

**TOWN OF TRUMBULL
CONNECTICUT**

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611



Trumbull Community Center Study and Building Committee
Thursday, March 23, 2017
7:00 pm
Long Hill Conference Room, Trumbull Town Hall

Present: Co-Chairmen Joseph Pifko and Daniel Marconi; 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 and Kevin McFarland, Quisenberry Arcari; Mark Block, Town Council; Michele Jakab, Director of Human Services; Joseph Laucella, Chief EMS; Deputy Police Chief Ron Kirby; Megan Murphy, Fire Marshal; Frank Smeriglio, Town Engineer; Rob Labrandi, Town Planner; Rhonda Capuano, Health Director

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mr. Marconi followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Past Minutes

Motion was made by Mr. Seaman to approve the minutes of March 1, 2017 as written. Seconded by Mr. Costa. Approved with an abstention from Mrs. Cantafio.

Public Comment

Tony D'Aquila, 29 Valley View Road – At 6pm this evening, the Town Engineer made a presentation for a traffic study on Quality Street and Church Hill Road. He had a concern about the study in that there was a fatality in that area between a motorcycle and a car. He noted there is still not a final report on this incident. He does not feel things should proceed until we understand clearly what happened at that scene. There have been multiple accidents at that intersection and he is very concerned about the safety by introducing vehicles coming out of the driveway of a proposed Community Center and how much it will impact the congestion in that area. He suggested to not move forward to the Department of Transportation because he will be in attendance and will make his concerns known. Please consider this very carefully.

Mr. Pifko noted that, as part of the Building Committee requirements, a traffic study must be conducted. Five options were considered and the Engineering Department chose this one particular design, which would be the optimum layout. It recommends to move Quality Street over a bit and give Stop and Shop more of a border, it will line up Quality Street with Old Church Hill Road and then a traffic

light will be installed. This was approved by the Police Commission and it will now be presented to the State, as it is a State road.

Mr. Pifko also noted that the guests present at the meeting have been invited because the Building Committee Rules require an impact statement. All these individuals are here for comments and to note any impact that this proposed Community/Senior Center would have on their services.

Architect's Presentation

Mr. Arcari made his presentation to the Committee noting they have been working on a concept design that included working with the site plan and traffic engineers, taking the floor plan of the building, and formulating them into a proposed, consolidated building. This is only a draft concept design that has been redefined and continues to be an on-going process. This plan will move to Planning and Zoning for a review and development of the buffer zones and landscaping for the site.

The floor plans were presented with Mr. Arcari noting that a recreation style pool has been included; however, the architects are waiting for the final report regarding the aquatics assessment done by the Public Works Sub-Committee before more definite plans are decided.

Architectural detailing was presented that would be pleasing for a residential neighborhood.

The design process is a continuing exercise but it is important to get to this level so that there is a feel for the vision of the facility and how the architects feel it would integrate into the community. It also provides information to the Cost Estimating Team. They have also been working on what it would cost the community.

Mr. Arcari noted that this facility is envisioned to have the capacity as a shelter and it will be designed as such with an appropriately generator.

Cost estimates were presented which were broken down by component. There is a Community Center of approximately 20,000 sq. ft. that has a hard cost of about \$5.7 million, a gymnasium component of about \$2.4 million and a natatorium incorporating the pool shown of about \$2.5 million. There are total trade costs for about 41,000 sq. ft. of \$10.7 million and then general conditions, bonding, profit and design contingency. The total hard costs for this building are \$12.15 million. All soft costs would be factored into the project. These costs are projected to be \$2.6 million. This is a guideline at this point. Still working on details that will define costs further. The total estimated base bid project cost is \$14.7 million with two add alternates. One is realignment of the roads through the State that includes signalization at the intersection and reorientation of the streets based on the traffic study for \$1.5 million. The second is extensive fit out of the gym. The original plan called for activity gym space; this is a much fuller gym space. One benefit of this approach is that, by building the basement, you have the space. This could be a future consideration as a full size recreation gym. The project will be a \$17 million project. This is just a guideline; it is dynamic as there are many factors that affect the cost of the project. As the design continues to mature, it is anticipated that the cost will continue to be refined.

The Committee felt the design was sharp and fits into the image of the community. Additional discussion was held regarding the realignment of the intersection, heating and cooling of the building, traffic design within the complex, expansion space and parking.

