisor to identify what the costs associated are going to be with bonding and legal costs, make decisions on whether or not we are going to capitalize those costs, get our debt models together and figure out what the impact on our debt service line item is going to be going forward. From a Charter perspective once the decision is made that we are comfortable with that debt load there is a whole Charter process that is initiated in terms of Board of Finance review, Special Town Meeting, and ultimately Town Referendum, a Town-wide mailer; all of that takes time. We have done initial estimates out and even if the decision were made to go forward with this project in November we are easily out to March or April for a referendum. Another important element to all of this and what the Council has always talked about is that this project would be a partnership: local funding, State funding, and money from local fundraisers. Unlike the Library Project, to use as an example, we do not have any commitments from the State or local fundraisers to offset the costs of this project; it is not what we had talked about when we initiated this project and if we wanted to go ahead without having any of those commitments in place and if we think that perhaps funding may be forthcoming from other sources we need to engage Bond Counsel early on to help us design a question that could go to referendum that would anticipate all of that. Best case scenario, if the green light were to go ahead in November you are looking at March or April for a referendum. Mr. Lowry questioned the construction time. Mr. Roise responded approximately 120 days, presumably not done during the winter; 90% of these projects are done between graduation and the first day of school or some offset of that window; something that can be discussed is if the school can live without their school over winter there is a significant savings that you could see by bidding it out for a project on that schedule but we do not anticipate that because school is in session.

Gary Mala, Superintendent of Schools, introduced himself. He questioned that because you are going to build a wall closest to the school, right now our student athletes access either going down a ramp to the practice field or down a staircase we put in a number of years. Help him visualize how the athletes get onto the field. Mr. Roise responded that the stairs will be moved over a little bit and widened out, the ramp that is going down now and we want to make it handicap accessible will be moved down approximately fifty feet and will still exist. Mr. Mala questioned if the storage building is sufficient enough to accommodate the non-fixed field equipment and the maintenance equipment if that is something to be pursued. Mr. Roise responded that it is adequately sized for the field equipment, not for the maintenance equipment and would not recommend storing such equipment near your athletic equipment. Mr. Mala questioned what the delta is if you just put in the electrical infrastructure for the lights; that has not been recommended but more for curiosity. Mr. Roise responded that the lights themselves are approximately \$350,000 all in, the conduit would be approximately \$20,000-\$25,000, but then do you put in the controls and the box that the controls would be in.

Mr. Spivak questioned the expected annual maintenance cost. Mr. Roise responded that they are not maintenance free but a lot less expensive than natural turf which is approximately \$27,000 per year to maintain. What they call for with a synthetic turf field is approximately \$7,000 per year, depending on the use you should groom it with the machine every 100 hours and your guys will be trained to do that before the project is over. Mr. Spivak questioned what it costs ten years from now for both the field and whatever timeframe the track would need to be replaced. Mr. Roise responded that the urethane track lasts approximately 20 years and needs to be resurfaced every five years and keep on top of it. Mr. Roise responded that the artificial turf field has a 12-year life span and approximately \$600,000 to redo it. He noted that they just redid Simsbury's artificial turf field. Chairman Zacchio questioned if Simsbury used encapsulated rubber. Mr. Roise responded yes; the same system that we are proposing.

Mr. Stokesbury, Town Council member, commented that two of his questions were just raised with impact on operating and capital budgets and concerns as we project forward. He questioned, having been involved in both baseball and track field programs for many years, he worries about the narrow space between them as he has seen many line drive foul balls hit the track and you mentioned no safety devices at all. Mr. Roise responded that is another reason why the visitors' bleachers were not put over there. He added that if you did something like that you would have to put in a significantly high safety netting system to really intercept those balls. Mr. Stokesbury questioned the risk of the people on the track. Mr. Roise responded it is a matter of how much you want to spend for what you want to block. Mr. Stokesbury commented that there is nothing in the plan. Mr. Roise responded no.

Ms. Blea questioned what is meant by lacrosse netting. Mr. Roise responded that lacrosse netting goes up inside the track and goes around the edges of the field at both ends and hooks around at both ends; lacrosse is a really hard ball and shooting hard for that crease when they are playing, that netting is intended to intercept those balls that miss the crease before they get someone on the track. The sides are open, it is more about cross shots when going for a goal.

#### **IV. COMMUNICATION FROM AUDIENCE**

Chairman Zacchio opened it up to the floor and he asked members of the public to state your name and address for the record.

Steve Muench, 34 Sudbury Way, commented that he has been in Town for 21 years, has taught at Avon Middle School for the last 18 years, he coached the girls' basketball team at the Middle School and the boys' baseball team at the Middle School when the budget allowed for that; he has umpired for over ten years and still does for the little league and Babe Ruth games. He thanked everybody for caring to come out tonight. He knows that there will be differences in opinion and respectfully we can come to the right decision for the Town; he likes seeing the student athletes here as well, it is a good education for them. He commented that sometimes their neighborhood takes a little heat for not supporting this totally as originally proposed. He noted that during his 21 years on Sudbury Way we have endeared two major expansions at the High School, two major expansions to Valley Community Baptist Church to their south and sewer line construction project that connected to the Avon High School to their east so while most of these construction projects involved (non-audible), residents of Sudbury Way supported all of these projects and endured many summers of construction noise from 7 AM to 3 PM to better the neighbors at Avon High School and Valley Community Baptist Church. Tonight's report by the Sub-committee on the turf and lighting goes beyond what a reasonable person would consider being a good neighbor looks like in return. Variances might not be needed for what you are proposing but it is to the point where there are variances almost on variances that existed at Avon High School. He does not know if we are rewriting our building code a little bit and not an expert in these areas but it is designed to protect all residents. When the Boards consider the Sub-Committee's proposal please consider the Town's needs not the wants; what is needed are more fields. Turf fields if proven to be safe to our children's health would provide more playable fields. Once the special equipment to maintain the field is purchased why not turf both football and he did not realize the field hockey field wasn't being considered which should be. He noted that Avon Middle School that has a very large field that is flat and fields between Thompson Brook School and Pine Grove School behind the tennis courts that lacrosse used to use, but fields that dry out, turf fields, more playing fields, are really what the Town needs. Lights become the issue because those monies could be better used to give us more turfed fields. He knows that a gentleman who sat in David Pena's seat years ago, Bill Shea, about twenty-five years ago voted to buy our street for about \$500,000. At that time it was a lot of money and for whatever reasons the Town Council voted that down and in hindsight that looks like a bad decision. He asked that you don't get shortsighted again and overlook the Thompson Road site. He hears the proposal tonight and he thinks that Thompson Road offers a more comprehensive, long-term approach in solving the Town's needs for more fields while providing more wants that many of you desire with the first class sports complex. He heard this \$3.5 million proposal which has port-a-potties and stuff skimmed out of it, the options kick it up to \$4 million, add in the north field hockey field you are at \$1.2 million, and add in the little fees you are at \$5.5 million. He does not have the original number proposed for Thompson Road but thought it was in the \$5 million range at that time and throws it back out. He knows the Board of Education needs to consider their budgets for operating and these incremental costs are going to creep in. He thinks your main charge quite often is academic programming, good for all students. You would like to think that all students play sports, but not all do. The budgets are always tight and these costs to operate this facility at Avon High School eat up some of the total budget we will

have much less programming. We have a much better track record he thinks with academic performance than managing our sports field. He referred to the baseball field at Avon Middle School which is totally overgrown and the back stop is dangerous because it collapsed from snow five years ago and it was a beautiful field. He mentioned that the field hockey coach that spoke at a meeting has excellent rationale on why they need that field turfed and even though they can play their games on the football field, but they would be practicing on grass. Thank you for the consideration of the issues brought up tonight.

