Committee Members attending: Co-Chairs Gary Dell’Abate and Scott Johnson; Katie Deluca; Karen Fassuliotis; Alan Monelli; Liz Peldunas; Kirk Schubert; Joe Siciliano, Sue Snyder,

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 PM. Scott Johnson, the Committee Co-Chair, asked for a vote to approve the minutes from the last committee meeting on February 26, 2019. A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded and they were approved unanimously.

Mr. Monelli walked the committee through the Scoring Instructions for responses to RFQL 7484, the submittals of qualifications from architectural firms interested in providing architectural and engineering services for the new Eastern Greenwich Civic Center. Each committee member is responsible for reviewing all of the thirteen (13) qualifications packages, completing an evaluation sheet for each package and returning all 13 evaluation sheets as a single package to Renata Michalski in the Purchasing Department by 4 PM on May 17, 2019.

Mr. Johnson discussed with Mr. Monelli how to handle the fact that he has a conflict of interest with one of the submitting firms. It was determined that an adjustment to the total score for that firm can be made.

The objective of this scoring process is to choose the top four or five candidate firms based on these qualification packages. Those top firms will receive detailed RFP information including property surveys, existing building plans, a GIS map, zoning information and desired features/replacement goals in a new structure. On one day, in the next couple of months, all of those firms will come in to make presentations of 40-60 minutes to the committee. The firms will be compensated for their time since completing the RFP will require a significant investment of the firm’s time.

If firms did not follow the RFQL instructions, they cannot receive all the possible points. Mr. Monelli told the committee to score the packages based on what information is presented/not presented. This is primarily a quantitative exercise. Fractional points can be allocated.

Qualitative judgments will be made by the committee in evaluating a submitting firm’s distinctive competitive advantages (#5 for 10 points) such as unique prior experiences and/or business relationships, specialized knowledge, specialized equipment, etc. Mr. Monelli urged committee members to look at photographs for possible innovative ideas.

Question #8 gets at how well the architectural firm has put together its bid.

Sets of the thirteen packages were distributed to the committee members. Mr. Monelli expects that scores will be spread broadly across the thirteen submittals.
Architects will need between 4-6 weeks to prepare their packages responding to the RFP. Mr. Siciliano reflected on the challenges of scheduling meetings during the summer. Ms. Fassuliotis commented on the public’s criticism of scheduling decision meetings on MI projects during Christmas holidays.

Committee discussion turned to timing of the next steps in the process. An architect will be selected. Site work and floor plans will be prepared. Mr. Monelli will take the project to the First Selectman for MI request. Then the project would move to the P&Z. Summer/Fall 2021 would likely be shovel in the ground based on current timeline.

Mr. Schubert asked about timing of construction from beginning to end. Mr. Monelli said there will be two separate contracts; one for demolition of the building and another for construction of the new Civic Center. But it’s possible to schedule tightly so the old building is closed and demolished just before town is ready to start construction of new building.

Mr. Dell’ Abate asked what will happen to staff and programs while center is under construction. Mr. Siciliano responded that some programs might be relocated or be put on hold depending on the season. Parks & Rec will want to give users of the building opportunity to find other space.

Mr. Schubert asked about the possibility of using temporary buildings. Mr. Siciliano responded that P&Z has rules about temporary buildings and the limit for use is typically 6 months. He doesn’t think Parks & Rec would be operating from temporary buildings, that is office space, in the parking lot. Management would be where the programs are going to run.

The fields will be left open during construction and unaffected by construction. The tennis courts and playground would be closed. Mr. Monelli hopes some portion of the parking lot that’s not taken over by construction would remain for those using the fields during spring, summer and fall. Ms. Peldunas asked if the parking lot can be reconstructed first. That’s possible but the parking lot area may be required for laying down of steel required for the new building. That would ruin the newly constructed lot.

Mr. Dell’ Abate asked if the day in which the 4-5 architects present their proposals would be considered a public meeting and Mr. Siciliano responded that it likely would be but there would be no opportunity for the public to ask questions.

Conversation turned to the scheduling of next public information session. Mr. Siciliano preferred public input is captured before the architects are given the final criteria for the building. Mr. Johnson believes we captured public input a few years ago that architects can include in schematics that are presented at the next public information session.

Mr. Dell’Abate asked Mr. Monelli what happens after the architects make their presentations. Mr. Monelli described the following: demolition package of current building lump sum: site development, preliminary floor plans and elevation, P&Z process through final site plan approval; and 100% completion of construction/design plans. Budget is $600,000 for all of this. Bidding of actual job will give the price for the project. Fifteen (15) million dollars is a placeholder amount for the project. If the desired project plans coming from the chosen architect would cost $18 Million to build, the project would need to go back before the BET for approval of the higher amount.

MISA’s escalating cost from the initial $23 Million to $46 Million (without soil remediation costs) was cited by the committee as a path it doesn’t want to follow on this project.
Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Monelli about the geotechnical services required at the civic center. Geotechnical services looks at (1) the bearing capacity of the soil and (2) absorption capacity of the soil to meet stormwater regulations. It doesn’t look at environmental issues. Certain sections of the new building will likely need to be piled based on some preliminary borings.

Discussion returned to scheduling a public session. Mr. Dell’Abate believes we have addressed why we’re not building a pool or fitness center. Mr. Johnson is concerned about the public’s feedback regarding not considering a second floor. Mr. Monelli said architect will design building with a second floor if that makes his plan work.

Mr. Johnson says $30 Million project has been nixed. Mr. Schubert wanted to know how we know that large indoor synthetic field will add $15 Million to project cost. Mr. Monelli said 14,000 sq ft at $350-$400/sq ft. will cost additional $15 Million. Mr. Schubert asked about the possibility of private funding. Mr. Dell’Abate said private funding needs to found quickly. Experience of public/private partnership at Byram Pool was discussed as an example. Junior League donations came in over multi-year period. Western Civic Center large donation came in tranches over a three-year period. Town cannot go to bid for contract without Town’s commitment to pay for 100% of the project.

Discussion returned to timing of next public meeting. Ms. DeLuca asked what the goal of the public meeting would be. It was determined that a public meeting should happen in the first two weeks of June (either June 5th or June 12th). Session would be advertised via Parks & Rec email contacts and newspapers. Residents abutting the project will be contacted directly by mail.

Mr. Schubert submitted a fact sheet regarding OGRCC’s payments to the town for rent at the Civic Center as well as for use of fields and facilities across town. This document was to answer the question Ms. Peldunas had asked at a previous meeting why the town should rent office space to OGRCC at the Civic Center

Ms. Fassuliotis asked if the co-chairs could set a calendar for future meeting dates. The next big meeting will be the review of architects’ presentations. No other dates were set.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Peldunas, Recording Secretary