



Eastern Greenwich Civic Center Committee
October 17, 2018 Meeting Minutes
Frank Keegan Conference Room

Committee Members: Gary Dell'Abate; Scott Johnson; Kirk Schubert; Karen Fassuliotis; Meg Nolan; Joe Siciliano, Sue Snyder, Katie Deluca; Alan Monelli

SFA Representative: Dan Morton by telephone

RTM Members: Monica Prehauda, District 6; Victoria Quake, District 6

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 PM. Scott Johnson, the Committee Chair, welcomed Committee members and guests to the second meeting of the committee. Scott began with some housekeeping matters. Compilation of minutes will be rotated among Gary Dell'Abate, Scott Johnson, Kirk Schubert, Meg Nolan and Karen Fassuliotis. Karen will be responsible for the October 17th minutes, followed by Meg, Kirk, Gary and Scott, for subsequent meetings.

The Committee focused on questions to the survey consultant representative, Dan Morton, of SFA, who was available by telephone. Mr. Morton had forwarded answers to written questions submitted by committee members which are attached to these minutes as "Exhibit 1".

Mr. Morton was asked whether the \$13.5 million quoted for the indoor turf field was in addition to the replacement facility of \$15,029,824 for replacement of the current facility. He responded that the \$13.5 million would be in addition to the replacement of the current facility as a standalone building. However, if additional square footage of 20,000 sq feet was added to the existing building and the administration section was omitted there would be a saving of \$9-9.5 million for a total of \$25 million.

The conversation also focused on the existing building replacement and whether there was a multipurpose flooring could be utilized for the basketball court. Mr. Siciliano stated that the preference for the basketball court would be a wood floor. Multipurpose flooring could be considered for the other parts of the building.

Mr. Morton was asked if they were to present this project to the BET how would they present it? Mr. Morton stated that they would do a pro forma to include revenue, expenses and the bottom line in terms of revenue/loss to the town to prove out their analysis. Mr. Morton stated he would need to get back to the Committee with a cost to do the pro forma but he felt they would turn it around in approximately 4 weeks.

With respect to the second building, the focus would be on revenue. The plan would be to have indoor turf. However, Mr. Morton said turf could be seasonal and likely be peak from November to April 1st. The space would not likely be in high demand during summer unless air conditioning was added to the space to use in foul weather. It was Mr. Morton's opinion that the facility has the ability to pay for itself operationally. Mr. Del'Abate stated that the challenge would be to convince the town whether it wanted to be in the business to run the facility or hand it over to a third party. The key would be programming. Mr. Siciliano says there is an opportunity for the town day camp to use it in that time period and other third party camps. The issue is whether people would pay a significantly higher price when Chelsea Piers is nearby.

The Committee also discussed whether SFA would recommend locker rooms. They would not, but they would recommend changing rooms – open space with no showers.

SFA also indicated that they did not look at a court over the court (e.g., mezzanine track above the basketball court). There is enough space to do that but he could not guarantee that it would be ADA requirement.

The Committee also discussed indoor turf options. SFA was aware that foam rubber is not preferred by Greenwich and stated that there are other options.

Mr. Monelli then explained the approval process to the Committee members. He stated that he met with Ben Branyon, the Town Administrator and they will be requesting \$14 million in the capital improvement plan but that the capital would not be in this year's budget. Mr. Monelli's recommendation is to come up with a laundry list of amenities in the main building. He would then give the list and the survey to 4-5 architects who would then make a presentation on the vision and the site. Each architect would likely charge \$4,000 to come up with a plan against the vision. The Committee would then grade them on their presentation and an architect would be chosen to draw up a preliminary site plan. Mr. Monelli would then go to the town agencies and boards for municipal improvement (MI) approval. For that he would need a floor plan, elevation and a site plan. Once MI approval is granted there would then be hydrology testing for engineering. P&Z comments would be addressed and the plans would go to the architect review committee. A final site plan, which is 30% design, would then be presented to P&Z for approval.

Mr. Monelli also described the monies need to get to 30% design. In FY 15-16 the project was appropriated \$200,000. In FY 16-17 an additional \$170,000 was appropriated. Approximately \$50,000 has been spent to date, so there is \$320,000 remaining. The normal estimate for a \$12 million facility for A&E is 6%, so \$720,000 will be need for 100% design. So an additional \$300,000 will be needed to complete the 100% design. This is the amount that has been requested for the FY19-20 budget.