Wendy Howard, Board of Education member, questioned what the material that the fence between Sudbury Way and the school is. Chairman Zacchio responded cedar.

John Carlson, 28 Sudbury Way, is disappointed in the field hockey field. Both of his daughters played field hockey and he witnessed the difference in the game when they went to play a game on a turf field versus on a non-turf field so unless they are going to have the ability to practice on a regular basis on that "football field" you are putting the team at a disadvantage to just play the games over there and not practice. He commented on seasonal use of port-o-potties allowed under State code. Mr. Roise responded that as a seasonal use you can use port-o-potties without an actual building with a septic connection. Mr. Carlson questioned that if this is proposed as it is here that have usage of the facility on all (inaudible) how is it seasonal use? Mr. Roise responded that you are not going to playing on it in December, January, or February. Mr. Carlson questioned where the storage building would be located on the property. Mr. Roise responded that it would be located adjacent to the concession and existing driveway. Mr. Carlson commented that his concern all the way along is that we made the wrong decision twenty years ago and are still paying the price for it and now shoehorning in something with a potential dangerous issue between the baseball field and the track, a soccer field that meets minimum standards and do not know if they will be able to play playoff games on and still do not have a field hockey field that is going to be turf. When all is said and done we are going to spend \$3.5 to \$5.5 million and still not have the right answer and that is a concern as a taxpayer; if we are going to spend money, let's spend it smartly. His biggest concern from the beginning has been the enforcement of policies, from when lights will go on, when the PA can and cannot be used. How is that going to be enforced? If I have a neighbor that is having a late night party I can walk over there and ask them to tone it down a bit. When the lights are left on beyond the respective time or somebody brings in another PA system, it is against policy and that night he is dealing with it. That is the issue that he is dealing with it; there is no ability to have a real time response to a violation of these policies. He asked the Council what is being brought forward here. Chairman Zacchio responded that is why we are here. We have gone through these iterations, we made a decision with where we put this field, we charged the Sub-Committee with a number of issues and concerns to solve for, they have solved for those, say for the items that were not unanimous and we would like it to be unanimous. We are here tonight to listen to what their recommendation to the Council and Board of Education are. The Council and the Board of Education have an opportunity, along with the comments from the public tonight, to make adjustments to that project. At the end of the day we need a shovel ready project. Without that we cannot move forward, we cannot apply for State funding for a grant, we cannot get a final cost as to what that project is. That project could be the base you saw here tonight or any combination of those alternates that the Council and Board of Education decide to move forward with. It could include the field hockey field, the extra stands, or extra items that are in the add alternates. That is the meeting tonight is about, hear the presentation as recommended by the

Sub-Committee that we appointed, to listen to the feedback, to ask our questions, and the next steps will be to react to those questions and concerns to come up with a final iteration of what we would like to move forward and would have to be agreed upon by the Council and the Board of Education. Then decide what the cost is and how to move forward with it.

Peter Hayes, 38 River Mead, is a lacrosse coach and we experience the field shortage issue in a very critical way as he knows some other teams do as well. We are short in fields. This does not solve that issue. When springtime does come we have maintenance issues, we have drainage issues, the fields cannot be played on, the management of the fields as we have had days when the fields have been closed on bright sunny days when thunderstorms were in the forecast and we need playability, we need our space when we need to use it. Right now this whole project is beautiful, he loves the idea but we still have a shortage of fields. We are asking for a space, fighting with different teams, the boys versus girls and it is frustrating. He thinks the Fisher Meadows project should be a little more front and center as it provides more playing space and we need that. He would like to see more emphasis put into creating the space and maintenance issues for the baseball field at Thompson Brook. We are short on fields. Chairman Zacchio commented that is one of the reasons why the Fisher Meadows piece was included in the presentation to remind us that if you look at our entire Town and our entire fields' needs this is just a component of it. We would like to address it similar to the way we addressed the Council when John Carlson led it, address the Library as a one and done concept. If we agree on a base project and have the means to move forward we would like to perhaps go to bond on a bigger package that takes care of athletic needs to our build out. It is a concept we used with the Library and never expect to make another addition to that. It was a concept we thought we did with our schools to the best extent we could and using the property that was available at the time, and it is a concept that we are trying to wrap into this Town Center Project with our Town buildings connected to them so we get that done all at one time. We haven't had any meaningful upgrades to athletic facilities in Recreation and Parks since 1977. Buckingham was a gift that came to us through the development process. The last time the Town engaged in a Recreation and Parks field assessment was 2007 when we did the Master Plan and we are trying to act on as much of that as we can at one time.

Natalie Grillo, 36 Old Kings Road, Hannah Deppe, 35 Westland Road, Paige Deppe, 35 Westland Road, Lauren Jeandell, 35 Buckingham, commented that they think the turf field is really important not just for the high school sports but all sports for the whole Town; youth sports use our fields, high school sports use our field; if we have a turf field it benefits them too. We play field hockey and the north field should be taken under higher consideration because it is used all the time in the fall and youth field hockey uses it; there are dirt patches on the field right now. In the spring, girls' lacrosse will practice on it when track has a meet; youth lacrosse uses the field too. We also need turf playing time so we have to go other fields; we have to get on a bus and go to Canton or Ethel Walker and practice on their fields because we do not have the space or turf to play on. These skills are really important because when we get to the State tournament and we face turf teams we don't stand a chance. The game has changed and that is why turf is important; it costs money to travel to other towns. Three of us are seniors and will never get the chance to use these fields but we care so much about the girls coming after us, that they have a chance to play on these fields and compete evenly with other towns that we are willing to advocate for this, not just for the field hockey team but for everybody. We have had problems with school spirit at our school and low morale and incorporating turf fields at night

games could boost everybody's spirits; even other people from the community can come out and enjoy it. We are pretty good; all of our sports teams are good. When it rains and we can't play because we can't practice on our field we are at a disadvantage to the turf teams because when we play the next day on their turf field they had a day of practice while we were in a gym. They noted that last year their quarter-final game was supposed to be played at home but it rained so we could not use our field and had to pay to go to Simsbury and use their field. If we only turf the football field there is the issue of distribution of who gets to practice on what field because football will probably take priority over us. When field hockey has a game at 3:45 p.m. football could practice on the north field and vice versa. We are consistently one of the best sports teams and we appreciate the chance to win a State championship at home.

