

**TOWN OF TRUMBULL
CONNECTICUT**

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611



Trumbull Community Center Study and Building Committee
Thursday, April 6, 2017
7:00 pm
Long Hill Conference Room, Trumbull Town Hall

Present: Co-Chairman Joseph Pifko; Committee Members Richard Seaman, David Preusch, Joseph Costa, Lori Hayes-O'Brien, Dawn Cantafio and Jeannine Stauder

Also Present: Lynn Arnow, Chief of Staff; Thomas Arcari, Quisenberry Arcari; Mark Block, Town Council; John Marsilio, Public Works Director; Kevin Bova, Purchasing Director; First Selectman Timothy Herbst

Committee members Absent: Co-Chairman Daniel Marconi

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 pm by Mr. Pifko followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Past Minutes

Motion was made by Mr. Seaman to approve the minutes of March 23, 2017 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Stauder. Approved unanimously.

Clarence Heimann Leadership Awards

First Selectman Timothy Herbst congratulated the Committee on their hard work and efforts on behalf of the Town. The Committee, as a whole, were the recipients of the Clarence Heimann Leadership Award. Members of the Committee were presented their awards.

Project Update

Mr. Preusch clarified where the Committee is in the process noting the Committee has been meeting for approximately two years. He spoke on the process of how buildings are developed, particularly for the Town of Trumbull. This is a sub-committee of the Town Council and it operates under Town Council Building Committee Rules. There are 17 different areas the rules discuss but there is a series of steps that pertain to development of the architectural work of the Committee. That deals with five distinct steps. The Committee is at Step 1. Mr. Preusch read Section 9 of the Rules –

“Prior to any request for appropriation from preliminary plans and specifications, the committee shall present to the Town Council such drawings, cost estimates and other documents as are necessary to fully apprise the Town Council of the expected scope of the project.”

The Committee has been doing this job for two years. The Committee is working towards a comprehensive preliminary package or a pre-design phase. The Committee is not into the basic architectural services part of the project. The Committee chose to do a conceptual design/feasibility study in order to answer three basic questions to give the Town Council information so a responsible decision on behalf of the Town of Trumbull can be made to then proceed to architectural services to actually do a building. The three things determined are what is a community center, where might it go, and what might it cost. This was done on a conceptual level. This information then goes to the Town Council. This process is the same process followed by the THS Building Committee. The architects have taken this concept design a bit further in several iterations and prepared a cost estimate on the preliminary site design based on the results of a site review process by the Committee. This project cannot go any further until the drawings, indicating the scope of the work, is approved by the Town Council.

Mr. Preusch read Section 10 from the Rules which is Step 2 for the Committee –

“After approval by the Town Council of the scope of the project, the committee shall recommend to the Town Council its choice of architect for the project. Upon approval of an architect by the Town Council, the committee shall engage said architect.”

Step 3 is the actual architectural work; Section 11 of the Rules --

“The committee shall submit preliminary plans and specifications for the proposed building or structure to the Town Council for approval.” This is approval number 2 of the Council that also includes a copy of the IMPACT Statement required to be done by the Department of Public Works with regard to the impact on the infrastructure of the utilities, etc. “Upon approval of the preliminary plans and specifications,” (approval number 3) the committee shall obtain final plans and specifications and submit same to the Town Council for approval.” (approval number 4).

After that, and only then, Section 12 of the Rules –

“The Committee shall be empowered to seek appropriations as may be necessary for the construction, furnishing and equipment of said building or structure.”

There is also a section about site selection where the Planning and Zoning Commission will make a referral. It is called the 824 Referral to the Town Council. This is a separate item that has a separate approval process. What the Committee has now is a conceptual design and the only thing final about it is that this is what will be reported to the Town Council after two years of work for their approval to engage the architect to do preliminary design and specifications for the project. There are five steps in the building process used by the Town. The Committee is working to finish Step number 1.

