

**COTUIT FIRE DISTRICT
PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE MEETING
ZOOM only – Hosted by ICON
COTUIT, MA 02635
April 25, 2025**

The meeting was called to order by Mark Lynch on April 25, 2025, via ZOOM.

Mark led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mark did roll call:

Prudential Committee members: Mark Lynch, Fran Parks, Seth Burdick all via ZOOM.

Before the presentation from ICON, Mark spoke about the history and background:

- May 4, 2024, SDM (Special District Meeting) with two (2) articles on the Agenda:
 - Article 1: Demolish the Cotuit School Building and return to nature
 - This received 59% of the vote but not the required 67% for borrowing purposes; and
 - Article 2: Sought additional studies on the building specifically the cost to renovate partially or completely for recreational use or community center or to demolish it
 - This received 51% of the vote.
- July 2024, Prudential Committee interviewed and hired a Procurement expert, Jannelvy Martinez, to guide the Prudential Committee through the process
 - Ms. Martinez suggested RFPs (Request for Proposal)
 - A proposal is advertised on various state websites and vendors are allowed to submit a sealed bid in response
- July 2024, an Ad Hoc Sub-committee was formed
 - Mark Lynch, Carol Zais, Patty Daley, Jamie Jackson, Stephen O'Connor, John Havel, and Patrick Lentrell met six (6) times over July and August to meet to figure out the language in the RFP for the various scenarios, details, and cost
 - This draft RFP was approved by Prudential Committee in October 2024
 - Vendors had one (1) month to respond to RFP and only one (1) responded
 - Small 2-person architectural firm that did not have any experience in the areas that were needed
 - Prudential Committee, Ms. Martinez and two members from Ad Hoc Committee met and decided that this bid did not meet the criteria and was rejected
 - December 2024, Ms. Martinez suggested RFQ (Request for Quote)
 - Vendors that saw the RFP but did not vote stated that the RFP was too detailed, required too many sub-contractors and not appealing
 - Prudential Committee did an RFP closely tracking the language with Article 2 from SDM
 - Article 2 allows the Prudential Committee to go to trusted vendors with specific detailed requests and see if they are interested in bidding on it
 - RFQ is recognized under Municipal Law
 - Prudential Committee went to:
 - Habeeb & Associates that did the original rehab study on the Cotuit Property

- Catalyst Architects which are working on the Cotuit Fire Department renovations
 - Tighe & Bond which has worked with Cotuit Water Department and frequently collaborates with ICON Architecture
- January 202, ICON submitted a bid that Prudential Committee approved
 - ICON has substantial experience in rehabbing “mothballed” school properties
 - Bid was \$122,000.00 to perform the work
 - Prudential Committee entered into a contract with ICON and ICON has finished their report and are presenting it during this meeting
- Paul Digiandomenico, Senior Project Manager and Mark McKevitz, Project Manager with ICON Architecture, presented their report
 - They work in the Institutional Studio
 - They perform a lot of municipal work
 - ICON was asked to study the feasibility and estimate the cost of restoring and rehabilitating a portion of the former Cotuit Elementary School at 140 Old Oyster Road (“the property”) for the use of district residents, funding a professional analysis of building for potential reuse and potential recreation and other uses of the grounds and for the authors of said study to present the finding of the complete study to the voters of the district at a public meeting and to study the cost of demolition of the school property and restoration of the property site to a natural state.
 - Exact language from Article 2 from SDM
- **Site Conditions:**
 - Existing structural foundations are all functional and in fairly good condition
 - Roofing/masonry/walls/doors need repair
 - Asphalt shingle roofing is worn
 - Windows and doors are functional but need to be replaced in order to be current
 - Modular classrooms are in poor condition inside and out and do not meet current codes and recommendation is to demolish
 - Interior finishes are dated and worn and well past useful life
 - Flooring contains asbestos material and would have to be abated
 - Mechanical (electrical / plumbing) systems are antiquated and, in most cases, past their useful life
 - Importantly, this building does not have a Fire Protection System (sprinkler system) which would need to be added if this building were to be reused
 - Paved areas (outside) are in poor condition and lack poor drainage
 - Drainage issues need to be addressed in order to meet requirement of Town of Barnstable Storm Water Management Rules and Regulations

- **Options:**

1. Demolition and Return to Nature
2. Community Center
3. Recreational Building

Demolition and Return to Nature

- Site-based project
- Area would have potential walking paths
- 6-8 car parking lot
- Native grass and plants would be planted

Community Center

- Removal of part of the building
- Providing new parking area in front - off of Old Oyster Road
- Native grass and plants would be planted
- Bifurcated or split design
 - Senior Center / Community Center
 - Senior Center has offices and game room, small library, program rooms, and a multi-purpose/dining room for 40-45 people
 - Community Center focuses on multi-purpose rooms, office, and program rooms (teen focus) and other indoor games

Recreational Use

- Focused on providing more outdoor site amenities
- Entrance from Old Oyster Road
- Retaining old entrance from South
- Removed 40-45% of buildings and brought in site amenities
 - Pickleball court
 - Basketball court
- Two (2) program rooms with a few offices
- Existing multi-purpose room is 38' long and standard for high school is 50'+ so gymnasium proposal is part of the Recreation use option
 - Gabled roof in multi-purpose room is sloped
 - Challenging space for basketball

COST

Background:

Previous Study: Referenced deferred maintenance \$5M

ICON Study: Functioning as a school \$6.6M

What drives the requirements for a building?

