

COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

6:00 PM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2025

GRANT HOUSE

- **Public Comments**
- **Approval of Minutes of September 11, 2025**
- **BH&A Updates and Discussion**
- **Presentation Timeline**
- **Other Items**
- **Next Steps**
- **Action Items and Next Meeting Date**

COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

6:00 PM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2025

GRANT HOUSE

6:00 PM – Regular Community Center Building Committee (started at 6:00 p.m.)

Present: David Cohen, Greg Fyfe, Adam Gould, Bill Olsen, Richard Raimondi, Gregory Schwab, Brianna Scott, Peter Murray (ex-officio), Robert Palmer (ex officio) and Jacqueline Crafts (alternate)

Absent: None

Others Present: Joel Bargmann (Bargmann Hendrie & Archetype, Inc.[BH&A]), Marla Johnson (Member, York Selectboard), Julie Kelbert (Chair, York School Committee), Mike Modern (Chair, Parks and Recreation Board), Rhonda DiCarlo (Member, Center for Active Living [CAL]), Roy Sieber (Secretary, York Climate Action Committee), Mac Booze, Wendy Pruel, Jeff Berlin, Sue Berlin, Courtney Munoz, and Megan Gean-Gendron

Call to Order

Chair Olsen called the meeting to order.

A. Public Comments

Murray presented the following posted public comment concerning CCBC activities:

1. Linda Sullivan wrote that she is opposed to the project as there are enough resources in neighboring towns and that York is losing its small-town appearance.

There were no comments from the public members in attendance.

B. Approval of the September 11th Committee Meeting Minutes

Raimondi moved that the minutes from the September 11th meeting of the Community Center Building Committee (CCBC) be accepted as distributed; Gould seconded, and the motion passed without objection: Vote: 7-0.

C. BH&A Updates and Discussion

Bargmann presented a slide show “Village Elementary School (VES) Study Draft Review to the committee for its review.

1. Design and Renovation Concepts:

He stated that of chief concern for the BH&A team was to create a space for the people that would meet their recreational and activity needs and would create a sense of community for York. He stated that in the current VES floorplan 26% of the rooms are windowless, 18% of the building is circulation space, 29% of the facility is accessible by stairs and/or a ramp, and that 10% of the building is comprised of rooms with concrete block, load-bearing walls which makes it difficult to reconfigure in a different manner. He noted that the following considerations were made to improve the design of the facility for a greater impact:

- a. Study how to make the circulation space more efficient and more secure;
- b. Design to get more spaces with natural light and fresh air;
- c. Find the right spaces to put in the windowless rooms
- d. Study how to use “borrowed light” from other rooms;
- e. Zone program spaces to keep senior-accessed spaces on the upper level;
- f. Need to factor in cost to create new and better space; and
- g. Create spaces that make a difference from what exists today.

2. VES Existing Site Conditions and Analysis:

Bargmann showed an aerial view of the existing VES property and a proposed drawing of the property with existing structure, the new gymnasium and pool facilities, and an expanded parking lot. He stated that the existing playground on the northside of the building could remain but is a design constraint. Additionally, the propone field would have to be relocated or could be eliminated if all electric systems were utilized in the new center. He offered several options for parking lot designs for the facility. He noted that access for emergency equipment/vehicles and deliveries was a consideration in the proposed designs. The BH&A team recommended moving the main entrance to the facility to a central section of the westside of the structure.

3. VES Optional Floor Plans and Analysis:

Bargmann presented variations for the renovation of VES: a minimal renovation, midlevel renovations, and full renovations. In all of the

versions, the BH&A team tried to keep the administrative offices in the center of the building, with multipurpose rooms around them, the fitness and exercise spaces near the entrance/exit leading to the pool and gymnasium facilities, the Adult Education and maintenance and other non-programmatic spaces in the lower section of VES with the concrete, load-bearing walls.

- a. Option 1: Minimal Renovation: This design would make minor adjustments to the circulation space and slight changes to the existing rooms and building entrances.
- b. Option 2: Midlevel Renovation: These two designs incorporate more structural changes to the existing layout, eliminating additional circulation space and making better use of the space of the facility.
- c. Option 3: Full Renovation: These three options change the existing building into a community center with better flow, minimal circulation space, additional storage facilities, and the main entrance at the center of the west wall of the building.
- d. Cost Estimates: Bargmann stated that the renovation costs, including site work, for the VES building (41,400 square feet), would range from \$5,000,000 for a minor renovation to \$8,000,000 for the full renovation. The cost of the pool facility (24,800 square feet) is estimated at \$31,000,000 including site work and the cost of the gymnasium is \$10,000,000. The costs include a 10% contingency funds. He noted the following in regard to this cost estimate as compared to the 2024 Feasibility Plan cost estimate:
 - i. The new VES renovation's space is 1.6 times larger than the 2024 option;
 - ii. The 2025 proposal is to use the existing building while the 2024 option used a pre-engineered metal building;
 - iii. The 2024 proposal was for a single pool with one filtration system and the 2025 proposal is for two pools with separate systems; and
 - iv. The 2024 proposal built the pool over the playground on the lower level and wouldn't need as much sitework.

