

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Leslie Montgomery <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 10, 2014 12:27 PM  
**To:** skateparkideas@brattleboro.org  
**Subject:** Rating Scores

Dear Members,

Upon closer inspection some interesting conclusions can be drawn from the site selection rating process completed by committee members, none of whom seem to be purposely skewing the results overtly to achieve a certain agenda in my opinion. However there are some instances where there is a 40 point spread difference rated from the highest score for a particular site to the next lower score in that same category or location, therefore notably conspicuous. This is even more drastic considering the differential range of lowest scores in a given rating resulting in a wider disparity at that end. Having so many points available, ten in all for each site rated, may have contributed to this apparent impression some may consider a possible discrepancy for a member taking measures to assert their preference which I suppose they are entitled to a certain degree.

Possibly to avoid the extremes in the rating process in all fairness, the high and the low score could be thrown out for each site selected to achieve a more accurate reflection of the general consensus among committee members when correlating their figures.

The rating totals when throwing out the high and low are as follows:

Sites:

- #1 Elm St. -- total point = 1327
- #2 Memorial Park (POOL) & Crowell Lot -- total points each = 1060
- #3 Memorial Park (UPPER) -- total points = 1047
- #4 BAMS Field -- total points = 1018

Thank you for your time, Les Montgomery

5/10/14



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

①

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Elizabeth McLoughlin <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 09, 2014 11:42 AM  
**To:** Carol Lolatte; Betsy Gentile  
**Subject:** Fwd: skatepark

B&C

Please review this information from the planning department - looks like Joe was on the money here.  
Betsy, such a good idea to have another meeting to discuss the final four,,,,,  
Liz

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Sue Fillion <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Fri, May 9, 2014 at 10:59 AM  
**Subject:** RE: skatepark  
**To:** [REDACTED], Elizabeth McLoughlin <[REDACTED]>

Maps from 1885-1919 show the property in use for lumber storage with sheds and storage as well as part of that time with a carriage and box shop later turned into storage of finished goods. The 1925 map shows no buildings and a new parcel. Perhaps this is when the town the operations consolidated to the Brattleboro Kiln dry site. In our downtown sites we've typically seen arsenic and PAH in the surficial soils.

Sue Fillion

Planner

Town of Brattleboro

230 Main Street, Suite 202

Brattleboro, VT 05301

Phone: [802.251.8112](tel:802.251.8112)

Fax: [802.254.6456](tel:802.254.6456)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 09, 2014 9:53 AM  
**To:** Elizabeth McLoughlin  
**Cc:** Sue Fillion  
**Subject:** Re: skatepark

Hi S,

2

Do you recall anything at this site as far back as the Sanborne maps? It seems that this whole section of the Whetstone could have had mills etc at some stage. I don't think that there is any chemical treatment going on at the Kiln dry now but I would be looking for arsenic.

We won't have the Fluvial Erosion layer for here ANR didn't map this far down. This area was impacted by Irene significantly and that would be expected to recur. I suggest a plug hole of some kind in the bottom and expect occasional impact. Permitting with the state will be necessary if it is in the 100yr floodplain which is likely a question of elevation. What does Maps online say?

R

On May 9, 2014, at 9:44 AM, Elizabeth McLoughlin <[REDACTED]> wrote:

hi guys

can you tell me if there is any contamination studies at the elm street lot, and also the flooding potential?

I need to know before May 22, so there is time to discuss, just wanted to put on your radar.

thanks

Liz

--

Elizabeth S. McLoughlin, AICP

Elizabeth S. McLoughlin, LLC

Land Use Planning and Environmental Consulting

A Certified DBE/WBE and SBA EDWOSB Firm

3

[Redacted]

--

Elizabeth S. McLoughlin, AICP  
Elizabeth S. McLoughlin, LLC  
Land Use Planning and Environmental Consulting  
A Certified DBE/WBE and SBA EDWOSB Firm

[Redacted]

4

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Leslie Montgomery <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 6:50 AM  
**To:** skateparkideas@brattleboro.org  
**Subject:** ULMP vs Crowell Park

Dear members,

I'm astonished that the Crowell Lot Site was rated above Upper Living Memorial Park considering these following reasons based on criteria:

- 1.) ULMP has access to public Bathrooms/ Crowell does not
- 2.) ULMP has room for expansion / Crowell does not
- 3.) ULMP has much better contours/slope and topography to develop an expansive wheel friendly park with trails while keeping adequate space for varied uses/ Crowell does not
- 4.) ULMP provides significant buffers/distance in place respecting neighbors/ Crowell does not
- 5.) ULMP is set well off major in-town arteries with speeds exceeding 25mph or a track record of hazardous/ fatal traffic related incidents/ Crowell is certainly not and right on top!
- 6.) ULMP is away from well- traveled public roadways that are extremely steep and do not provide side- walks or safe crosswalks/ Crowell is not
- 7.) ULMP has much broader open sightlines (with some excavation) that are not obscured on four sides / Crowell does not
- 8.) ULMP has an access road that can be easily patrolled by police in the absence of roadway traffic/ Crowell does not
- 9.) ULMP has ample, safe parking set off major roadways (3 lots in all) and can accommodate special events/ Crowell does not and will rely on needed side street parking
- 10.) ULMP is directly accessible for emergency vehicles without interference of heavy trafficked congestion/ Crowell is less so
- 11.) ULMP has access to concession stands and pool activities in a major recreation park / Crowell does not
- 12.) ULMP could utilize this area more inclusive of future wheel friendly activities such as utilizing the skating rink for summer roller derby sports earning income/ Crowell can not
- 13.) ULMP would not destroy park shade trees or displace/reduce an established, valued neighborhood playground area/ The Crowell site can NOT equivocally make this claim supported by any VALID evidence.