Public Comment (limited to 2 minutes each speaker)

Kim Schneider, 111 Sturbridge Lane – Asked about the agenda item stating the Committee would be voting on the final design – this was answered but asked what will the Committee be voting on? Noted the conceptual design has no scale on it – what size is the basketball court? Size of locker facilities? Size of kitchen? *Mr. Preusch noted this is a conceptual design and does not work out all details; it shows that the details can be worked out.* Ms. Schneider asked how the plan can be approved without knowing sizes. *Mr. Preusch noted that it is still conceptual and when the architectural work proceeds, the schematic designs involving the kitchen may be revised. Specifics of the building have been discussed but take place further along in the process.* Also noted no design for the parking lot and bio/remedial catch basin. No design for a landscape architectural design that was to be turned over the Planning and

Zoning; does not think they have the required expertise to do that. In this case, a well-thought out landscape design is important with the potential effect to the neighbors. Also asked about the sale of the six properties appraised in 2015 that came to approximately \$6.6 million. The First Selectman estimated there would be an \$8.5-\$9.5 surplus from those and the numbers do not equate. Wanted more data and research done.

Kevin Shivley, 66 Beardsley Parkway – works on the TCTV Committee; wants to make sure they maximize the opportunity to serve Trumbull with TCTV. The Committee is concerned about the preliminary plan that does not seem to have any concept as a 21st century building. The IT components as they relate to being accessible and usable by TCTV - TCTV wants to make sure they can serve the public with the most transparency of the town government. This is not on the plan at this point. There are also concerns regarding space on the conceptual plan for a server room, racks for IT, racks for TCTV to make sure they have the equipment in this building. One thing to consider is that you want to be a legacy, something that lasts and serves the public to its maximum capability so we need to make sure we have that space. They have met with the architect and the Building Committee on this issue and is disappointed that it doesn't show in the conceptual phase.

Melanie Flavin, 23 Louis Street—wanted to know the cost of the conceptual plan. There is a potential to add other parts to this building as the process goes on. This would potentially add to the cost of the center. *Mr. Pifko noted it will be a part of the presentation.*

Marty Isaac, 50 Skating Pond Road – concerned that there is no understanding of what is going on. Is it a senior center or a community center? Hearing it is \$17 million and 6 properties are being sold. No one has a clue what is going on and people are concerned about what is happening. He didn't feel that input was taken from the community. There is no identified user group for the center other than a very early discussion of seniors using the facility earlier in the day with others using it later in the day. Has it been determined what this is and who has access and when? An email was sent to a Committee Chair and he received a response that these are operational questions. His question was how can you hire an architect, draw up plans and spend \$17 million and not know the intent? This is the perception; perhaps this information has not been shared with the community; they do not understand. Does not know why the community doesn't know what is happening. Would like more information shared.

Eric Paulson, 69 Brittany Avenue – read a portion of Mr. Herbst's remarks from the Trumbull Times. He wants to move Trumbull forward but wished he knew what was going on.

Michael Ganino, 3 Canterbury Lane – Moved to Trumbull several months ago and is perplexed and confused. He attended a meeting several months ago and was told that it was too late to make any remarks or complaints about the building. Does not understand what direction the Town is going. He is in favor of the direction the Town is going in with a senior/community center but feels it needs to be done in a way to not destroy the community where it will be placed. He is not convinced of that. He is a senior and a veteran. Caught up in the process is the veteran's facility and they have been treated abysmally. You need to canvas the community and see if they actually want the facility. *Mrs. Stauder addressed the veterans noting it is a relocation.*

Tony D'Aquila, 29 Valley View Road – First recommendation was to move the meeting into the Town Council Chambers as it is now empty. It is a disgrace having people stand up while a decision is made. Has a serious concern about a traffic study recently submitted to the Police Commission who is the local traffic authority. The document submitted was not the final document. He visited Planning and Zoning

and he saw the final document which is 10-15 pages more than the document presented to the Police Commission. The Police Commission voted on it and then came to the Building Committee meeting immediately following and it wasn't even presented to the Building Committee. No one voted on it, no one read it. He did read it and his analysis will be presented at the Planning and Zoning meeting when they discuss the 824 Referral. He will make comments because he thinks it is seriously flawed. For the Building Committee not to review and approve it, he doesn't understand how the Committee works. It is a disgrace.