Mr. Block, from the Town Council, noted the Public Works Committee reviewed a final draft of the Aquatics Assessment conducted at their last meeting. He noted it is an extensive report on the facilities both outdoor and indoor. There is a series of recommendations the Committee is considering and will be voting on at the next meeting. There are no costs attached because it is up to the Town to do that step. The Committee is at a point where they can forward the report to the Town Council.

First Responder Comments

Deputy Chief Kirby – noted that in addition to his police function he also works closely with the mass care team as part of Emergency Management. As they would no longer have access to Priscilla Place, this would be the primary shelter for up to 90 residents. He commented on the windows being hurricane rated; designed to consider easy access to multiple points; would only need a section of the building so the remainder of the building could still function in some manner with the shelter running. Storage of emergency equipment is good on site because it speeds up responses in the valley. Rooms to be used for the shelter were discussed and it was stated that they would adapt to whatever they have to work with. It is more important to have the building be able to withstand the outside forces.

Chief Laucella – having access for emergency vehicles is great. Access into the building is good either from the first or second floor. We would potentially look to have two/three AEDs in the building.

Question was asked if the generator at Priscilla Place would be used in the new facility. Mr. Arcari noted it was too small to carry the potential load. The window construction is dynamic, as they have to meet code and wind zone requirements. There may also be some shelter requirements that change the cost. As the plan develops, they will be looking at more details.

Michele Jakab -- felt the design was good. Their goal is to serve the community and this is a wonderful spot. She felt many seniors would be crossing the street to access Stop and Shop or the Library. Ideally, the design is beautiful and it is a great way to congregate.

Rhonda Capuano – would like more specifics on the kitchen and the café area on the top level – are their two kitchens in the facility? Mr. Arcari noted there would be a full commercial kitchen to serve the multi-purpose room. The café is an amenity as a counter that provides coffee, drinks or snacks brought in through a caterer but mostly it is a social center/staging area for events. No food prep would be happening in this area.

Frank Smeriglio – noted the parking lot plans would need a storm drain system. The Engineering Department will work with them to come up with a solution because of the drainage west to east. Sanitary sewers are set. Kitchen would be reviewed. Inland Wetlands would require a soil scientist to visit the site to verify whether there are any regulated areas on the property line. Mr. Arcari noted he does have a team to assist with these concerns and would work with the Town.

Megan Murphy – Ingress and egress into the property – are there approximate widths? They are approximately 20 ft. wide. Is there mountable curbing? At this point, no. Access to the building is relatively short. Fire lanes are not on the design map. Do you have a plan for a snow shelf where snow can be moved? The entire perimeter can be a snow shelf. Occupant load – calculation has not been done at this point. This requires an agreement as to how the building will be used and applying the calculation to each space. This will be done as the design develops. Multi-purpose room, when dividers are up, ingress/egress to the outside – dining in that area will not block the doors they would maintain the required egress. CR1, 2 and 3 Rooms – are the exits remote enough from one another? This will be

developed into the design. Concerned about the remoteness of the doors out of the pool and recreation areas. This area may have another egress depending on the width and they will look at the most effective way to provide egress without doing a stairway. Building will be sprinklered? Yes. Full generator and not solar? Unknown. Engineered lumber on the top floor? Top floor would be wood construction; lower level would have a steel frame with a concrete slab. There is a significant savings with wood over steel. Is there access to attic space? Yes, if it is not sealed. If there is mechanical space, there would need to be access. Concept has not been developed that far. Vehicle storage – what type of fire separation is proposed? Two-three hour separation with consideration of allowances by the sprinkler system.

Lynn Arnow – the pool area is a design filler? Mr. Arcari noted that at this time it is a filler. What is the capacity for usage? Depending on the size, the capacity depends on uses at any one time. Mr. MacFarland noted that code and function work into this calculation and dictates limits. He felt that 50-75 people could be served in this area.

Rob Labrandi – What security measures would be included? This is an operational system decided by the community. Many have card access at the doors. There are senior track type of programs. A minimal system would be a TV system at the doors and around the site. This has not been determined. Handicapped parking at Priscilla Place is a large amount of spaces, how many are included in this facility? This is debatable but most senior facilities have more spots and could be larger. There will be a minimal amount but a fixed number has not been determined. Is there a queuing area for drop off and pick up? At this time, this is not included in the design but could potentially be added. Bike racks? Not decided at this point but will be included because of the trail system.

Mark Block – The Pool Committee reviewed several schematics at their meeting – is this a single filtration system being shown? Yes. This would not include a therapeutic area. Mr. Arcari noted there is flexibility within the designated to develop a specific pool for community needs.