1. Accessibility Requirements
 - a. Requirement based on cost
 2. Building Code Threshold
 - a. Energy
 - i. Additions / new construction must meet current MA stretch/specialized code
 - b. Systems
 - i. New systems must meet current codes
 - c. Building
 - i. New Construction must meet current codes
 1. Three Levels of Alteration
 - a. Any of the above construction would meet Level III alteration
 - i. Structural: Hurricane ties / fire protection system / roof structure has to be tied down to the existing structure
 1. Significant added cost
3. Phasing
 - a. More expensive than doing everything all at once
 - i. Need to engage the design bid of the process at different times
 - b. Logistics and Function
 - i. Constant construction / moving around the building / different contractors and quality

Option 1: Demolition

- Hazmat remediation
- Demo existing building and site

Cost by Option: New

- Small 6-space parking area
- Walking paths
- Replanting native grasses and meadow
 - Construction cost \$1,489,142
 - Total project cost \$1,861,431

Option 2: Community Center

- Scope – Demo
 - Hazmat remediation
 - Demo modular and areas of the building
- Scope – New
 - Parking area
 - Senior Center / Community Center
 - Replanting Native grasses and meadow
 - Construction Cost: \$10,992,172
 - Total Project Cost: \$14,289,823

Option 3: - Recreation Center

- Scope – Demo
 - Hazmat remediation
 - Demo 45% of Existing Building
- Scope – New
 - Parking area
 - New site amenities
 - Rec program with indoor basketball court
 - Replanting native grasses and meadow
 - Construction Cost \$8,562,468
 - Total Project Cost \$11,131,315

Questions and Public Comment

- Patty Daley asked for estimated written report. Paul answered that it would be shared as soon as possible.
- Patti McCormick asked about the initial proposal for three (3) houses and there was a well, so is there any risk of water contamination from buildings. Paul answered that it would be taken into consideration with the site work.
- Rick Stadterman has asked about any options regarding Senior Centers and Community Center fundings. Mark Lynch stated that is beyond what was requested from ICON. Presentation does not include those costs. Prudential Committee is not in favor of moving forward with rehabilitation. There is no answer regarding how rehab options are funded.
- Jean Mojo asked about community center teen amount statistics. Mark answered there is not many updated information.
- Ray stated that a community center is not just for kids but for everyone. He asked about the non-demolition costs and how they were arrived at.
- Jim asked if public have more input on the scenario that is selected. Mark answered that at the ADM, public votes.
- Fran Parks pointed out that MMills demolished the school on Rte. 28 (3 years ago) it was under \$100,000.00. Additionally, those that wanted to turn it into a Community Center stated that grants would be sought so that the cost to run such a center would not fall on the taxpayer.
- Patty Daley stated that there will be a Citizen Petition Article on the Warrant at the ADM to pause any decision on the ultimate disposition of the school for four months.
- Joanne Massaro commented that she hoped that at the ADM, there is discussion about how close those that want to move forward with a Recreational Center or a Community Center, are to getting millions of dollars in funding, rather than postponing for four-months.
- Sharon Kiernan agreed with Joanne Massaro (above) and asked about potential overages. Paul answered there is contingency money - money that is budgeted to cover unforeseen conditions that the contractor has to deal with on site so Total Project Cost is encompassing these types of unforeseen conditions.
- Stephen O'Connor stated the Ad Hoc Committee was looking at the preservation of a great community asset and was heartened to hear that structurally, the building is not as bad as once thought. Regarding funding, Cotuit Non-Profit Collaboration Center.
- Fran Parks stated that Cotuit is not a Town, it is a Fire District within the Town of Barnstable with taxing ability. Rental properties covered under Enabling Legislation? Cost of running and maintaining the building. Fire requirements should not be the taxpayers
- Stephen O'Connor replied to Fran's comments stating that since they were told that the building is salvageable, then the village can move forward.

- Fran replied to Stephen O'Connor's comments that it has been four years and the longer that it is delayed, the more money it will cost.
- Ray commented that he endorsed what Stephen O'Connor said above. Ray went on to comment that the Prudential Committee violated the by-laws by refusing to spend money in 2021 on the study and it was only after they lost the vote so now the study happened.
- Fran Parks replied to Ray's comments.
- Jane commented about the two options other than demolition and asked about salaries / maintenance, etc. Mark answered the cost is based on the building and not operational costs.
- Patty Daley commented again about the Citizen Petition and its purpose.
- Mark Lynch replied to Patty Daley asked about funding progress for operational costs.

Mark asked for Motion to Adjourn. Mark Seconded. All in favor.