

ICON Architects continue updating information from the 2016 Community Center studies.

1. Meetings with service providers, (LPS Administration, LEAP, and Magic Garden, Parks&Rec, and COA/Human Services,) for information on program delivery needs and aspirations
2. Survey launched to Lincoln and LPS communities on values to guide development of a community center (Boston and Hanscom residents included because they participate in programs and receive services.)
3. Invitation to wide variety of community groups to comment in writing or before the CCBC on development of the three design models
4. Open Mic Night April 4 for anyone to speak directly to the architects. Well attended both in person and virtually (approx 100 people). Comments ranged from hopes for a full-service center similar to a college campus student center to fears of large tax increases.

A sizable group advocated for locating a community center not on Bellfield Road but as part of a master plan for development of the South Lincoln business district (near the train station.) ICON principal Ned Collier pointed out that his contract is to follow the November 2022 Special Town Meeting vote for the Ballfield Road location, but he requested the mall advocates send him written comments

April 12 is next CCBC meeting, night before our School Committee meets.

April 25 (Tuesday): A public forum on the data ICON has received from stakeholders and surveys as well as information on demands of the specific site. This includes pedestrian and vehicular traffic, septic limits, passive solar and other energy reducing designs, wetlands, and condition of existing buildings on campus and satellite locations such as Bemis and Pierce House. After receiving feedback, ICON will develop cost estimates for presentation in June.

My concerns for School Committee:

1. We become fully informed of the District's needs and aspirations for any development
2. We work with the administration and FinCom to clearly – or as clearly as possible – understand the financial consequences to the District if the project is not approved.
  - a. Is the District left responsible for financing and managing needed upgrades to the pods, Ballfield Road, parking lot, etc? Might we extend the life of the SBC?
  - b. What is our exposure to continued energy and other utility costs both for District use, LEAP, Magic Garden, and for Parks and Recreation?
3. We agree on a process for drafting a statement of our concerns either as a submission to the architects, a public statement on April 25 or as guidance to me in CCBC deliberations.