Claire Weitzman, 209 Fernwood Road – felt the meeting was breaking the law because occupants are limited to 30. *Mr. Pifko noted most meetings have 3-4 residents attending; this was not anticipated. Mr. Herbst noted that because the meeting was noticed for the Long Hill Conference Room, under FOI, if you go to move the meeting to another room that has not been noticed, that may be an FOI violation. If it is an FOI violation, the Committee could be accused of not being transparent. Mr. Herbst contacted the town attorney regarding this.*

George Boland, 32 Blue Ridge Drive -- read the architect information where he said he met with some of the people before it came to the conceptual designs; he noted there would be numerous times to speak about this and engage with the community. What happened with this? Now we are finding out various buildings are being closed and those groups will be included and a four-lane swimming pool? He feels a lot of people would like a community center but requested that we put the best pool in Fairfield County where we can do swim meets. Has followed the project but felt the residents have not had the chance to speak on this and now the conceptual design is set. *Mr. Pifko noted there were post cards sent to every home in town, there were meetings in every district, there were meetings in the Library and the Senior Center to get public input. This information was used to help develop this conceptual design. This is nothing but an idea. It is planned tonight to set an agenda to go back to the public again to speak on the project. Mr. Preusch noted a conceptual design allows the client to react. Now the public engagements can be a reaction to the design that was developed from numerous meetings with user groups and the general public. Now people can make comments on what is or is not included. The Town Council will decide if the residents will vote on this project. What happens if the residents do not want this after the next round of discussions? Can we get another group to come in or fix up the old Senior Center? It would be taken into consideration, if this should be the case. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien made it clear that the people who decide whether this happens or not are not at this table; it is the Town Council.*

Unknown individual comment—client terminology should be erased from any language; we are stakeholders.

Jason Marsh, 55 Tashua Lane – thanked the Building Committee for their hours of work. There is some consternation as there seems to be a mixed message that we are at Step 1 but the First Selectman issued a release where he talked about breaking ground in the summer. We don't seem to know – the comments by the Building Committee and the First Selectman seem to be disconnected.

Ray Fuchs, 221 Fitch Pass -- will there be a timetable outlined in the presentation tonight and are we going to see the programs you are putting into the conceptual plan? Are you going to tell us how big the footprint is of the conceptual plan so that even if someone wants sizes of individual spaces, we could decide what it is that we will get. *Mr. Pifko noted the plans were outside of the meeting room with sizes of the rooms. Programs are an operational decision. We know that the seniors are going to use the building, not exclusively. How big is the building, how many people can you accommodate? The Committee has been visiting community centers over the last two years and have given the architect*

what they felt was needed such as conference/meeting rooms, small gym, good dining facility, game room, exercise rooms. These are all in the conceptual plan. Approval of this project is unknown as the Committee is only at Step 1. Now the next step is to speak with the residents to see what they want and again the design will be refined. Then it will go back to the Town Council. Hopes it will take several years to complete the approvals so that some detail will be included.

Laurie Citarella, 50 Westfield Drive – with all the confusion, what is being voted on tonight?

Vickie Tesoro, 133 Beechwood Avenue – thanked the Committee for their work as everyone is a volunteer and it is not an easy process. She does not agree with the process so far. Her concern was about the posted agenda which was answered already and some other questions were answered by Mr. Preusch. She stated the agenda is confusing on accepting a final design. This represents an issue with a lot of people because there is confusion and information that is out there is confusing or non-existent. There was no actual plan posted with the agenda from the architect. The plan presented from the March 23 meeting was not included with the agenda. That is a Charter violation which leaves people in the dark. People want information so going forward plans should be posted. The last plans posted were from March 1. March 23 should be posted which is part of the discussion tonight. If the vote is to be on the final conceptual plan, she requested the Committee not do that tonight because the presentation made may be based on discussions you had on March 23 with the Fire Marshal, Emergency Management Director and perhaps a totally different plan is being presented to be voted on.

Mr. Herbst noted the Town Attorney is researching the meeting request. Mr. Herbst noted that he cannot find any language as to whether you can move a meeting. The attorney is under the impression that when you notice the meeting it is date, time, location on the agenda. This meeting has been noticed for this location. He feels if the meeting needs to be moved, there is one option – under Section 1-229 you can adjourn and continue to another date. Mr. Herbst recommended that if people have comments, let them voice them. People should make comments and not be argumentative with members of the Committee.

Mary Joan Wright, 55 Aspen Lane – Part-time employee of the Rec Department, since it is conceptual, does that mean it is definitely going across the road? That would mean that the building would have to stay within the limitations of the space. How many square feet is the building? *40,000 sq. feet.*
Unknown about additions.

Comment was made about having the architect do pricing for various amenities for the building.