My niece is an active roller derby team leader aside from her professional career in Burlington and has mentioned to me Southern Vermont needs more venues to host Roller Derby events, the Hockey Rink next to ULMP could be this place providing revenue, we must think of the future in this respect, the Skate Park is a permanent project and will most likely, considering the mass of concrete involved, will not be removable without a major expense.

I disagree you cannot consider the arborist report as it applies to Crowell Park as it is extremely relevant information and the argument not all potential skate park sites conducted these reports is a weak one considering most seriously contending sites do not affect park trees directly with the exceptions of the Commons/ Elliot St which aren't even a runners up. Dan Adams town tree warden and member of the Tree Advisory Committee request we hire a ISA certified arborist and complete a report at Crowell specializing in park tree cost replacement estimates and survival evaluation, which we did, this must be respected in my opinion. Thanks again, Les Montgomery 5/8/14

5

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Leslie Montgomery [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 10:27 AM  
**To:** skateparkideas@brattleboro.org  
**Subject:** Follow Up ULMP

Hi Members,

I would like to add one other point to the discussion of ULMP vs Crowell Park as I may not be able to attend next meeting, and that would be ULMP could be gated and without street lighting would be more difficult to skate on after hours, not to say kids wouldn't try on a full moon, but this will happen to a degree at any of the sites mentioned, it's more of a question of who in particular doesn't want to be disturbed at unreasonable hours by kids hanging out or want the responsibility to keep in check. Kids can also duck and hide in any skate park bowl after hours at any site or run into the woods, except this would be more difficult at Elm Street I suppose. Thinking more positively, there is the distinct possibility for the future ULMP could be supervised if the economy improves or money can be raised in order to provide a person with this job.

Just to follow up on my remarks about reviewing the arborist report at Crowell, if the town cannot supply an alternative report by a company with the same qualifications and credentials, then they have no right in my mind to decline a professionally conducted report provided by concerned members of the community who paid out of pocket for such an important impact assessment where non was available.

One other question for Elm St, is it possible the COOP can make more space at their parking lot in the future and eventually relinquish the present space they occupy? Thanks Les Montgomery 5/8/14



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Leslie Montgomery <~~leslie@brattleboro.org~~>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 09, 2014 7:34 AM  
**To:** skateparkideas@brattleboro.org  
**Subject:** Review

Hi Members,

I don't think it would be unreasonable to request the members go back through the criteria list and determine or more defined order of importance for each they can agree on, then make further determinations on how these rate comparing the final three or four based on these conclusions. For instance, Roadway Safety factors ( a given) have to have more weight than shade that can be created with proper planning, Les Montgomery 5/9/14



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

⑦

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Brenda Carr <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 12:03 PM  
**To:** skateparkideas@brattleboro.org; lesmont; Simrin Socci  
**Subject:** Questions

Dear Committee members,

First I would like to say how much I appreciate your time and efforts. I attended your meeting last evening and I have some questions perhaps you could address at your next meeting.

I have several questions pertaining to the criteria for evaluating "safety and environmental" impacts. I would be interested to hear more specifics as they relate to conclusions. Safety is a broad topic. What criteria was employed to evaluate safety? Were traffic studies reviewed, did any one assess the car accidents, traffic patterns or pedestrian fatalities within the given areas?

Also, how were conclusions arrived at relating to environmental impacts. Specifically what criteria was used to determine the level and risk of environmental impacts on each site? Has the Conservation Committee been consulted? I know the Conservation Committee expressed concerns for at least one of sites.

My questions are not intended to fuel the discourse, but I am curious to understand what data or empirical evidence may have been employed draw specific conclusions or was the criteria evaluated on personal observations alone.

Lastly, I was very concerned to learn after the meeting that Mr. Bushey was filling at out the assessment forms at the meeting. I was under the impression that he was just adding totals, but in reality he was filling out the entire form. This concerns me and I wonder if he even visited each site?

Respectfully

Brenda Carr

**carol lolatte**

---

**From:** Adam Hubbard <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 09, 2014 9:24 AM  
**To:** skateparkideas@brattleboro.org; carol lolatte; Jeff Clark  
**Subject:** Elm Street

Dear Site Selection Committee,

Congratulations on your hard work. I think Elm Street could be a suitable location.

Here are a couple items to consider:

>In previous discussions about this site with the Town, during the Sondag/Degray era, the Town was unwilling to give up parking revenue. Considering David Gartenstien's recent comments, I imagine the idea of sacrificing that revenue is even less palatable. (they are concerned that the cost of leaf blowing in the spring and fall is too much!)

>You may want to consider a back up/'second choice' site should subsurface investigation reveal contamination. As you know, the Tri State Building across the street lies vacant due to brownfield issues. I recommend a 'conditional selection' pending subsurface investigation.

>I've always felt strongly that the rating system should be weighted toward mixed use recreation. Multiple, active uses make places more populated and inviting. Successful skateparks are inviting to all ages, particularly the 7-12 year old set. I'm afraid Elm Street will not be a good place for the younger kids. I wouldn't leave my kids there like I do at Memorial Park and Crowell Lot.

Obviously I'm biased toward the Crowell lot for many reasons, but I also respect the work you've done and I thank you for taking on this task.

Best of luck,  
adam

**Adam Hubbard, RLA**  
Stevens & Associates, P.C.  
95 Main Street, P.O. Box 1586  
Brattleboro, VT 05302  
802-380-5875 mobile  
802-257-9329 x105  
[\[REDACTED\]](#)