

**MINUTES OF THE JULY 9, 2019, EASTERN GREENWICH
CIVIC CENTER COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING**

Cone Meeting Room
Greenwich Town Hall 12:00 p.m.

Committee Attendees:

Scott Johnson, Co-Chairman
Gary Dell'Abate, Co-Chairman
Kirk Schubert, Committee Member
Karen Fassuliotis, Committee Member
Liz Peldunas, Committee Member
Katie DeLuca, Committee Member
Susan Snyder, Committee Member

Members of the Public in Attendance:

Nancy Ramer
Susan Foster

Meeting commenced at approximately 12:00 p.m. This was a Special Meeting with the sole purpose of receiving presentations from the four finalist architectural firms responding to the RFP for the potential new EGCC. These firms consisted of Moser Pilon, KG&D, TSKP and QA&M.

Al Monelli gave a brief overview to Committee Members on how to complete the scoring sheets, which are to be completed by all EGCC Committee Members, based on each presentation. Presentations were limited to approximately one hour, and questions were to be asked during presentations by Committee Members only. Examples of typical questions were discussed.

Each architectural firm gave very complete presentations (including handouts) and generally covered the required items, including the following, however, each had a different approach and a different level of detail on the various items:

- Site Plan
- Entrance
- Façade
- Stormwater Management
- Layout
- Structural Components
- Glass
- Interior
- Design
- Scheduling
- Availability
- Elevations
- Operating Expenses

- Footprint
- 1st Floor vs. 2nd Floor
- Parking
- Traffic Flow
- Square Footage Allocations
- Floor Plans
- Sections
- Topography
- Finishing Materials
- Wetlands
- Flooring Materials
- HVAC
- Alternative Energy, such as solar and geothermal
- Environmental considerations, such as trees and NetZero
- Options
- Zoning Compliance and Analysis
- Budgets and Cost of Completion
- Need Analysis
- Value Added Ideas

[It is noted that the various firms did provide different solutions and ideas and a diversity of design concepts but with the overall size and basic characteristics similar and consistent with the requested program and presentation goals as submitted by Al Monelli and the EGCC.]

All firms indicated that the budget could be made realistic but also indicated a number of alternatives and that if various itemized goals were more developed, alternative pricing schemes with slight additions could be easily presented. All firms also indicated that the ideas presented were preliminary in nature and that they invite more specific Committee feedback, ultimate questions, modifications and alternative ideas. The presented schematics were for purposes of their initial vision for the project and not intended to be fixed or set in stone.

The scoring panel asked numerous probing questions of each firm. Firms also had various consulting contractors in attendance, such as interior designers, landscape architects, engineers, etc. Examples of questions were: a) Is the budget realistic?; b) Do the room dividers work well; c) Does PV and geothermal work?; d) How does the traffic flow in terms of safety; e) Is the schedule realistic?; f) What is the best floor material?; g) How does the HVAC regulate large open spaces and where are the ducts located; h) Impact on neighbors; i) Is parking adequate and do we use staggered times?; j) Does an elevated walkway track make sense?; k) Is zoning a problem?; l) Where will the stormwater go?; m) Does wetlands limit us much?; n) Interior safety; o) What do other towns do?; p) Why steel vs. glue laminate?; q) What are value added options?; r) Are the square footage allocations reasonable?;

s) Are there engineering and contingency numbers in the budget numbers?; t) Were efforts made to minimize environmental impact?

Each member of the panel completed its scoring sheets and submitted them to Al Monelli at the conclusion of their presentation. Al was then responsible for forwarding them to the Purchasing Department.

[It is noted that the format of the presentations, as well as the specifics of the requirements of the presentation, was as per Purchasing Department requirements.]

The meeting was concluded at approximately 4:30 p.m.