**Joint City/School Memorial Field Planning Committee**
April 29, 2026 Meeting #8 Minutes (approved)

Location: City Wide Community Center, 14 Canterbury Road
Time: 5:00 pm

Committee Members Present:

**City Councilors:**

- Nathan Fennessy
- Jeff Foote (Chair)

**Board of Education:**

- Madeleine Mineau (new member as Jim Richards no longer on School Board)

**City/School Staff present**: David Gill from the City of Concord, Steve Largy from Concord School District.

**Guests**: Cara Meeker Board of Education Vice President

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm by Mr. Foote. Mr. Fennessy made a motion to accept the minutes from last meeting (August 2025). Mr. Foote seconded and the minutes where approved.

Jeff Foote introduced Madeleine Mineau the new member of the committee representing the Board of Education and Cara Meeker the VP of the Board of Education as a guest.

Jeff Foote indicated the goal of the meeting is to review the Master Plan Concept and reduce the overall cost of the project. Although the overall cost of Option D was listed at over $30 million dollars he never anticipated that would be what would be approved.

Cara Meeker indicated the School Board at their December 2025 meeting approved funding their share 50% ($600,000) of the cost for the final design and permitting phase understanding the master plan and phasing still needed to be agreed to and they are just waiting for City Council to decide what they would like to do. She stated the School Board understands the dire need to move this project forward while ensuring the project covers the <u>needs</u> of the student athletes and the community and not wants. Madeleine Mineau also stated we need to agree on a plan to move the project forward as soon as possible as the current conditions of the complex is bad.

Jeff Foote asked David Gill to present his PowerPoint to review the history of the project and the two concept plans discussed. As part of the presentation, Mr. Gill presented his thoughts on “needs” vs “wants” A copy of the PowerPoint is included at the end of these minutes.

| **Needs** | **Wants** |
|---|---|
| Site drainage improvements | Increased onsite parking (some will say it’s a need) |
| Improve ADA and general accessibility | Rebuild Tennis/basketball courts with lights (new fencing might be a need) |
| Running/Walking Track | More than one artificial turf field |
| Full size field inside track | Field House Building with 4 team rooms |
| Bleachers/press box for track/field | New maintenance building |
| Athletic Field lights | Concession building |
| Repairs to baseball and softball A fields Bleachers, press box, lights | New bathrooms (some will say it’s a need) |

David Gill based on his thoughts of “needs” vs “wants” presented new phases, along with cost estimates for both Option A and Option D.

**Master Plan Option A:** Picture shows Master Plan if all phases were built.
Cost estimates as provided in fall of 2024




| | |
|---|---|
| Final design, permitting and traffic study | $1,200,000 |
| Projected construction cost (all phases) | $25,600,000 |

Phasing construction costs:
Phase 1 (Track/Turf Field/Parking/drainage/bleachers): $6,200,000 (lower is we do not include parking)
Phase 1 (Baseball Field Renovation/lights/drainage): $2,600,000 (originally stated phase 2, less if reuse bleachers)
Phase 1 (Softball Field Renovation/lights/drainage): $1,600,000 (originally stated in phase 2)
Phase 1 (Rest of natural grass fields renovations/drainage): $2,200,000 (originally stated in phase 2)
**Total Estimated cost for phase 1: $12,600,00**

Phase TBA (New bathrooms, team rooms, maintenance): $5,500,000 (originally stated phase 1)
Phase TBA (New Multi-Purpose Athletic Field with bleachers for 2,000): $5,300,000
Phase TBA (Basketball & Tennis Courts with lights): $2,200,000
**Total Estimated cost for other phases: $13,000,000**

**<u>Master Plan Option D</u>**: Picture shows Master Plan if all phases were built.
Cost estimates as provided in fall of 2025




| | |
|---|---|
| Final design, permitting and traffic study | $1,200,000 |
| Projected Construction cost (all phases) | $31,724,807 |

Phasing construction costs:
Phase 1 (Track/Field/Parking/lights/drainage improvements): $8,199,735 (lower is we do not add parking)
Phase 1 (new Baseball Field/lights/bleachers): $3,961,870 (originally phase 2, lower if keep in current orientation + bleachers)
Phase 1 (new Softball Fields/lights/bleachers): $3,244,351
**Total Estimated cost for phase 1: $15,405,956**

Phase TBA (New Multi-Purpose Athletic Field/lights/bleachers for 2,000): $6,640,988
Phase TBA (New Field House – 4 changing rooms, concessions): $5,826,480
Phase TBA (Bathrooms, concessions and maintenance building): $1,240,305
Phase TBA (Basketball & Tennis Courts with lights): $2,611,078
**Total Estimated cost for other phases: $16,318,851**

At the end of the presentation, Jeff Foote thanked David Gill for the presentation and for his discussion regarding “needs versus wants,” noting that it was very helpful in guiding the conversation.