Mr. Herbst suggested that everyone in the room can give their contact information to him so that each individual can be contacted regarding meeting and information so people are updated. Residents attending this meeting again requested the meeting be moved to another room. The meeting will not be changed at this time. In the future, if the council Chambers is available, the meeting will be held there. Mrs. Arnow explained to those present how to find information on the Town website for this project.

Kathleen Fearon, 38 Sherman Avenue -- with the plan, has there been consideration of set backs for the neighbors as it is not on the plan.

Geraldine Marrocco, 60 Louis Street – Comment that one of the options was to adjourn the meeting and hold it at another time because people are standing and hot. Felt it was unfair to hold a meeting in the

small room when there is an option to hold it at another time in a different venue and be able to make comments.

Julie McNamee, 256 Booth Hill Road – did not understand why the architect doesn't present his proposal, have public comment and then vote. We do not know what is being presented. *Mr. Pifko noted the architect made a presentation to the committee at the last meeting. Tonight is comment and vote.*

Kim Schneider – the mention of access to the Valley with a motorized vehicle, in order to deforest the State park, which that is, we have applied for the TA project which is non-motorized vehicles. If it is received, the TA Project/Award will be for non-motorized vehicles. Suggests that this also stop being spread around - that there will be another trail head in that location because it won't be for motorized vehicles. It will be against the law. Recommended that a trail head not be put in because the Valley is, by permit, hunting and that means there will be guns in the neighborhood. This would not be something she would want.

Pierre Margraff, 30 Chestnut Hill Road – wanted clarification on who the community center is for? Who would be the users of the community center? *Every citizen of the Town of Trumbull would be able to use the community center during regular business hours.*

Christine VanCott – 28 Teeter Rock Road – understands and respects the time spent on the development of the project, but even though it is conceptual, you need to know your users. Felt something lacking was family bathrooms, a lactation room, place to have a meal with family, no seating to watch kids in swim lessons. She noted the facility needs to be a multigenerational space. Need to review how the space will be used, the hours and the access. *Mr. Pifko thanked her for her very constructive comments. He noted that at least 30 centers were visited and noticed this was the case. All this was taken into consideration. Although the initial charge was a senior center, the committee felt it was wasteful to invest into a senior center and for not that much more you can expand it for the whole community. The trend is moving from senior centers to community centers. The architect has built over 20 community centers and verified the information we studied.* Programmatically as they look for utilization by the town, it is ideal to have all generations doing things together. We need to match form and function at the same time.

Unknown Individual Comment – would like a list of components in the center. Would like to do something nice for the neighbors.

Kathleen Kosak, 59 Brookside Drive – commented on a recreation pool versus a competition pool. A recreation pool serves a very small subset of residents and does not take into consideration all the competitive swimmers. Renovating Hillcrest pool does not change the size and it is a major factor with regard to the size of the teams. A competitive pool could be a revenue generator. We have two recreation pools in town and since Hillcrest is currently being used as a recreational pool, it could stay that way and a new pool could be for the competitive swimmers. Recommended the new pool be a competitive pool as a recreation pool cuts off all the competitive swimmers. A competitive pool could be used by everyone.

Unknown Individual Comment – how many people attended the informational meetings? *There were 15 meetings with approximately 60 people each. No attendance was taken as it was a public meeting.* Does not understand why the process could not be slowed down to properly survey the residents.

First Selectman Herbst thanked those present for coming out to give their opinions on this project. He gave the Committee the Clarence Heimann Leadership Award for their hard work on this community project. He noted that every capital project of this nature is complex. There have been questions raised about this project, transparency, building committee rules and the steps followed for this project. There are four more steps in this project and future designs will be vetted not only by the Committee but by the community. There are certain particulars in the project and the public will have an opportunity to comment on them. He spoke about the Plan of Conservation and Development noting it recommends a senior center and multigenerational community center as priorities for the community. Spoke regarding having seniors go to centers outside of Trumbull. Senior population of Trumbull is going to raise at a rate higher than other areas of Fairfield County. If you are going to build something, every resident of the community should benefit from it. Residents who don't have children in the school system still use the schools for various programs. Capital improvements to our schools benefit the entire community. The current Senior Center is 100 years old and should not be used for the seniors or any other group in town. It is beyond its useful life. We do not have adequate meeting space for community organizations. He spoke on how the Town will pay for this center in light of the proposed Governor's budget. State budget cuts and how it will affect Trumbull was addressed. He noted they are intending to keep the budget in line without compromising services.

