

**Dover Parks and Recreation Commission
Meeting of February 8, 2013
Minutes**

P&R Commissioners In Attendance: Chris Boland, Rich Oasis, Scott Seidman, Nancy Simms

P&R Employees In Attendance: David MacTavish, Mark Ghiloni

Others In Attendance: Jim Dawley (BOS), Bill Seymour (Gale Associates, Inc.), Lindsey Barbie (Gale Associates, Inc.)

The meeting was called to order at 7:55am.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Acceptance of Minutes

Motions were made and seconded to approve minutes from 11/19/12, 11/28/12, 1/4/13 and 1/18/13, unanimous approval 4-0.

Field Usage Fees

Deferred until the next meeting.

RECREATION

D/S Youth Football

After one year of collaboratively running the Dover Sherborn Youth Football program with Dover P&R, George Kostakos and Dan Bennett have proposed that DSYF take over the program in its entirety. They want to expand the program to include 4th and 5th graders. They have requested that we give them all the equipment we have purchased over the years, including \$11,000 worth of helmets and shoulder pads that we purchased just last year. It was agreed to defer the decision on our response to these requests until our next meeting.

Other

P&R received a letter from a Dover citizen commending Dave and the P&R staff for doing such a great job in keeping Channing Pond clear for community skating this winter. Dave was asked to share this tribute with all five members of the P&R department.

PARKS

CPARC Update

Planning Board work - It was agreed that the Planning Board work to date has been fine. Gale will continue to represent P&R at future P&R meetings.

The need for new traffic study work was discussed. Jeff Dirk with Vanasse Associates Inc. has told P&R that he can update the Dedham Street traffic volume calculations using the number of proposed parking spaces within the plan created by Gale. Bill was asked if Gale would be prepared to defend and justify the number of parking spaces as adequate and appropriate and to do so at a Planning Board meeting. Bill confirmed that Gale could do this. Vanasse will contract with P&R for this work and will report to P&R. Copies of Vanasse's new work will be provided to Gale either by Vanasse or by P&R.

Bill confirmed that Gale had received and addressed and returned to the Planning Board all Comment Letters from various Dover town departments: Public Safety, Highway, Water, Facilities Management, Building Engineer.

Conservation Commission work – It was agreed that the ConCom work done to date by Gale has not been what was expected by P&R. P&R was taken by surprise at the first ConCom meeting when they were told by ConCom that there were clerical inconsistencies within the work documents and that no replication plan nor basal tree count was included in the filings. There was also confusion on the part of Gale and ConCom as to why the Notice of Intent filing had a state DEP filing number.

At the second ConCom meeting, the chairman pointed out that there was no certified wetlands survey contained within the filing. Gale insisted that it wasn't needed because there had already been a ConCom finding on this parcel of land for this project in November. Gale and P&R were told that the November findings were not sufficient to satisfy the certified wetlands survey requirement for the NOI.

Rich has had several conversations with Bill Seymour and we welcome him and his colleague, Lindsey Barbie, to this meeting. Lindsey is a civil engineer with a specialty in wetlands issues.

Bill acknowledged that Gale's work to date for P&R has been an aberration and inconsistent with their quality standards. He praised the qualifications of Eric Roise and his successes on other athletic facility projects. Bill stated that Eric's attempts to meet with ConCom for clarification on filing procedures and required content had been rebuffed three times. In Gale's experience, this lack of cooperation and communication ahead of filing submission was unprecedented. Bill stated that, going forward, Gale's senior civil engineer, John Perry, would play a more active role in this project as would he and Lindsey. Bill and Lindsey committed to being at every ConCom meeting going forward.

Alternatives Analysis: Gale prepared an Alternatives Analysis as requested in the ConCom NOI filing directions; their analysis was purposely vague. ConCom and their wetlands consultant, Paul McManus of EcoTec, Inc., have come back to us saying that it is too vague and that they would like more detail.

Questions to be Answered:

1. What are the Alternatives we want to consider?
2. What will the new Alternatives Analysis include and what additional details can be identified?
3. Who will address the request for additional information, Gale or another contractor? If Gale performs the work associated with refilling the NOI, they will not charge us for this extra work.
4. How do we address the missing NOI elements:
 - a. Withdraw the current NOI, address the omissions, and resubmit a new NOI, or
 - b. Keep the current NOI on file, address the omissions, and submit a supplement to the current NOI which would contain the previously omitted materials, or
 - c. Withdraw the current NOI and submit a completely new redesign based on other alternatives to be identified as per items 1 and 2 above.

Bill was asked to evaluate the pros and cons of options 4a and 4b and stated that 4b is cleaner but that there should not be any prejudice associated with either option.

Bill was asked if Gale would reduce the amount they have charged P&R to date for the time their two employees spent attending the ConCom meetings and for the time spent re-doing parts of the NOI deemed inadequate by ConCom. Bill stated that would not be possible.

The Gale contract dated June 3, 2011 was reviewed and certain commitments were revisited. Bill agreed that Gale would submit all work products to P&R for review prior to submission to any town official, town committee or other person or organization. Bill agreed that P&R would receive such work products at least 24 hours ahead of submission deadlines and that Gale would be available to address any requested changes made by P&R so that corrected work products would be submitted on time. Bill was asked to have the Gale project team hold strategy sessions with P&R as stated in the contract, either via telephone or in person,

regarding Dover's filing procedures and permitting policies; Bill agreed. Bill was also asked to have the Gale project team provide progress updates as stated in the contract, either via telephone or in person, on a frequent and regular basis; Bill agreed. P&R acknowledged these more frequent status updates might come with a price tag but were necessary to ensure the ongoing quality of the work and consistent understandings amongst all stakeholders.

P&R shared with Bill and Lindsey that we would be hiring a certified wetlands scientist to perform the wetlands survey. Bill confirmed and stated that although Lindsey had done some of this type of work, she was a degreed civil engineer, not a degreed wetlands scientist. Bill asked to review Scott Goddard's contract prior to P&R executing. P&R agreed. Bill suggested that the contract should be structured as a fixed price contract rather than as a time and materials contract as submitted by Goddard. Bill asked if Goddard's contract included the certification of flags. P&R confirmed that it did. Bill also pointed out that in one of the comment letters submitted to the Planning Board, there had been an inquiry regarding the number of trees with a diameter of 18' or more measured at a height of four feet. Bill wants to make sure Goddard is aware of this particular requirement.

Bill recommended to P&R that Goddard's contract include:

1. Attendance at up to three meetings,
2. Wetlands delineation in accordance with town bylaws,
3. Surveyed location of resultant flags (Goddard needs to hire Cheney or another surveyor),
4. Resolution of 18" tree count, and
5. Fixed price rather than time and materials.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15am.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Simms, P&R Commissioner