Jeff Foote stated that he preferred Option D because it begins with the areas experiencing the worst drainage issues and allows construction to proceed upward from the lowest elevations. He emphasized that improving site drainage will require starting at the lowest level of the complex. He also noted that maximizing the usage of the complex would require two artificial turf fields. Grass fields generally support approximately 700 hours of annual use, while artificial turf fields can support approximately 2,500 hours annually and are not affected by weather conditions.

Jeff Foote said that although additional parking would eventually be needed, he considered it a “want” rather than a current “need.” Nate Fennessy also stated that he did not believe the recommended parking layout for Option D was efficient and thought it could be improved. Regarding Option D, Jeff Foote suggested constructing only one softball field during Phase 1, while reserving the location of the second softball field as open space or future parking expansion.

Committee members had a general conversation of needs and wants. Mainly focused around Option D:

Key discussion points included:

- When constructing the new track, the press box and bleachers may not need to be included in Phase 1; however, the layout should accommodate their future addition.
- New track, field and lighting are considered necessary.
- The new eight-lane track should include a full-size multipurpose field within the interior area, large enough to accommodate all sports, including girls’ lacrosse.
- The baseball field should remain in its current location and orientation. Improvements would include new field lighting, some replacement fencing, adjustments to right field to accommodate the relocated track, and repairs to the existing bleachers.

Jeff Foote stated that he had spoken with Scott Owen, who indicated that the baseball field is currently in excellent condition and considered one of the best in the state. Mr. Owen also stated that the right-field area could be reduced in size to allow room for the track relocation

Madeleine Mineau stated that she prefers natural grass for soccer and asked whether the proposed stadium field would be artificial turf and large enough to accommodate all sports. David Gill responded that the current concept includes artificial turf for both the stadium field and the field inside the track, while the field located between the stadium and track would remain natural grass and be sized appropriately for all sports. Madeleine Mineau also requested a cost comparison between one turf field and two turf fields. David Gill stated that he would request that breakdown from the consultants.

David Gill further asked whether there were any plans for one of the new athletic fields at the new middle school to be artificial turf, noting that if so, Memorial Field might not require two turf fields. Cara Meeker stated that there are currently no plans for an artificial turf field at the new middle school. However, she explained that the athletic fields are part of the project’s final phase, and the district could revisit the possibility later if funding is available.

The committee agreed that new lighting is needed for the baseball field, softball field, stadium field, and track. Members discussed installing efficient athletic lighting systems similar to Musco lighting systems that provide appropriate illumination levels for each sport. David Gill stated that the current budget estimates already assume all field lighting would be replaced with new, energy-efficient systems.

The group also agreed that a field house, new restroom facilities, and a new maintenance building are project wants at this stage. However, members agreed that the final design and permitting process should anticipate these future facilities by installing underground utilities during Phase 1, including water, sewer, and electrical service. The group further agreed that the proposed restroom building near the new stadium complex may need to be included in Phase 1 because the proposed stadium bleachers are expected to seat approximately 2,000 spectators.

The committee asked David Gill to work with the consultants for updated cost estimates for both options for their next meeting. The committee voted to have the next meeting on Wednesday, May 20 at 4 pm at the City-Wide Community Center.

Cara Meeker asked whether the city could obtain a quote to resurface the existing track, which would allow the school to host meets for the next several years while final design, permitting, and project funding are completed. David Gill stated that he would make inquiries and attempt to provide a budget estimate at the next meeting.

Jeff Foote then opened the meeting for comments from community members in attendance. Concord resident Doug McGee expressed concern regarding relocating the track to the current varsity soccer/lacrosse field area. He stated that the area is one of the lowest points within the complex and contains approximately 20 feet of clay and poor soils, which could significantly increase project costs due to the need for imported structural fill to support the track, press box, bleachers, and related facilities.

Mayor Champlin, who attended the meeting along with several city councilors, thanked the committee for reconsidering the project costs, noting that the current proposal is too expensive and lacks sufficient public support.

Nate Fennessy made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:35, Madeleine Mineau 2nd and approved.

Respectfully submitted

David Gill

Concord Parks and Recreation Director