Mr. Herbst noted the Town has an annual operating budget and a capital budget. Every year, department heads develop a capital plan that goes before the Town Council and Board of Finance for their consideration. This details the proposed capital program for the Town. This proposal will have to go through the Planning and Zoning 824 Referral process, Board of Finance for funding and the Town Council where it will be approved, modified or scrapped. The Building Committee works with many checks and balances as noted in the Charter. There are inherent checks and balances in the Charter that address many of the concerns raised to night.

Funding was discussed. The provision in the Charter regarding the \$15 million referendum threshold, is supported by Mr. Herbst. This was approved by the residents in 2011 by vote. The Town has approved bonding of \$39.6 million over the last three years. None of that has gone to a referendum because each capital plan is different and each has been below the \$15 million threshold. If the project is under the \$15 million, provisions in the Charter must be followed. If we become arbitrary on what we put on the ballot and what we don't put on the ballot, we risk and compromise a capital plan that is making investments in our schools, roads, infrastructure.

Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien moved to clarify that the Committee is not voting on accepting the final design as noted on the agenda as #3 but voting on accepting a conceptual design. Seconded by Mrs. Cantafio and approved unanimously.

Pool Committee Presentation and Recommendations

Mr. Block noted the Public Works Committee has completed its charge on this project which was the aquatic program assessment in town. A report was submitted to the Town Council at its last meeting and the Town Council overwhelmingly approved to accept the report. The report was written and accepted on the partisan basis by the Public Works Committee unanimously. Mr. Block read portions of the report which is available on the Town website. There were six recommendations in terms of aquatics in the community. The following recommendations are directed to the Building Committee:

1. The Committee proposed a recreation pool be included as part of the Community Center project. A separate community pool was only recommended if the community center project proceeded.
2. Two different recommendations were made. One a renovation of the Hillcrest pool for competition and a separate recommendation for reconstruction of the Hillcrest pool.
3. A recommendation was made on community partnerships for aquatic facilities and availability of outdoor pools and alternative funding.

Summary conclusions was read – The strategy plan that is outlined in this report, Trumbull will average one pool facility for every 8,000 residents that is an improvement over its present rate of one pool for 11,000 residents. This value will standardize Trumbull in the national average as defined assuming all other like-sized principalities grow their own systems in a comparable fashion. The Trumbull aquatics program will be far more responsive to the needs of individual aquatic user groups because both the system's existing pools and its new facilities will be designed with far greater specialization. The needs of recreational, competitive, fitness, instructional and therapeutic aquatic users will be better addressed than is possible with the Town's current aquatic facilities. The Committee's plan of service recommends that the underlying service philosophy with the Trumbull aquatics program deliver quality aquatic experiences in education and an affordable user cost be preserved. Accordingly, the assessment projects a continuing need for annual Town of Trumbull funding be appropriated. The overall age of the system's facilities will decrease with the new pool and renovated existing facilities are on board, potentially lowering annual maintenance expenditures. Recommendations to broaden the capital funding base for the aquatics program, including the use of joint public/private partnerships and/or private equity rights, could assist in the procurement of some portion of the capital funding necessary for improvements to the Town aquatic system.

Mr. Block noted the Committee spent four months reviewing this system. There was an extensive conversation with user groups and community members. He spoke about the recommendations noting that information did not support the site for a competitive pool. The Committee felt it didn't make sense to fit a competitive pool on a piece of property with all the activity that will go on. There is a parking problem with competitions – 200 to 300 cars potentially. The Committee was not interested in a natatorium but they did look at an aquatic center. However, we do not have that kind of money. Everyone can use a community pool. The Committee did not get into costs or design. Several meetings were held with town department heads and the architect was the last meeting held. The two outside pools are seasonal pools only so there is only one recreational pool in town to be used year round. It needs a lot of work – either renovation or demolition. The Committee recommends that only if there is a community center built, should there be a recreational pool. The Committee does not support a stand alone recreational pool.