Chip Walters, 56 Stony Corners Road, questioned one of the options with equipment that was necessary to the plan and some equipment he would have thought we already have a process to replace equipment like hurdles, pads that we already have. He is not sure why that stuff is in the plan for this project. Is that not something that we budget for replacement on a regular basis? Ms. Zirolli commented that she was confused as well by some of the equipment that was placed in there as she thought we already owned it. Mr. Roise responded that some of it you do own already, it is just updating it; you would have a turf field so you want to have turf goals on it. Ms. Zirolli commented that she understands that. Mr. Roise commented that as far as hurdles and everything else are a discretionary thing; if you do not believe they should be replaced at this time they don't need to be. The Sub-Committee going forward thought it was best to include all of that in the cost. Mr. Walters commented that there are six teams that are under consideration for use of the field from the high school, two soccer teams, two lacrosse teams, a field hockey team, and football team. Six teams, nineteen night games that the lights would be on and would there be expected equal use by all of the teams in that estimate of the usage. We said fifteen games and four optional which doesn't work out to even usage across the teams. Tim Filon, Avon High School Athletic Director, responded that who plays there, normally if you go around the state anywhere and you have lights, most football games are played on Friday nights. There are five home football games and a sixth if you get a State playoff game; we could play three at night and two on Saturdays. We would have our spirit week which is one game for field game, boys and girls soccer. We built a few more in if you do a senior night or you go to States; with the quarter-final game you have a choice of playing in the afternoon or evening based on if you have lights or not. All State games right now, quarter-final, are played on turf fields just because of the time of year so neutral sites, State championships are played in Middletown or New Britain, bigger facilities, and can be night games. Would each team get an equal amount? Probably not because there is a cap. Football would normally play on a Friday night. Lacrosse games would be played at 3:45 p.m. on turf. We are doing spirit week now a little differently than having lights in the spring but you could play one if you want or do the senior day game at night in the spring. It is not going to be exactly equal because of the number. Mr. Walters questioned that based on that answer the shared use of such a facility by all of the teams is probably not going to happen and created some (inaudible); thinking about that and the lights and how infrequent they will be used given being respectful to the community and the policies that are there. The lights seems to be an extravagance to this whole thing; we should really be talking about turfing fields and make that space available. You can practice any sport on a smaller field but cannot play the game on the smaller field; if it can be worked in there could be a better outcome if we focus on getting the base plan being about the fields and not being about the lights.

Kelly Jackson, 11 Michelle Lane, commented on the north field and is one of the Sub-Committee members that feels strongly that it is a priority with regards to the number of youth programs. Your original quote for the first meeting for that second field was \$656,500; at our last meeting the breakdown jumped up to \$948,000 though she feels that something was listed twice; and now tonight it is well over \$1 million for field two. As she looks at it line by line for every single item that was listed in our last meeting, how did it jump? Mr. Roise responded that the first version at \$656,500 was a traditional turf field and did not include the pad and the cool fill infill system so that got added in. Ms. Jackson commented that they had discussed that if they are going to do the second field for field hockey it could be on astro turf which is much less expensive than field turf and if that was the reason for the cost difference. Mr. Roise responded that it was the traditional turf system with sand and gravel and meant to be an all-purpose field. When you go to astro turf then all you are playing on it is field hockey. Ms. Jackson commented that it was \$656,500 for normal field turf. Mr. Roise commented that we then added the pad and cool fill infill and brought it up to \$948,000. Ms. Jackson commented that how it went up from our last meeting. She noted that Simsbury and Granby said that it is a 15% reduction on construction cost if you are doing both fields at the same time for that secondary field. Mr. Roise responded that is considered but varies widely. Ms. Jackson commented that it would be a percentage less expensive if we did the second field now while all of the equipment and everything is going on versus adding it on.

Susan Rebol, 23 Sudbury Way, asked for clarity on why the number is over \$1 million tonight. Mr. Roise responded that we are carrying a 15% contingency in there for unknown circumstances and design going forward; that is the second jump. The first jump was that the original field was a traditional long nap turf with sand and rubber on gravel. We added a pad and cool fill infill which was an upcharge to get that second field.

Pat Hennig, 32 Avonridge, commented that she has been around since Avon Soccer first started. She congratulated the girls for talking about collaborative fields, use during rain, etc. She is in favor of the lights and the high school program. She attends her granddaughters' events who play for Farmington and the facilities they travel to and they are so much greater than what we are providing our players; it is a different atmosphere, it is a community, it is a spirit, everybody comes out and cheers them. That doesn't happen at Fisher Meadows. She remembers when her husband used to cut the fields that the Town gave us to use for Avon Soccer so we have come a long way and appreciate it all. In addition to looking at the high school, we need to readdress Fisher Meadows for lacrosse and soccer. We are crawling over each other and it is not fair to the parents or kids. Maybe we need to expand a little of spending to look at the other project as well. Dr. O'Connor made a very good offer for the fields, the Town didn't take care of it but that's history and let's try to straighten it out for the kids. Chairman Zacchio responded that the Fisher Meadows project has been a conversation of the Council over the last couple of years in terms of how we finance that, bond or capital improvement. The reason we shared the program tonight is that those are construction documents and ready to go. A member of the public said that we need to execute it. Chairman Zacchio responded that we would need to go to referendum.

Mike Koval, 11 Sudbury Way, commented that a lot of people are agreeing that we are not solving what he thought was the key issue was to expand the number of fields. He recalled that the proposed fields at the Thompson Road site would include a turf and non-turf field, more

space for potential expansion, more turf fields in the future, more of a logical plan for the future and the cost was a little over \$5 million. Here we are looking at a base at \$3.4 million with additions over \$4 million with field hockey over \$5 million. We are shoehorning this into it and does not make sense for the future. He thinks that during the Sub-Committee meetings that he attended the majority of them, somebody had proposed the idea of the base bid not including the lights but including the field hockey field but it was shot down. The usage is a concern as a neighbor. We are already being generous in terms of how many nights we are proposing at this point. Simsbury and Farmington allow their fields for 12 night games per year. Avon would be above that at 15 plus 4 for playoff games. He thinks the idea of 6 nights of night games is excessive; the lights themselves seem like an extravagance; the idea of every weekday having lights on until 7:30 p.m. is not necessary. He commented for other parents that are his age, we have three kids who will within the next four years all be in the Pine Grove School and with recent budget cuts to the schools, the condition of Pine Grove School with overcrowding, lack of computer lab and music room, make shift rooms, rooms that do not have windows. These things concern parents. He questioned if the funding of this project going to affect the ability to fund more important things like our schools. Chairman Zacchio responded that answer is probably no. Any funding around this project, although we have not gotten there yet, would be bonded. Referendum bonded dollars are not used to pay operating costs. Operating costs come out of the annual budget that is presented by the Board of Education and Town Council. There is operating, capital which is the 1-year expense, and there is bonding which is what we borrow for. This would be within the bonding market. Mr. Carlson commented that you still have to pay the bonds. Chairman Zacchio responded that one of the reasons we are talking about bonding is because we have to (inaudible) within that bonding line in order to do that without additional taxing. Mr. Carlson commented that someone is still paying. Chairman Zacchio responded that we are paying for it every year.

