

Newell Building Committee Notes

1-24-2012

In attendance: Mike Carrigan, Mark Cole, Joe Guzzo, Bill Goodwin, Bill Sanborn (arrived at 1:15 Pm)

Not Present: Kristen Michel, Dick Wilson

Others Present: Greg Verga, City Council Liaison

Steve Winslow, Sr. Project Manager, Paul Keane City Engineer

Anthony Zerilli, GHS Roger Corbin, Kim Patience

Meeting began at 12:40 pM

I. Administrative
No Action

II. 25%/100% Design Status

Issue #1: Orientation of the Field

Options: East/West (~current alignment) North/South (Alternatives 2A-2C)
(Alt 1A-1F, Alt 3)

Discussion: The major advantage of a north/south configuration is that athletes do not need to deal with a setting sun for afternoon games which make up ~90% of the current uses (the exception is football which is mostly at night under the lights). North/south configurations bring action closer the neighboring homes. Shifting the lay-outs of Alt 2A or 2B farther from homes is constrained by the salt marsh and/or Leslie O'Johnson Drive. Alt 2B and 2C also greatly reduce practice field space. One potential benefit of a north/south orientation could come if parking was shifted to be along Centennial Drive and contaminants buried under that area.

Motion: by Joe Guzzo to keep an East-West orientation. Seconded by Bill Sanborn

Voted: 4 votes in favor, non-opposed

Issue #2A: Width of Fields / Radius of Track

Options: 210+ foot width (Alt 1A and 3) 195-foot width (Alt 1C) 180-foot width (1E)

Discussion: Kim Patience noted that wider fields provide a larger safety buffer from the track and other hazards. Others expressed concern that a combination of a wide field and low-angle stands at other stadiums made viewing difficult. All agreed that priority should be given to athletes.

Motion by Joe Guzzo to accommodate fields 210-foot fields. Seconded by Mark Cole

Voted: 4 votes in favor, non-opposed

Issue #2B: Number of Track Lanes

Options: 6-lane Oval or 8-lane Oval

Discussion: This issue had been discussed many times in the past. The only identified potential use for a track with 8-lanes all the way around was for the Bay State games, an event Gloucester would be lucky to attract once in ten years. Fewer lanes would be less expensive and allow spectators to be closer to the field

Motion by Bill Sanborn to provide 6-lanes around the track oval. Second by Joe Guzzo

Voted: 4 votes in favor, non-opposed

Bill Goodwin arrived and was briefed on the prior discussions.

Issue #2C: Location of an 8-lane straight

Options: Visitors side vs. Home Side

Discussion: All agreed that an 8-lane straight should be provide to allow for regular and regional meets. Steve Winslow pointed out that Alternatives 1A and 3, the wider field options could not accommodate an 8-lane straight on the visitors side due to the proximity of neighboring homes.

Committee members reconsider their vote in support of the 210-foot fields. Having the 8-lane straight on the visitors side would allow closer viewing from the home stands. Track events draw smaller crowds and take place during the day so they have less impact on neighbors. Keeping the straight away on the visitors side allowed the night games to be further away from the neighbors. CDM-Smith should be asked to investigate raising the stands at least 4-feet above field level and having them more steeply sloped for better viewing angles.

Motion by Joe Guzzo: Notwithstanding the previous votes on Issues 1, 2A and 2B, the Newell Building Committee hereby directs that CDM-Smith proceed with a design according to the following guidelines:

Issue 1: The field be orientated in the current east-west orientation,

Issue 2B: The track oval be 6-lanes,

Issue 2C: The track straight away be 8-lanes and located on the visitors (south) side of the field, and

Issue 2A: The field be a minimum of 195-feet wide and the CDM-Smith investigate track radii greater than 112-feet that could accommodate wider field widths within existing site constraints such as the wetland and residential neighbors.

Second by Bill Goodwin

Voted: 5 votes in favor, non-opposed

Issue #3: Level of the Field

Committee members agreed that this issue requires further information from CDM-Smith regarding drainage design and the cost trade-offs between removing and disposing fill material versus surcharging the field.

Location of Top Soil: could this be moved to existing softball field?

Issue #4: Location of Field Venues: No Discussion

Issue #5: Tidegate

Paul Keane showed aerial photos from the 1950's and 1990's indicating that the wetland area may have been larger in the 1950's and filled to some extent since then. CDM-Smith needs to discuss the potential options on the tide gate with the Conservation Agent.

Issue #6: Buildings

Bathroom pilings: Mike Carrigan was seeking the piling installation logs. At this point CDM-Smith intends to develop a foundation design without relying on those piles.

After the basic lay-out and field elevations have been set, CDM-Smith may need to be asked to develop specifications for all the site buildings including the bathrooms, concessions, ticket booths and storage units. These would need to be concrete modular construction units. Joe Guzzo would like an arrangement that creates an attractive entry building.

Issues 6 – 13: Not discussed

Other items to follow-up with CDM-Smith:

- Track Durability – does it need to be replaced after ~10 years like turf?
- Coordination with possible water main / gas main installs
- Obtain and test groundwater samples to better understand dewatering costs
- Getting an updated cost estimate to determine if project costs for preferred alternative is within current funding raising goal of \$3.5 million.

III. Fundraising
No Updates

Adjourned 2:15 PM