Mrs. Cantafio was concerned because of the public turnout and the information not attached to the agenda. Asked if the Committee felt the meeting should be adjourned, the information posted for the next meeting so everyone has a chance to review and come back in a bigger venue and vet this out? Mrs. Cantafio made a motion to adjourn the meeting so the information can be reviewed. There is a lot to discuss and felt the need for more time to review. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien seconded the motion. Mrs. Cantafio and Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien voted in favor of the motion; Mr. Seaman, Mr. Costa, Mr. Preusch, Mrs. Stauder, Mr. Pifko voted against the motion. Motion passed.

Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien commented that the community forum was overwhelmingly a discussion about competitive pools and the need for a competitive pool. However, the Committee felt it was too much.

The charge of the Committee did not have a cost component. How did the Committee come to this decision? Mr. Block noted that in the forum on the aquatics program, it was mostly competitive swimmers that came out but that was only one user group in town. However, after discussions, the primary issue was scheduling. Mr. Block spoke on the reasoning behind the recommendations made by the Committee. Revenue generation was discussed.

Mr. Arcari noted a recreation pool is in the concept design as a place holder and can be many different configurations.

Mrs. Cantafio questioned the recommendation about partnering with the Trumbull YMCA. Mr. Block understood that the Town had some discussions with the Y. These discussions didn't continue. The Committee felt this should be revisited.

Mr. Pifko clarified that the Town Council received this same presentation and accepted its recommendations. Mrs. Stauder moved to accept the recommendations of Mr. Block's Pool Committee. Seconded by Mr. Seaman. Motion was amended to state accepting the report of the Committee. Approved unanimously.

A recess was called at 9:00 pm. Meeting resumed at 9:13 pm.

RFQ Construction Manager Discussion

Mrs. Stauder moved to move up the RFQ Construction Manager discussion to the next point on the agenda. Seconded by Mr. Preusch. Approved unanimously. Mr. Pifko introduced John Marsilio and Kevin Bova who discussed the next steps in the process and what the Committee needs to start thinking about as far as a construction manager.

Mr. Marsilio spoke on three parts of a project – the budget, the schedule and the quality of the project. If the first step is approved by the Town Council, the next step would be to begin getting more granular in the development of the design, actually putting measurements in the drawings and incorporating the elements of the program that people have expressed are important to them. Important things to ensure – the constructability of the project and ensure there are alternatives to the construction elements reflected in the budget that permits you to get to where you want to go.

There are three appropriate delivery methods for this project:

1. Design/bid/build and have a general contractor build it. Most common way. Missing is the collaboration of the design team and the builder and the interfacing that can effect savings, economies, substitution of materials and presentations to the owners of those decisions. You must take the low bidder. It is difficult to disqualify someone.
2. Engage through an RFQ process an entity that would submit a bid and offer you experience in projects of this scope and budget. This is a construction manager. There are two forms of construction manager. There is a construction manager in advisory where bid packages are put out through the Purchasing Department as a package. That manager is involved throughout the design project. The contracts of the subcontractors are with the Town not the construction manager.
3. Engage a construction manager at risk where you pay a fixed fee to get the drawings. It is 85% drawings for a GMP (Guaranteed Maximum Price). Extras are minimized; schedule is set. The subcontracts are selected by the construction manager at risk and those contracts are with this individual.

Mr. Arcari spoke on these options from his perspective noting that an owner's rep could be hired. All three deliver a good project. Mr. Marsilio recommended the Committee move forth with an RFQ for a construction manager at risk. He noted we are not compelled to engage them at 85% drawings and can back out at that point if not comfortable with the number. If the Town Council approves the conceptual plan and you move to the next step, timing is important. Trumbull typically has a construction manager at risk. Mr. Costa agreed that a construction manager at risk is the way to go from pre-construction through design and then do a GMP. Mr. Arcari spoke on project budget estimates and removal of scope due to inflated numbers. Mr. Costa felt two estimates should be done – one by the design team and one by the construction manager at risk and then they have to come to a decision and agree on a price. However, this can be adversarial. Mr. Marsilio noted that a construction manager in advisory may have the project go faster but the budget numbers may not be as clear. An owner's rep will be necessary when construction starts. This is a decision in the future.

Mr. Bova discussed the RFQ with regard to timing of the bids. Need a minimum of 10 days; bigger projects can be longer – 20 days. Review time would be another 2-3 weeks and from there award and contracts which would be about a month and a half total time. Interviews can be done. Green incentives were discussed to reduce the cost of the project.