Susan Reboul, 23 Sudbury Way, commented that what is confusing is that Gary Mala, Superintendent of Schools, sent out an e-mail about having a shortfall in operating expense. If we are talking about the CREC kids taking money out of the district, shortfalls from the State so when she hears a project that is mounting to this expense which will also increase the operating costs of the Board of Education every year because they have to maintain this and is not solving the problem until tonight that we are spending all of this money and not making people happy, if you are not paying your bills yet renovating your house, it is beginning to sound irresponsible on top of other things. She is starting to feel tremendous empathy for the girls who cannot use this other field. We are discussing formally in dollars and we have a whole section of girls who cannot benefit and that is alarming to her on top of the fact that the usage is out of control. We spent all of this time and energy not solving a problem, in addition I have our Superintendent telling me that I already can't pay the bills on our home but I want that fancy new kitchen. It doesn't add up the way she sees it. Love the field idea but you have get it to work where it makes sense that I would want to vote to bond it. She is happy to bond it when it is the best for everybody as opposed to a narrow subset. If that means no lights and more fields and we can pay our bills then she is all for with regulation on usage which is not what she saw tonight. Chairman Zacchio responded that respectfully with the field hockey field they can use this; they are advocating so they have two fields and have the field that they would be able to use even more. They did not say that the field hockey field and the girls would never be able to use this field. Ms. Reboul commented that they are not going to gain the benefit of the football team and they have articulated that and to try to defend that and say yes; that group is telling us is not

going to be the same. Chairman Zacchio responded that the football team, boys' and girls' soccer teams, boys' and girls' lacrosse teams and the field hockey team could use that field. The field hockey field would be specifically for the field hockey team and we could decide to do both and Fisher Meadows in one bond and it still wouldn't make any difference in terms of what you're talking about for a shortfall in operating dollars that the State of Connecticut has footed to us; they are two separate subjects. Ms. Reboul commented that it is hard with these two messages, let's spend more, that the sky is falling and Pine Grove School is tight. I have to rethink as I head to vote for bonding what makes the most sense and I have heard more tonight than I guess I evenly realized.

Jim Blaha, 16 Fenwick Drive, thinks this has been awesome conversations all around and thank you everybody for volunteering your time. He is a youth girls' lacrosse coach and his daughters, who are here tonight, play both field hockey and lacrosse so he hears the pains in the conversations. Being a business person, you have to talk about root cause and what we are solving for. The first thing he heard tonight was more fields. The current solution logically does not solve for more fields. Girls' lacrosse cannot even play on them and does not know why we would go down that path. The Thompson Road site seems logical. He agrees with all of the sentiment here tonight and Thompson Road needs to be revisited. Chairman Zacchio responded that we can consider that; one of the conversations we had when going through that process that site even at that dollar amount takes away the opportunity cost of that land and what we could use that land for in the future. There is no infrastructure there that is the additional cost and for the \$5.1 million it was you get one field and a grass field in the back but we could put two grass fields there with our Department of Public Works for a couple hundred thousand dollars. At the end of the day the recommendation to move it back to the high school solved a problem at the high school, predominantly for the size and the lot and number of field usage you could get at the high school. Today you do not get the same use that a turf field would give you at the high school and it does solve that problem but it does not solve the global problem of the Fisher Meadows expansion or other fields but that is certainly within our purview. Tonight's discussion was about what the Sub-Committee has recommended based on the charge that the Town Council and the Board of Education provided them.

Sara Roberson, 24 Sudbury Way, commented that she was on the Sub-Committee and is very pleased that the Town Manager and Chairman Zacchio have acknowledged that the neighbors did not agree or were not in support, rather dissenting voters for a number of reasons. Part of that was the additional field hockey field and did not feel that lights were more important than having a second field. She noted that it was brought to our attention that there was a need for fields and turfing two fields, as Mr. Roise pointed to us a number of times at the Sub-Committee meetings, provided for more and more use within the community. There were comments made tonight about the Middle School fields and why we don't turf those fields before we go putting lights in. Lights have always been a key issue and we have been very up front about that, we have been very up front about the usage, we have been very good neighbors, we want to continue to be good neighbors, we love our Town, we have supported it for 20+ years yet we are not benefiting the whole Town. We are looking at a very small party. She thinks we would be better served speaking to the additional need of fields and usage. She would love to see Fisher Meadows have what was intended for it for many years. She would love to see the Middle School see turf. Turf was never the issue for your neighbors at Sudbury Way. You could have had turf ten years ago and that needs to end here; it was never an issue for us. What was an issue

was the fact that we asked for reasonable partnership being neighbors with you. Chairman Zacchio has kindly taken an effort to hear the neighbors on Sudbury Way and West Avon Road and both did not vote for this. We are good neighbors, we do love the Town. We just think there is a better way to accomplish the goal for more fields and good things for our students. Thank you.

Chip Walters, 56 Stony Corners Road, asked if we could put to bed what teams cannot play on what fields under what conditions. He questioned that with a turf field on the south field there are issues with State playoff games but any other game is doable for all six teams. Mr. Filon responded yes; most high schools will not let you play a State final on a field like this. Mr. Walters commented that there was confusion about lacrosse playing on that field. Mr. Filon responded that they should be allowed to as he has been to stadiums with the same size field and play State quarter-final games.

Jim Stapleton, 45 Zachary Drive, reported that he is Treasurer of the High School Booster Club. He read a statement that Susan Rietano Davey drafted and asked him to share with the group. He noted that she is President of the Booster Club. "The proposed improvements to the school's existing facilities are long overdue and the installation will accomplish four important goals: to make our facilities more competitive and consistent with virtually all other schools in our conference and our geography; to better equip our athletes at all levels; to develop their skills to the highest degree; to improve access to practice and game field time and to build community both among the Avon High School students and within the Town of Avon at large and that we encourage that this proposal be pursued." That is what is most important to the Booster Club; that whatever the resolution is it moves forward.

Jackie Blea, Board of Education member, questioned where the port-o-potties will be located, who cleans them, and what budget does that come out of. Mr. Roise responded that there is one port-o-potty out there right now. Chairman Zacchio commented that it is located on the northwest corner. Mr. Roise commented that the port-o-potty pad will be in the lower left corner as illustrated on the drawing, at the main entry that goes in toward the concession and bleachers closest to West Avon Road. There was discussion about putting out back near the baseball field but the truck could not get back there so it had to be near the road for easier access. Ms. Blea questioned how many port-o-potties there will be. Mr. Roise responded that it could be four or six. Ms. Blea questioned what budget the upkeep comes out of. Ruth Checko, Director of Recreation and Parks, responded that the Recreation and Parks Department has placed port-o-potties at all of the sites be it Town or School fields for community and high school use because we share all of the fields and my department pays the bill and they are serviced and cleaned by the contracted carrier. Chairman Zacchio commented that respectfully we could solve for that if they were going to be able to use a school facility but that might change based on the feet from location; that is solvable. Ms. Checko commented that if we traditionally put one port-o-potty at a site and we know there is a big event coming up we will order more and bill the users, maybe soccer or lacrosse for the their tournaments, so the Town does not pay for added units.

