

Project Advisory Team (PAT)

November 18, 2010

4:00 - 6:30 P.M.

Notes

Ad Hoc Committee to review athletic field Improvements

Committee Members:

Darrin Kenney, Scott Barker, Jeff Beardsley, Karl Thielking, ~~Liz Konar~~, ~~Douglas Bennett~~, Michaela Ryan, Bill Beach, Scott Schindler, Bob Vansice, Bernadette Canfield, ~~Michelle O'Connor~~, ~~Kathy Hutteman~~, Alan Shaffer, ~~Peter Crooker~~, Brian Domke

1. Brief recap of meeting held on October 28.
2. Jeff Beardsley presented recent aerial photos of our buildings and athletic facilities to give a real visual of the four options.
 - a. Grass Field Annual Maintenance Estimated Cost analysis presented by Jeff Beardsley based on assumption of SHS stadium and two lower fields and MHS two lower multi-use fields.
 - b. Approx \$75,000 per year for all 5 fields for labor and materials.
3. Discussion of capital project process, approvals, funding and how our charge corresponds.
4. Brian Domke presented a matrix and started walking the group through an analysis of each of the four options and global estimated cost effectiveness. The group will continue where it left off in this process.
 - a. Cost will be driven by the size of turf area and needed drainage internal or external.
 - b. Vendors tell you \$10 per sq ft but they are not including excavation, storm water mitigation, drainage, plus infrastructure associated with lights, concession and lavatory, press box, bleachers. etc.
 - i. Above ground retention pond less costly, takes space, could cause loss of fields.
 - ii. BRMS already has one but not our schools.
 - iii. MHS and SHS are challenged as well.
 - iv. Below ground is 2 – 3x the cost of above with minimal maintenance required and does not take up space.
 - v. Sutherland already has all the primary systems in place, could be more cost effective.
 - c. BRMS – if we leveled the entire upper portion could have several new fields and due to expensive excavation and drainage, NOT turf it. Topsoil could be used elsewhere or sold.
 - d. Are lights to be a part of this? Per S. Barker – primary goal is turf to improve usability. Group to discuss further.
 - e. Which area schools have lights, concession, toilets, bleachers?

Next meeting December 2nd at 4:00 P.M. BRMS Meeting Room #2