



MINUTES

EASTERN GREENWICH CIVIC CENTER COMMITTEE

Cone Conference Room, 2nd Floor,
Town Hall, Wednesday, February 26, 2019 at 4:30 p.m.

Sub Committee Attendees:

Scott Johnson	Co-Chair, BPR
Gary Dell'Abate	Co-Chair, BPR
Joe Siciliano	DPR
Al Monelli	DPW
Kirk Schubert	BPR
Katie DeLuca	P&Z, Planner
Sue Snyder	BPR

Regrets:

Meg Nolan	BPR
Karen Fassuliotis	BET

Community Attendees:

Billie Schock	Director, EGCC
Dan Ozizmir	RTM
Lucy Krasnor	RTM
Pattie Roberts	RTM
Elizabeth Peldunas	Riverside Association
Linnea Stenberg	Riverside Association
Susan Foster	Riverside Association
Nancy Ramer	Visitor

Meeting Agenda distributed.

The meeting was called to order at 4:37. Mr. Dell'Abate opened the meeting with a motion to approve prior Minutes, which was unanimously approved.

Discussion was then turned over to Mr. Johnson who reviewed the First Selectman's Mandate for the Committee, issued in July 2018, with a proposal to extend the Mandate

to cover review of selection of architects and engineers and basic plans associated therewith. He stated that this is not intended to be a “building committee” under state statute by just a review and recommendation committee. Mr. Johnson reviewed precise language as submitted to First Selectman and said language was unanimously approved, including by the First Selectman, who was present.

Mr. Monelli of DPW then presented and discussed, at length, the Request for Qualifications (“RFQ”) for architects, which was to be issued shortly and be based on required town procedures. This would then be followed by an RFP for same and, ultimately, the selection of an architect/engineering firm. The plan development process would be phased with an initial and preliminary set of plans and, upon approval and funding authorizations, followed by a more detailed set of plans, including construction drawings. Mr. Monelli discussed the budget requests relating thereto, including the two sets of requisitions—one for initial plans and the other for more detailed plans for various stages of Land Use approvals—including the Municipal Improvement approval process. Mr. Monelli gave a detailed review of the documents used for RFQs on a power point presentation. Mr. Monelli included a description of the basic examples to be used for the proposal, subject to modifications, consisting of a set of attached recommendations (Scope of Work, Recommendations and Goals) with square footage allocations, description legends and space descriptions and with an initial generalized construction cost of \$15,000,000 and generalized architectural and engineering fees of \$600,000, subject to adjustments. Several of the qualification categories were company resumes, history of similar projects, insurance requirements and staff expertise.

Once responses are received, Committee will rank submissions on a score sheet. Anticipated submissions are expected to be between 20 – 25 and then reduced to 4 – 6 firms. Previously approved money will take us to 30% of A&E expenses, which includes land surveys, geotechnical services, civil and site services. Future advances, pending approval, will get to more detailed plans.

Qualification responses will also include a description of disciplines within firm, including mechanical and technical, plumbing and engineering, with Connecticut licenses and expertise and shall include description of recreational buildings since 2010 of similar type and scope. Each firm will also list name and locations of similar projects and include method of construction, construction costs and degree of change orders. It is important not to pick someone who designed a building with extensive change orders since that very often reflects incomplete plans. Litigation history disclosures will also be required.

Analysis and scoring of qualification process was discussed. Once 4 – 6 architectural firms are picked, an RFP goes out to those firms requesting greater detail. The RFP gives history of building, site restrictions, design concerns and limitations (including size of

lot), existing parking and other limitations of parcel. Ultimate figures will also include pricing for overseeing the construction process once construction begins. Bidders will give a 40 – 60-minute presentation on their vision of what the building can and should look like. Bids will be sealed.

For the next round of architects, there will be payment of a fee in the neighborhood of \$4,000 - \$5,000 to compensate each for their design proposals.

To assist in the process of giving bidders background, information on operations, custodians, renovation vs replacement, etc., will be issued. We will also give them A-2 survey information, GIS map, restrictions on building size and restriction to build on a certain 4.5-acre site. Design will be compliant with P&Z regulations, drainage and stormwater regulations, and wetlands regulations. Design suggestions are to incorporate as much as possible of the replacement goals and include design ideas but with limitations; i.e., not a 50,000 square foot building with a swimming pool. Parking limitations will be important and will be subject to P&Z regulations.

Wetlands regulations are also an important consideration as a result of a stream to the rear of the property and poorly drained areas which will restrict building area and setbacks.

Architects will be required to take structural borings to confirm subsurface structural conditions.

Phase I and Phase II environmental analysis has already been completed and indicate no problems.

New building must be designed to accommodate a variety of considerations for all spaces, including, but not limited to, athletic space, exhibition hall, basketball court and several methods for delivery of electricity for display and exhibit areas.

The town will not be providing initial construction specifications. Those will be developed later by architect.

Drainage problems and solutions must be addressed. Engineering department will be working on stormwater drainage issues, catch basins and current back-ups, separately, and is not included in proposed replacement building cost, but is included in engineering budget. That information will be shared with the architect of record.

Presentation goals include proposed site layout of building and parking lots, architect's opinion on space allocations and adequacy in terms of zoning analysis, site availability and replacement goals and stormwater management requirements. Layout must comply with replacement goals and include considerations for options, including building size, footprint, staff requirements and budgetary guidelines, and includes

demolition. Plans must also include development of exterior façade with elevations, topographic contours, vision of front entrance with cross sections and prospectives to explain design. Design must also include description of building systems, including HVAC for building and different space configurations, and also include review of material selections alternatives and design options for open and closed interior spaces that tie venues together. Presentation will also include samples of interior BAT materials and color palettes. Town will also consider additional value-added items during the process. A&E firms must show ability to meet design schedules, timelines and meet budget requirements.

Possible historic preservation considerations will also be discussed during the process. Discussion included a confirmation that renovation of existing structure is impractical due to major structural deficiencies, presence of asbestos, inefficiencies of space allocations, roof defects, foundation defects and antiquated drainage facilities.

It is anticipated that RFQ will be issued within the next 30 days based on the format and contents presented in the discussion. It was made clear that ultimate design characteristics, goals and details are intended to be developmental (within basic limits) during the process with architect suggested alterations continuing during the process.

[The foregoing includes discussions and questions by and between EGCC members Katie DeLuca, Scott Johnson, Joe Siciliano and Gary Dell'Abate]

Brief questions from the public that occurred: Peter Tesei indicated a need to review the facility as a potential emergency back-up facility and should be included in architects' review. Lucy Krasnor reiterated need for the facility to be multi-use, not just devoted to athletics. Liz Peldunas asked why OGRCC has a presence in the building.

Discussion occurred on regularizing next meeting schedule and having meetings after regular work hours. It was also confirmed that additional public meetings will occur, including with RTM districts and public hearings based on P&R distribution and participant list.

[Meeting was recorded, but audio from various members of the public was inaudible]
Mr. Dell'Abate adjourned meeting after questions from audience at 6:15 p.m.