Jackie Blea, Board of Education member, questioned how much it costs to rent the lights for football spirit week. Mr. Stapleton responded that the Booster Club pays for it and it is approximately \$3,500 for the week.

Wendy Howard, Board of Education member, questioned if there will be six to eight port-potties at all times. Mr. Roise responded only for big events. Ms. Howard spoke to Mr. Carlson's question about who is going to stop some group from coming in with a PA system and from shutting off the lights and calling Mr. Mala. She questioned if the police can control that and have access to turn off the lights. Chairman Zacchio responded that he would expect so but should be one of the items that we solve for. He added that one of the things he heard when he met with the neighbors is accountability and how you tie that to someone who breaks the rules. It sounds like we are able to turn the lights off remotely by phone. John Carlson, commented that the reason he is so passionate about that is that when a call has gone into the Police Department before the answer came back, talk to the school department tomorrow. We are dealing with it tonight. If the lights are on at night, who is he going to call? That is the real fine issue we are dealing with. Chairman Zacchio commented that clearly with a new program we need to figure out logistically how it will work. Ms. Howard commented that there has not been an issue at the tennis courts.

Terry Walters, 56 Stony Corners Road, coached girls' lacrosse for four years, the rec league, seeing my daughter go through that and through the field hockey program and that north field at Avon High School spends a lot of time where it cannot be used at all. They had lacrosse seasons where we had not gotten out of the gym before their first game. It is not a matter of more fields, but of more usage and it makes that north field essential. It is ripped up, very difficult to maintain and very difficult to keep open. Our girls' of all ages use that field. This year we have a record number of girls that have gone out for the field hockey team, 60 girls; our program is run every single year. As a lacrosse player herself and a fan of Avon sports the sports that we are talking about for that multi-use field; the kids are running on that main turf. You can play lacrosse and run on the grass but you cannot play field hockey and have that ball fall in the grass. It is no longer equipment of the game. She never played the sport, she is watching it and was there today; there are days you cannot even see the ball because it is deep in the grass. As parents we spend a lot of money for our kids to learn this game through clubs outside of the school and they do not benefit if we cannot play on that turf every single day the practice that sport. Our kids are putting a lot of time and effort into this and we need the field. All ages, those girls needs more playing time on turf. We need to get our kids the equipment to play the game.

Sara Roberson, 24 Sudbury Way, echoed something that Mr. Carlson said. She commented that we need to have reasonable policies and procedures in place; it is about being accountable. In business you are accountable to your employees, clients, to your Town when you have to pay your taxes, pay your bills, utilities. She cannot say strongly enough how important it is to the neighbors, West Avon Road and Sudbury, that should these lights stay on, should there be problems with people bringing in PA systems that are not approved, that there is an immediate accountable remedy and not something that we all say, we'll deal with it. We would like it in writing and we would like the action to be taken as quickly as possible and within a timeframe that it can be handled. She gave an example. She called Gary Mala about the lights staying on 24/7 for a period of time at the high school; she does not think anybody was aware that the lights had tripped. Gary got on it and he took care of it; it took about three days and he did a great job. The lights in the gym were staying on 24/7, he took care of it and he was great. He called him again months later about the lights staying on in the parking lot; he was great and within 24-48 hours the issue was remedied. We do not have that luxury should this other thing happen. If we

can put something in writing that there is immediate accountability and an action. She found Gary to be very responsible and receptive as quickly as he could be. She called him back later because the lights were staying on until 11:00 p.m. and asked if we could turn them off at 10:30 or 10:00 p.m. Gary looked into it, got back to her within a day and said that custodians are there and finish work at 10:30 p.m. and need the pedestrian lights and she said that makes perfect sense. We are reasonable, we understand that. We are just asking for reasonable policies and procedures to be put in writing and hold those people accountable.

Mike Witzleb, 5 Sudbury Way, questioned the potential intended use for User Groups and B and C. We have a lot of athletic groups that are trying to find the appropriate practice time as well as competition time but there was specific comment relative to User Group (inaudible). He questioned if there was any comment with what we are anticipating what groups and the amount of utilization of the facilities relative to that. Ms. Checko responded that as far as community use we are thinking football, soccer, we can split the field in various ways, quarter it, half it, overlay practices, get as much practice time on it as we could during the week but it is up to the organizations. Mr. Witzleb commented that relative to that it sounds like there is almost the intention of a level of professional usage which might exacerbate the wear and tear of the field which is a concern. He commented on the \$600,000 replacement cost after twelve years if we have additional community groups using it on a professional basis and if that is a consideration for our athletic teams and our little league who use that field and maintain its longevity. Chairman Zacchio responded that when that first came up, the ten to twelve year recycle time was based on its highest utilization like in the south when it is being used every day for twelve months out of the year. He does not think that we would run into that issue but to Ms. Checko's point those youth groups would only be able to utilize them based off the policy that we set in terms of time and frequency. The Sub-Committee has made a recommendation, one that we have heard from the group that they would like to see some adjustment and within our purview to make that determination and come back with something responsive. Mr. Witzleb questioned where those groups are currently practicing or playing and does this fulfill a need or is this more of a want to play on the turf. Ms. Checko responded that it would be easier to answer where they aren't playing; they are practicing and playing games everywhere. We have put fields in spots where it used to be called the green space; every school, Alsop Meadows, we have soccer fields in outfields of softball fields. We are crunching out the softball players, both girls and men's leagues, because we are taking their outfields in the fall. She cannot think of another spot where she can squeeze another field. Mr. Witzleb commented that we are turning the football field into more of not a high school facility but a potential commercialized facility for all of these external User Group B and C which becomes a change in the intent of the field. Chairman Zacchio responded that User Group A is high school and has first scheduling priority, User Group B is the Town, and User Group C is probably never going to happen but is in there as a you could use it for other non-profits but wouldn't anticipate a lot of that use.

Rich Rogean, 44 Sarah Drive, commented that all the youth programs throughout the Town are extremely hard pressed for space, everything is maxed out; lacrosse and soccer at times have to rent space from Avon Old Farms Schools for practice and play time. There has been a plan for seven additional multi-purpose fields in north Fisher for a number of years, is all ready to go but it has never gone to a referendum. He does not know why but perhaps you might want to consider it as part of this package or a secondary referendum at the same time to resolve the tremendous capacity problems that we have. You have admitted that we haven't built anything

in a long time and the population has doubled. Chairman Zacchio responded that it hasn't quite doubled but we are in need of more fields in addition to just this, no doubt.