Vote to Accept the Conceptual Design

Mr. Pifko noted a presentation was made of the conceptual design at the last meeting. Discussion was held regarding the options for the design. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien asked why the options were changed. Mr. Preusch noted the architect was asked for a design without a pool which would have a blank space. He also did a one floor building. These major programming elements have components that can be changed and you can send three plans to the Town Council for review. She was unclear about the options. Mr. Costa felt it happened with the designs but there was only a small amount of breakout with the gym and pool. Costs of the construction were discussed. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien felt a clearer picture of costs needs to be prepared for each design before it is given to the Town Council. The estimate prepared by Mr. Arcari shows the appropriate costs for construction.

Mrs. Arnow noted that the traffic realignment has been removed from the project. The reason is that the realignment will need to be done if a trail head is done. Tighe and Bond currently reports that the amount of traffic calls for a traffic light at this location. This would be a separate project regardless of the community center project. The application for the trail head connection was sent to the State in the fall. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien felt that costs are constantly being pulled out of the number. She is still trying to get past not counting buying the four houses but we are putting our building there and now pulling the traffic study. Did not know if it was reflective of the community. Feels it is like a shell game. Perception is costs are being removed to get the cost down. Mrs. Arnow noted the numbers will change throughout the entire project. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien wants the costs to be transparent and to clear up where the costs are coming from. Mr. Preusch noted we are required to have a traffic study for the community center project no matter where it would be located.

Mrs. Cantafio asked about the parking for the community center versus the trail head. Community center spaces are 199; no parking has been determined for the trail head should the center not be constructed.

Discussion of program costs was held and Mr. Arcari felt that the plan represents the goal of the program. The scope of the program might be challenged and items taken out. The Town Council can make an informed decision with the numbers as presented at the last meeting.

Mr. Arcari presented an updated conceptual plan. He noted that information received from the last meeting has been incorporated. He noted that the plan and concept will continue to grow and items such as electrical closets and data distribution rooms will appear in the plan. We are trying to set a benchmark for the budget of the project. The plan has a recreational pool which is a place holder. Program reflects continued development of the site plan with input from the traffic engineers and with staff. The plan was changed to accommodate additional parking, turning radiuses for emergency vehicles, one-way drop off and access at the rear of the facility. Taking a hard look at the buffer zone with the neighbors. Looking at some of the grade and working on the drainage scheme. There will be no off-site drainage. All drainage will be collected and detained. It will be sub-surface drainage and retention. All water will be treated, go into retention and then infiltrated/discharged from the site. Landscape is being developed. Building is 40,000 sq. feet but the building footprint is 20,000 sq. feet.

Expansion of the site was discussed. Mr. Arcari noted that the goal is to meet a 50-year program need and does not anticipate expansion in the immediate future. Any expansion would need to be done by parcel acquisition, if they become available. This is just speculative. Shelter requirements are being look at in more detail. Pool designs were discussed. Question was raised about the six properties being sold – Mr. Arcari does not have any information on that topic.

Mr. Arcari noted that the design team is now making plans to have more public meetings now that a concept design and costs have been established.

Motion was made by Mr. Seaman to accept the concept design. Seconded by Mrs. Stauder. Discussion was held regarding the gym fit out and what that actually means. Additional discussion was held regarding the construction of a two story building and leaving the basement empty versus building a one story structure. Mrs. Cantafio and Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien opposed the approval of the concept design. Mr. Seaman, Mr. Preusch, Mr. Costa, Mrs. Stauder and Mr. Pifko approved the concept design. Motion passed.

824 Application to Planning and Zoning

It was noted that this application is an administrative step required by the Building Committee Rules. This is currently on the Planning and Zoning agenda. Mr. Preusch noted that the State requires any changes on a municipal property to have the Planning and Zoning Commission make a referral to the local governing board that it is an appropriate place for what is being proposed. A favorable recommendation needs a 50% vote of the Council to approve and an unfavorable recommendation requires a 2/3 vote of the Council to approve. It is a use approval. Next P&Z meeting is April 19.

Mr. Pifko noted that the outreach program to the public to show the progress of the project will be continued. Four district meeting dates will be decided.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee will be on April 20, 2017.

Adjournment

There being no further business, motion was made by Mrs. Stauder to adjourn the meeting at 10:37 pm. Seconded by Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien and approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall
Clerk