Mr. Siciliano added that the 15 year capital plan initially had the replacement building costing \$12 million. The plan will be revised this year at \$14 million. Mr. Siciliano believes that \$15 million is the correct number, which could be higher depending on the finishings requested by the Committee.

The Committee agreed that the next step is to do a quality based design evaluation with architects answering the questions, "What is the primary building going to be?" What are the additions that are being requested." Committee members should forward to Mr. Monelli the top five things they wish in the building prior to the next meeting. At the next meeting the list will be reviewed and a final list compiled. Mr. Monelli will then take that list and shop it to architects.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M. The next meeting will be on October 30, 2018 at 4:30 PM at the Eastern Greenwich Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen, Fassuliotis, Recording Secretary

Scott Johnson, Chair

Exhibit 1

1. Rather than a costly indoor aquatic center, what would the estimate cost of a field house of similar proportion that could handle an indoor turf field, (200 x 85 feet plus) be?

- This information is included in the attached facility program and cost document. The indoor turf facility is estimated to be 35,000 square feet and cost \$13.5 million.

Given activities like walking and cycling scored quite high on the survey, how do you account for those in the design? Same goes with fitness, given its broad nature?

- In the “Existing Facility Replacement” facility program, a walking track is recommended which will be suspended above the hardwood court area. Individuals would be able pass through and walk or run at their leisure.
- Additionally, in this facility program there are three 40’x25’ classrooms which could be split into 20’x25’ classrooms, creating six of them. Also, one 60’x25’ flex/team room is recommended, which can be split into three 20’x25’ rooms. These classrooms can be used to serve as group exercise areas. One of the most desired programs and spaces that was identified in the survey was fitness areas and fitness programs, utilizing the walking track and multi-purpose flex space for group exercise activities would be a way to address this need without the build out of a full fitness center.
- Alternatively, in the “New Facility Amenities” facility program, an 8,000 square foot fitness center with additional group exercise areas is recommended. Within this fitness center, SFA would recommend a full fitness studio which would include, cardio, strength, and circuit machines/equipment, etc.

3. If we were to use a surface that allowed for sports like basketball as well as indoor practices of lacrosse or soccer and then also be friendly for events, does that affect the cost? What surfaces do you recommend?

- SFA would recommend a poured synthetic surface that would be amenable to indoor sports activities (basketball, volleyball, lacrosse, soccer, etc.) and also function as event space. The cost related to include this surface is included in the updated facility program for the “Existing Facility Replacement” for the exhibition/event space.
- “Existing Facility Replacement” facility program is updated to increase the Event Space to support an additional basketball/volleyball court with a poured synthetic flooring.

4. Given more than 40% of the respondents of the survey do not currently use the facility, how do you then best appropriate the needs of the townspeople vs. the actual users and future users?

- SFA considered both the needs of existing users and townspeople when recommending the approach to the redevelopment of the EGCC. Based on 60% of respondents using the existing facility and the desired amenities/programs aligning with the existing capabilities of the EGCC, SFA recommends replacing the amenities to continue to serve the community and not displace these users as the priority for redevelopment.
- SFA found through the survey that the current indoor and outdoor amenities at the EGCC are heavily utilized by the existing users and recommended the “Existing Facility Replacement” facility program, which replaces the existing indoor assets.

- However, of the 40 percent of respondents that indicated they are not users of the EGCC, it was identified in the written response that these individuals do not use the EGCC because of the amenities offered at the EGCC and for “other reasons” which were related to having no youth in their households.
- 32% of survey respondents are using Chelsea Piers, 18% are using YMCAs, 17% are using health clubs
- Fitness activities and recreational swimming were the highest participated programs at non-Town of Greenwich facilities
- Fitness activities and recreational swimming were the highest identified programs that would make non-users more frequent users of the EGCC
 - For those reasons SFA analyzed a “New Facility Amenities” facility program, which adds a fitness center and recreational swimming components.
 - However, with the additional footprint of the new building to support these spaces, this could take away existing outdoor assets (playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball/softball fields, soccer fields), which existing EGCC users currently utilize.
- For these reasons, SFA found a balance which would not take away existing outdoor assets current EGCC users utilize, while understanding why a large number of individuals currently do not utilize the EGCC (amenities offered and no youth in households), and the desire for fitness related activities that could be addressed without the buildout of a full fitness center (walking track, utilizing classrooms and flex space to serve as group exercise areas).