Susan Reboul, 23 Sudbury Way, questioned what is next. This is what a Sub-Committee suggested. Is this it? What are the steps beyond this as it relates to any changes to this proposal? Chairman Zacchio responded no, this is not it and why we are having this meeting. He added that we are here to hear the presentation of what the Sub-Committee recommended. We allowed the Board of Education and Town Council to ask questions. We accepted feedback from the community to hear your ideas and what you think about the project. The next steps will be for us to come up with a final recommendation that the Council will choose is responsive to what we are hearing and to what the needs are. We are then going to ask the Board of Education for their feedback on that plan. If we all agree we will have a project and will then determine if, how and when to move forward with. The Sub-Committee has provided us a platform that solves a lot of the issues that we asked them to solve and have left a few that we still want to address before we come to a final plan. A member of the public questioned the timeline for that. Chairman Zacchio responded that he was sketching one and following the Town Manager's timeline you could theoretically have a final plan in place with final figures and cost by the end of the year. Ms. Reboul questioned if you project a town meeting to the public or when it will come back to the public. Chairman Zacchio responded that all of that would be done in public meetings. If we get to that point and decide to move forward with it we would have to put together a mailing that goes out to the entire Town, you have to schedule a referendum, we have a Town Meeting to discuss the project and its cost; the Board of Finance gets involved to supply us with the tax impact statement of how that looks within our bigger financial picture. Assuming there are other funding mechanisms that may change that timing because we have always anticipated some contribution from the State of Connecticut as other communities have received as well as some private fundraising that showed some interest in helping with some of the add alternates. Eventually if it goes to referendum it comes back to a meeting like this, a final presentation with final costs and a tax impact statement and people go vote on it. A member of the public asked if we pick a target date and work to it. Chairman Zacchio responded that is what we are working on. We got this in as fast as we could after the Sub-Committee finished with their recommendations so we could start moving forward. He would expect that the Council is ready to hear and give the Town Manager and his staff a charge to put all of the feedback together and come up with a final recommendation that they feel is receptive to what we are hearing, have the Council weigh in on it and have the Board of Education weight in on it.

Ms. Reboul questioned when it goes before Planning and Zoning. The Town Manager responded that as far as the Planning and Zoning process, we have gone through 100% Design Development, we had internal staff review of the project as proposed; if there are any modifications to the site plan we will go through the same internal process. Prior to referendum there is a referral to Planning and Zoning referred to as an 8-24 Referral to ensure that there is compliance with the underlying Plan of Conservation and Development. The permitting, the special permit is post-referendum but what is different with this project is that we are solving for those issues on the front hand. Chairman Zacchio commented that we normally do not do all of this for a project, rather after it has been through a referendum but because of the impacts to your neighborhood and size of the project we decided to go at this in a different way and include these kinds of meetings to come up with a project that we all felt was good before we went forward with it. Ms. Reboul questioned if we would see this on a Planning and Zoning agenda prior to

referendum. The Town Manager responded that you would see it for an 8-24 Referral prior to referendum but the special permit that would deal with the specifics about the use would be on a post-referendum basis assuming the project was approved. He added that this is the same process overall that we used for the Library but the difference in this case is that we are solving for so much on a pre-referendum basis, 100% Design and Development so that the project is permit ready.

Chairman Zacchio closed down the comment section from the audience and opened the floor back up to the Boards.

Jay Spivak, Board of Education member, commented that he went back and read the charge and minutes from the Sub-Committee and it sounds like if the proposal was to turf both fields and not include the lighting it might have been unanimous from the Sub-Committee to approve and something that we should consider. He questioned the cost for the lights. Mr. Roise responded approximately \$350,000 plus 15% contingency. Chairman Zacchio commented that the contingency is there if you run into a problem and you need it; we only bond for what we spend. He added that when he sat with the neighborhood their biggest concern was around the lighting and policy that goes along with it and there is some ground there for us to close that gap.

Kathy Zirolli, Board of Education member, commented that she had significant concerns which she relayed about but if we just do the “football field” she will be a stickler about what our policy is for usage and working closely with Tim Filon to understand that Title 9 is relevant and it is not going to be called the football field. She thinks if we can do the two fields, is what she is hearing, and would rather go that avenue. She is very appreciative of the change in fill.

Debra Chute, Board of Education member, commented that she appreciates all of the comments and it helps her to understand this project a bit better. Her biggest concern is the safety of the children and when Mr. Stokesbury mentioned something that he has experienced of balls coming onto the track because we would be so close to the baseball field and should consider addressing that before that happens. She is very much a proponent of having it at the high school because she likes the morale build and convenience of location and kids walking out and being able to participate. She does see that it feels like we are sticking ourselves in a shoehorn; are we just trying to make it work because we really like that idea. She does not want the girls to suffer; their needs are not being met with them not having the north field and she was shocked that was even taken off the plan and thought it was a given. She heard that the size of the north field if we turf it can only accommodate that one sport. She questioned if there was no way to expand that area so we can get more use out of it. Chairman Zacchio responded that we have a variance. Ms. Chute commented that the north field is a must and should not be taken off the table; it has to be provided for these students and because so many other teams outside the school leagues use these fields that it has to be part of the plan. She wants us to think ahead that we don't look back on this project and that this was pointed out and we neglected it. She wants to make sure that we are definitely considering all of these problems so that we look back proudly on this project and the Town does feel confident when they vote and that they are excited about it. Chairman Zacchio responded that for sure we did not remove the north field; it was just the base project in which we charged the Sub-Committee with to include main field, track, and lights; beyond that everything is an add alternate. We needed to narrow their scope and why it is still on; it was never off the project, it is within the site and there as an add alternate.

Houston Lowry, Board of Education Chairman, commented that while he originally voted to have this at the high school because he understands the people's concerns, spirit issue, and all of that stuff, he is concerned that everything is so tight on the high school site that a little change in the delta is going to make it unworkable and worried that the shoe horn is too tight. He has to go back and think of in his mind, which other members of the Board may not want to do, is whether or not it makes more sense to put it on Thompson Road because he is worried that we are in effect over utilizing the site. We talk about playing fields and the idea of making turf is we are increasing playing time which has the net effect of increasing playing fields virtually speaking. It sounds like the need is so great that it may not be able to fit on a high school footprint which is so tight right now with little spare room and if we ever need to do another addition it is not possible. He is letting people know what he is thinking so that they can react and straighten him up when they have a full fledged meeting. Chairman Zacchio asked Mr. Roise to respond in terms of if shoehorning it is the right way for us to be thinking about that. Are we trying to fit something that is not common around other school districts or other pieces of property? Mr. Roise responded that it is rare in their experience to find a school that has the room to not be shoehorned. He added that it is tight; you do not have a lot of room to expand on that school property, every square foot is programmed already with something. Mr. Lowry commented that was said by our last architect that there is no more room. His concern is that if we are talking about a 20 foot size in terms of increasing the width we cannot do it. Are we relegating ourselves to a Chevy when we could go to Thompson Road and not build necessarily a Cadillac but something in between so it is a more robust solution? As a design expert do you have something you would care to tell us about that? Mr. Roise responded that as a separate site that is off site from the high school there is a lot more infrastructure that you are going to be duplicating at that site that you are still going to have at the high school. For example, the track probably wants to stay at the high school. If you weren't trying to fit a field inside that track you would have all of the room you need; if it is just football you are playing inside that track you have all of the room you need but if you are trying to fit all the different sports in there and get a real multi-purpose use which takes the best advantage of your bleachers, lighting, parking lot, and all of the utilities you have there. You are saving money by putting it in one spot and there is definitely something to be said for it's at the high school. That said, you will have a more generous facility with a lot more room at Thompson Road but you will be duplicating use. Ms. Zirolli commented that you will be adding transportation costs. Chairman Zacchio commented that we continue to scratch the surface of the road and access with the dollars that we were talking about and one of the reasons that the Council decided not to pursue that site with the opportunity cost of that land and frankly may have to put another school there someday. Ms. Howard commented plus we still need to maintain the high school and maintain an additional property.