CCBC members' response to Bargmann's presentation included the following:

1. Olsen queried as to what codes changes were considered by changing the purpose of VES. Bargmann stated that there wasn't a need for lateral bracing, that most of the changes would be easily attained, and that if the full renovation plan was selected then the boiler system would be replaced with more energy efficient heat pump system;
2. Palmer asked about the changes in the square footage of the pool plans from the 2024 version to the new proposal. Bargmann responded that additional deck space was needed for the coaches and the "on-deck" swimmers;
3. Olsen noted that the viewing area about the pool could be used as a walking path for patrons, especially during the winter;
4. Raimondi asked if the HVAC system would have lower operating costs than the current system. Bargmann stated that the current heating and cooling equipment has lower proficiency than the proposed system and with the new system each room/section of the facility could be individually controlled which would make it more energy efficient;
5. Bargmann noted that the proposed lighting system is far more efficient, in terms of energy usage and cost effectiveness;
6. Murray inquired whether the BH&A team looked into the use of solar panels for the facility. Bargmann replied that panels could be added to the existing structure and to the new buildings as well;
7. Murray asked about the overall cost of the project if just the new gymnasium was added to a renovation of VES. Bargmann stated the cost of the new gymnasium remains the same with or without the pool building, but that a cost savings may come from having the locker rooms in the main building instead of the new pool/gymnasium complex;
8. Olsen informed the meeting's guests that the CCBC was charged with looking at all possibilities for a community center; bearing in mind the York residents needs and desires and presenting the best results at the lowest cost; and
9. Additional comments about the project included the following:
 1. One of the meeting guests commented about the CCBC charter on the Town website;

2. CCBC members discussed that the voters would decide whether to approve the capital monies needed for the project and that the earliest that VES would be available for renovation would be 2027;
3. Murray mentioned that the development of an operating budget is dependent upon the programming offered; therefore, he would need to know whether the new buildings would be part of the proposal.
4. Gould stated that a direction on which way to go is needed in order to come up with the best plan to put forward to the Capital Budget Committee (CBC), the Selectboard, and the voters;
5. Olsen said that it may be irresponsible to put up two large capital proposals at the same time (i.e.: the York School Reorganization plan and the community center project) and at the CCBC meeting on October 16th a decision must be made;
6. Murray asked the CCBC members if they had any other changes to the BH&A proposal to which Scott stated that members need some time to look at the proposed plans; and
7. Raimondi stated that the committee needs to rely on the experts for their information in order for the CCBC to make the best recommendation.

D. Presentation Timeline

Olsen discussed the compressed timeline for the capital projects:

October 1: School Reorganization plans reviewed;

October 15: YSC selects a plan;

October 16: CCBC reviews and selects a plan; and

October 30: CCBC presents plan to CBC.

CCBC members comments on the presentation timeline were as follows:

1. Fyfe stated that the cost for the full renovation of VES was only a few million dollars more than the estimate for bringing the building up to code without any other renovations to the facility;
2. Scott mentioned that the new gymnasium is needed as the currently the existing facilities are not meeting the needs of the community;
3. Gould stated that the pool is the driving force behind the community's interest in the project; and

4. Olsen thanked the guests who attended the meeting for showing their interest in the proceedings.

E. Other Items

Raimondi moved that the CCBC recommend a major renovation to VES; Gould seconded the motion. Discussion on the motion included the agreement that a decision on the gymnasium and the pool facility will be made in the near future. The motion passed without objection: Vote: 7-0.

F. Action Items and Next Meeting Date

1. The main action item is for CCBC members to prepare for a presentation decision at the October 16th meeting.
2. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, October 16 at 6 pm at the Grant House.

Adjourn

Raimondi moved that meeting be adjourned; Gould seconded, and the motion passed without objection: Vote: 7-0.

At 7:36 pm Chair Bill Olsen adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Gregory Schwab
Secretary