Megan Murphy – do you expect any blasting on site? No but no geotechnical testing has been done so it is subject to change. Stage and platform is a full blown stage? No. Hood system for the kitchen – looking to do suppression system for odors? Unknown. Height on the upper level canopy? This would be 14 ft. clear at the drive area. They would need to know information about emergency vehicles, busses, etc. Traffic light at Quality Street should be a pre-emption light as this is heavily used by emergency vehicles.

Mr. Pifko asked Mr. Arcari to address the concept of construction manager and what type of options are available. Mr. Arcari noted there are numerous delivery systems for a project. Traditional design/bid/build is a general contractor delivery method where they would design it and put it out to bid for a general contractor and then the town would hire an owner's rep or clerk of the works to oversee the process. This tends to yield the most competitive construction costs. It is appropriate for a project of this scale. There are no real complications on this site and it will be free and clear, no staging issues, no users on the site. The downfall of this system is that the bidding process can be cutthroat by contractors who will cut their numbers and it can be hard to make sure you are not paying out on change orders because contractors will pursue additional costs in the process.

Construction management comes in multiple forms. The first is construction manager advisor where you hire a construction manager to run the project. The town holds the contracts. The construction manager will help put all the different trades out to bid, works for a fixed fee and oversees the work. In

that case, the town may also hire an owner's rep to act as the town's representative to the construction process and would manage the contingency process. The construction manager works at a fixed fee and you know what your costs are for the manager side. Once the manager has his fee, there is no incentive beyond that. You are hiring a true collaborator.

The final method is construction manager at risk where you negotiate a GMP, Guaranteed Maximum Price. The construction manager comes on board and does your pre-construction. Typically, the construction manager would have already been engaged and helps to go through the cost estimating process and establishing the budget. If you are taking on a GMA, you want to be establishing what the design and scope is as it is associated with the cost. This can still happen in the process although we are a little further down the road. During the pre-construction phase, the construction manager gets a fee to help do all the estimating and get the project through referendum and contract. Then it reverts to a more at-risk basis where the construction manager takes on ownership, like a general contractor, and negotiates a GMP for the project. Mr. Arcari felt this is a good method, you have owner's representation and because of the bonding requirements, you can get contractors that are more experienced. The construction manager at risk tends to be more expensive.

Mr. Arcari has had good experiences with all three delivery methods and takes no exception to working with any method. Fiduciary responsibility is a key component of the project and looking at the current project, he would recommend the design/bid/build. This would require diligence on the town to oversee the project. He encouraged the Building Committee to work with Mr. Costa on this as he has many years of experience.

Mrs. Cantafio asked if there was a list of people using the facility as a home base. Mrs. Arnow noted there is a proposed program that includes Social Services, Senior Wellness, Senior Center Programs, offices for Parks and Rec staff. No other departments will be moving to the building. Outside programs may need to have designated areas if they use the facility. All rooms have multiple purposes so many accommodations can be made for these groups.

Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien spoke on Mr. Herbst's letter regarding the six different properties and how that impacts the proposed Community Center. She is concerned that we don't know what will happen to those departments and buildings. Usage is a question. She hopes there is more information about their plans and needs and wants to make sure we are meeting that requirement space and time wise. We should get closer to the answers to these questions before we can make sure we can accommodate and consolidate all the properties. Mrs. Arnow noted that the Committee designed a space that would be flexible for a number of community groups to meet there but not intended to designate a space for one group.

Quisenberry Arcari Invoice

Mr. Pifko presented an invoice to the Committee for approval for \$1,900 for services rendered. The Committee approved its payment.

Mr. Costa questioned that now that we have selected a site, written a program with a schematic design and have a budget, what was the next step for the Committee. Mr. Pifko noted they met with the Police Department and an impact statement will be completed by the Town Engineer. It needs to go to P&Z for them to review and then, if we accept this plan and budget, a vote will be taken and it would be presented to the Town Council. The Town Council will decide if they can afford this project. Mr. Costa asked if the target schedule was still workable. Mr. Pifko noted that once the impact statement is

completed and the Public Works Committee votes on their decision, it would be presented to P&Z and Town Council. Presentation of the Building Committee report is tentatively scheduled be made to Town Council on May 1.

Alternates to the project were briefly discussed. These could potentially be separate tasks.

Next Meeting

The next Building Committee meeting will be Thursday, April 6, 2017 at 7:00 pm.

Adjournment

There being no further business, motion was made by Mrs. Cantafio, to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 pm. Seconded by Mrs. Stauder and approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall
Clerk