Chairman Zacchio asked the Town Manager about next steps, incorporate what we have heard and come up with what we believe the base project should be. Part of that conversation has to be affordability and what we as the two groups would put before the Town and say we believe in this and we think this is a good spend. The Town Manager responded that he really needs to understand is what the scope is, do we want to add the second field to the north because it has a pretty significant impact on the overall cost of the project and will have a material impact on the bonding projections. Mr. Lowry commented that he thinks the Board of Education is leaning in that direction with the two fields. Ms. Zirolli commented that the second field is a priority over the lights. Chairman Zacchio commented that you are talking about \$300,000 in lights and \$1.2

million on a field and those are not mutually exclusive; it is apples and oranges. Mr. Lowry responded that the general feel is however you slice or dice minor additions the inclination is to say that the north field is an important thing. Mrs. Roell commented yes, for community support.

The Town Manager commented that it is the base project which would include the multi-purpose field turfed, not "football" field, the track, the lighting, and turfing the field hockey field to the north. He questioned if there were any other options that should be included. Debra Chute, Board of Education member, has questions about the lights. The Town Manager commented that he thinks you need to include the storage building because we will be buying this additional equipment with no place to put it. Mr. Lowry commented that those minor additions of approximately \$100,000 are not material for this. He questioned if we want to spend \$500,000 for new bleachers. Mrs. Roell commented that we have gotten a lot of grief since we took down the tower and do not have a press box. She questioned if we spend \$4 million and not have a press box. Chairman Zacchio asked the Town Manager to work with Tim Filon and Ruth Checko, come together with what you are hearing here, provide us with what you believe the base project should be that is responsive to the comments you are hearing from both the Boards and the public. Much of what the Sub-Committee has recommended is what we are talking about. Ms. Howard asked if we are talking about the bleachers too. Chairman Zacchio responded yes. He asked that Tim Filon as the representative from the high school, Ruth from a Town perspective, and the Town Manager to put together what that looks like and feels like for us so we can mull on the dollars. Mrs. Roell commented that you will get storage under the bleachers which provides additional space. Mr. Roise responded that it is not weather proof space. Chairman Zacchio asked the Town Manager to think about what changes you would recommend to the lights use policy that would be responsive to what the concerns are. Ms. Zirolli responded that she agreed; community buy in will go a long way if we do these changes. Chairman Zacchio commented that we get feedback after the first semester, second semester, and can revisit use policy of lights down the road should they turn out to be a hindrance or turn out to be not an issue. Ms. Howard asked how the Police Department cannot be responding to complaints. Chairman Zacchio responded that he does not have the specifics on that.

The Town Manager commented that we will work on the scope and revise the use policy. We have always talked about this as being a partnership with a couple of different funding sources. If the Boards are feeling like we want to have a faster cadence towards a possible referendum then he thinks we need to have the Bond Counsel come in and talk about how we can achieve that given the fact that we do not have any commitments or cash in hand from those sources. Chairman Zacchio agreed and that now has to be part of the equation as we upscale the project and think about two fields we have to have the reality of the finances for us to bounce off of to say okay that would be nice but that will have to be put off for two years and we will do this part first and that part second and do it in phases. We need to go to referendum and get it passed; the finances are going to be the real issue.

Gary Mala, Superintendent of Schools, questioned if the private funding source not a reality; at the beginning of the project they presented to you. Chairman Zacchio responded that he thinks it is still alive. He added that the issue we are usually facing is what is the project, what are the costs, and what is the Town willing to spend on that project, and what is the remainder and how do those other sources become reality. Those other sources become private fundraising and/or

going to the State and knocking on our legislator's door which we have already been doing but we know the state of the State from the Bond Commission perspective. The Bond Commission will meet again and somebody will get money and he says why not us so we need a project in order to sit in front of legislators and say we need money; everybody else is getting it for this. The Town Manager commented that in terms of the Bond Commission we also need to keep in mind that it is unlikely any of that funding will be available until the end of next session because it has to be approved during the next General Session in May or June of next year so that has a pretty significant impact on the scheduling. Mr. Lowry would guess that August 2018 would be the earliest this could happen.

Chairman Zacchio commented that once we settle on a project scope and we have real dollars the finances become the focus and that bright light is going to be on what those costs. We need to be worried about the scope in terms of what we can pass. Ms. Howard questioned if there is an opportunity for some sort of bricks or similar that people can buy. Chairman Zacchio responded yes and those have been successful before. He noted that with the Library project it was \$8.5 million, the referendum language included that the Town would bond up to and not to exceed \$7 million and \$1 million was already given to us by the State Library Board; Mark Nolan who was the fundraising Chair came and said that they would raise another \$500,000. We ran into a bit of a snag with that because the Bond Commission was not going to give us the \$1 million. He had to talk to Lisa Moody at the time and talk her into giving us the \$1 million that the State Library had already promised us because we had already gone to referendum. Typically you go to referendum with that whole scope so that you can borrow up to a certain number so we need to have those figures. The timing question is tricky because first it is scope of project and it is exactly what we want to build and then it is cost and how much the Town want to be able to spend and that involves the Bond Counsel to be able to say what we can afford, what the tax impact is, the Board of Finance has to review it, and is the remainder achievable. Our next steps are to determine what our project is and balance it with those costs because we may come back together as a group and say that we would love to do all of this but there is a cost that is prohibitive at this point, we are going to scale back to this and go forward with that to get that final number. We need to get to that final number before we can move forward and that is why this meeting was so important. Ms. Chute questioned if you had a number in mind when you started this project or a goal that you were thinking you could work within. Chairman Zacchio responded that working backwards at a \$3.5 million, \$500,000 in fundraising, \$1 million from the State, and \$2 million from a Bond perspective. Each year we have built a little more capacity because we have not borrowed since the Library. We are pretty aggressive about paying off our debt but we are using those dollars to offset our capital right now so that capital budget will take a hit when we go to borrow because those dollars will go back from capital to debt service where it is going to pay the mortgage so there is a trade-off. A Board of Education member asked how much capacity we have to bond. Chairman Zacchio responded that is why we need the Bond Counsel to come in and talk with us about. It is not just capacity, it is how capacity we have to bond without influencing the tax rate. The Town Manager commented that there is a shift that is occurring between capital and debt service. The last couple of years we have had significant declines of debt service as it has been paid off. We are not going to experience the same declines in the future so it will start leveling out but as we have had the declines it has gone to capital. Chairman Zacchio commented that debt service can only be used for capital and not the operating budget. Mr. Stokesbury commented that we have used it for a long lived asset of paving roads and we have more roads to pave; that issue is not going away. Chairman Zacchio

commented that there is a balance in how much we can borrow without significant tax impact and that changes the conversation. The Town Manager commented that we have to put it in the broader context of other projects that we know are coming. In terms of large capital projects, there has been a lot of discussion about a new fire station in the northwest area of Town but importantly the Old Farms Road Project that we have talked about for decades has recently passed an important milestone and we are beginning to dial the cost through the Design Development process of improving the road in place and looking at the north/south section from Thompson Road, around the corner at Scoville. The cost could be upwards of \$10 million net of State funding so that will have to be a bonded project and could hit in the next three years or so. Chairman Zacchio commented that we have to think about what we can afford to do reasonably. The Town Manager commented that in the meantime State aid is going to decline. Chairman Zacchio responded probably true, but the Bond Commission will eventually meet again and someone is going to get money and why not us. Avon has been in line, we have not gotten a lot of support, we need it, and we need to have a project ready to put in front of that group to say we need support for this.

**V. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

**Attest:**

**Ann L. Dearstyne, Town Clerk**

# Avon High School Synthetic Turf Field Project

## Fisher Meadows Field Expansion Project

September 22, 2016

### AHS Synthetic Turf Field: The Charge

- **April 2016**—The Town Council appointed a 8 member committee with the following **charge**:
  - Proceed to design development stage of planning and develop cost estimate for a synthetic turf field and related improvements at the Avon High School;
  - Assess and recommend a base bid and alternates, amenities, and site improvements. **At minimum** a new all-weather main multi-use synthetic turf field, a track, and athletic lighting;
  - Assess and recommend programming, operations and utilization of the site with consideration given to the impact on residents in surrounding areas, and;
  - Present a final proposal, including cost, and an updated statement of need to the Town Council and the Board of Education.



## RECOMMENDED LAYOUT – Project Scope

### Base Project:

1. 8 lane track and straight
2. Synthetic turf interior field
3. Existing bleachers to remain
4. Field events, walks and driveways
5. No visitor side accommodations
6. Entry and retaining walls NE
7. New security fence North and East only
8. Athletic lighting
9. Pedestrian lighting
10. Planted buffers & fence at property line (south)
11. Planted buffer at West Avon Road (full property frontage)
12. Maintenance equipment
13. LAX safety netting, ends only
14. Public address system



### Base Project Alternates

1. – Bleachers, press box, (structural bleacher)
2. – Storage building
3. – Non-fixed field equipment (hurdles, pads, goals, etc.)
4. – Turf north field hockey field

## PROJECT SCOPE – RUNNING TRACK



Structural Topcoat with Rubber Pigment  
Black SBR Granules  
Concrete or Asphalt

1. Urethane base mat (porous system) (95% solution)
2. Color: red
3. High school track event layout & standard.



## PROJECT SCOPE – SYNTHETIC TURF

**2" knap turf, resilient pad, sand and COATED SBR (recycled rubber infill)**

- Should crumb rubber ever be deemed hazardous: infill can be removed and new infill can be installed; resilient pad allows flexibility as to future type
- Add approx. \$150,000 over traditional rubber infill



SYNTHETIC TURF SYSTEM:  
SAND & COATED CRUMB RUBBER INFILL  
RESILIENT PAD  
STONE DRAINAGE SYSTEM



## PROJECT SCOPE – ATHLETIC LIGHTING

1. Highly focused, state of the art
2. Metal Halide source
3. 4 pole, system 70-80' high poles
4. Service, remote controls and warranty
5. Typical lighting levels (not pro-filming levels)



## RECOMMENDED LAYOUT – Project Budget

### Base Project:

1. 8 lane track and straight
2. Synthetic turf interior field
3. Existing bleachers to remain
4. Field events, walks and driveways
5. No visitor side accommodations
6. Entry and retaining walls NE
7. New security fence North and East only
8. Athletic lighting
9. Pedestrian lighting
10. Planted buffers & fence at property line (south)
11. Planted buffer at West Avon Road (full property frontage)
12. Maintenance equipment
13. LAX safety netting, ends only
14. Public address system

### BASE BUDGET COST:

**\$3,483,000.00**

**INCLUDING 15%  
(\$544,230.00) CONTINGENCY**

### Base Project Materials:

- Turf with resilient pad, sand & coated SBR rubber infill
- Asphalt running track with Urethane base mat surface
- Athletic lighting, controls, service & warranty
- PA System



## RECOMMENDED LAYOUT – Options Items Budget

### **New Home Bleacher & Press box:**

- 1,000 seat structural frame (storage & access below) with press box, electrical, and bleacher lighting

BLEACHER OPTION BUDGET COST: ADD \$459,000

### **Storage building:**

- 20'x22' prefabricated, non-conditioned wood shed on a gravel pad

STORAGE BUILDING OPTION BUDGET COST: ADD \$ 26,000

### **Non-Fixed Athletic Field Equipment:**

- Soccer goals, hurdles, hurdle carts, high jump pads, pole vault pads, discus netting, sideline LAX netting, football chains and pylons, etc.

NON-FIXED EQUIPMENT OPTION BUDGET COST: ADD \$ 79,000

### **North Field Option (Field Hockey):**

- Convert north field to synthetic turf, install drainage, 4' ht. chain link perimeter fence.

NORTH FIELD OPTION BUDGET COST: ADD \$1,134,000

ALL COSTS INCLUDE 15% CONTINGENCY

## RECOMMENDED LAYOUT – Budget Summary

BASE PROJECT: (MAIN FIELD TRACK, TURF & LIGHTING) \$3,483,000

### BASE PROJECT OPTIONS

1. OPTION – BLEACHERS AND PRESS BOX	\$ 459,000
2. OPTION – STORAGE BUILDING	\$ 26,000
3. <u>OPTION – NON-FIXED FIELD EQUIPMENT (HURDLES, PADS, GOALS, ETC)</u>	<u>\$ 79,000</u>

***BASE PROJECT WITH OPTIONS: \$4,047,000***

***NORTH FIELD \$1,134,000***



ALL COSTS INCLUDE 15% CONTINGENCY

## Recommended Operations & Use

- High School Events (User Group A)- Up to 15 lighted events Monday-Saturday during academic year
- Events and P.A. end by 9:30pm
- Lights off by 10:00pm
- Exception for 4 additional lighted events in the event of multiple teams making the playoffs

## Operations & Use—Continued

- Town Organizations (User Group B)
- Religious and Not for Profit Organizations (User Group C) :
- Scheduled through the BOE to determine appropriate use and availability.
- Lighted events Monday-Saturday
  - Events end at 7:30pm.
  - Lights must be off by 7:45pm
  - No use of P.A.
  - No lights on Sunday

# Fisher Meadows Expansion

