

**MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE COMMUNITY POOL (CCP) EVALUATION
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY AUGUST 8, 2013, AT 6:30 P.M. IN
ROOM 207, TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410.**

Present

Co-Chairmen John Purtill and Kevin Wetmore. Committee members: Lew Cohen, Bill Kunde, Matt Levine, Ron Urquhart, Sylvia Nichols, Bill Kunde, and Wendy Stevens (via conference call).

Staff: Sheila Adams, Vincent Masciana, George Noewatne.

Guest: John McIlhargy, Mythic Sports LLC, Consultant. Council Member David Schrumm

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Purtill called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

A quorum was determined to be present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

3. APPROVAL OF 7/18/13 MEETING MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Nichols; seconded by Mr. Urquhart.

MOVED to approve the minutes of July 18, 2013 as submitted.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

4. Mythic Sports, LLC Consultation Update – John McIlhargy.

Mr. McIlhargy has met with three (3) vendors on the tension membrane structure; all are in the \$2.7 to \$3 million price range; two vendors have made site visits; and the other will visit the site next Thursday. He has met with Town building officials at the pool facility, reviewed issues of interest and concern, and he has all the information he needs to complete the bid.

Mechanical Room Issues – it is properly sized; must mechanically refrigerate the facility; quotes have been received; everything is up to date; and preliminary renderings are done. On the code compliance issue, the spectator section must have a sprinkler system. The buildings are treated as two separate buildings – the existing one and the new one.

Mr. Cohen stated he has come to the conclusion to recommend refrigerated dehumidification. He agreed with Mr. McIlhargy, but asked why Mr. McIlhargy says this is needed.

According to Mr. McIlhargy his reasoning includes everything from bather comfort, environment protection, keep the cover from sweating, and protection for the steel structure.

Mr. Cohen submitted a copy of the study he completed for the feasibility of alternative ventilation systems. He explained that the least expensive refrigeration/dehumidifier is about \$250,000; and the most expensive system is about \$1 million. He used 150 x 200 x 25 to total 900,000 cubic feet to calculate his cost estimate. A 140 ton unit costs about \$350,000. The new building will be considered a structure and must have dehumidification. With the building opened up September to May, dehumidification could be done with outside air. To go to the next larger unit there would be a cost of an additional \$100,000.

Mr. McIlhargy used three 50 ton units which cost more and work better, at a cost of \$450,000 plus installation and duct work. The building official agreed this is needed for the pool covering.

5. Cost Projections – 40 year LLC projections (J. Purtill)

A graph showing the cumulative cost to acquire and operate the pool dome was prepared by Mr. Purtill and reviewed with the committee. He took the initial cost of each option – Redesigned Bubble \$277,500; Tension Membrane \$3 million; Polycarbonate \$5.664 million. Over the 40 year life cycle, the total cost of a bubble dome would be \$12.9 million; tension membrane structure \$11.8 million; polycarbonate structure \$8.6 million. Mr. Purtill believes that the polycarbonate structure could have a lower initial cost of about \$5 million. With the bubble failure, everything fails; with the tension membrane or polycarbonate structures, there is failure of a panel(s) or section(s), and this is all that is replaced.

In these cumulative costs, debt service was not included, as it cannot be included until it is finalized. The chart shows the cost of purchase and operation of the structures. It has not been determined how this project will be paid for – Town funds or a bond issue; and with bond issues, these are refunded over the time of the bond. A 28 ounce fabric was included in the costs; the vendor will come back with various fabric membranes to be considered. With the tension membrane/polycarbonate structures there is UVA and UVB protection, less chemical usage, less water, and pool usage in inclement weather.

The difference in energy savings between the tension membrane and polycarbonate options is about \$5,000 annually; on the revenue side the difference is about \$10,000. The difference is not enough to overcome the different starting prices.

Polycarbonate has an aluminum structure, and the tension membrane span has a strong steel structure.

This information was used in 2010 with the Open Aire structure when talking to the public, and Mr. Purtill found it was a difficult thing to get across to ordinary people. His recommendation is to not use the chart in talking to people as it generates more

questions. It is being used for the committee to see the hard numbers, and there are supporting detailed spreadsheets which can be looked at. Future data and information to the voters should cite the concept and benefits, using the 40 year forecast. The committee has the obligation to consider both the initial and operating costs, while the voters will only see one number.

Decision Time - recommendation

Staff Comments – Ms. Adams stated that everything she hears is people wanting a pool that will work without interruptions and a facility that is comfortable. People say they don't care about the cost 40 years from now, only what it will cost them now.

Stating his agreement, Mr. Noewatne said the Open Aire structure has the same issues as in 2010...it is too costly. People do not want another bubble, so he thinks the tension membrane structure is the way to go. Information on the life cycle of the structure should be out to the public.

Mr. Masciana stated that the Town has a tremendous asset in the Town pool and facility. The tension membrane is the best and most cost effective solution, and he supports this option. The committee should go forward with the \$3 million as the least cost solution over the long term.

Mr. Kunde stated that whether we are spending \$3 million or \$6 million up front, there is spending per year. Over 20 years at 3% interest it would be interesting to see a graph for cumulative cash flow at "0" years plus interest and debt. It would be a different picture.

At a prior meeting the issue of whether there could be a "choice of pool option" on the referendum question, i.e. polycarbonate or tension membrane structure was raised. Ms. Nichols informed the committee that under State Statute and legal opinion of the Town Attorney there can be only one referendum question for a defined project.

Mr. Purtill stated he considers the polycarbonate structure as the best option.

The committee was told by Mr. McIlhargy that competitive facilities rarely use the polycarbonate structures, and one reason is that the water gets too hot.

Committee vote on preferred option:

Redesigned Bubble - 0

Tension Membrane – 6

Polycarbonate – 2.

MOTION by Mr. Levine; seconded by Mr. Purtill.

MOVED that the Cheshire Community Pool Evaluation Committee (CCP) forward its recommendation to the Town Council for a Tension Membrane Structure for the Cheshire Community Pool.

VOTE The motion passed 6-2.

There was a discussion on the polycarbonate option at \$5.6 million failing at referendum, and the time frame when another referendum for a \$3 million tension membrane project could be held. The committee agreed there would be an issue of credibility, and voters asking why their needs and interests were not considered in the first place. With the tension membrane structure there is consideration of the voters and their interests. A separate referendum has costs involved, and the Town might want to wait until the next election cycle to put the question on the ballot.

Comments

Councilor David Schrumm stated that if \$3 million is the committee's firm estimate for the tension membrane option, it should be all inclusive, an all-in price. When it passes, the project goes to the PBC; the Council will appropriate \$3 million for the project. There should be no variations in the stated cost.

The recommendation of Mr. Purtill is for PBC to go through the RFP process to bring in interested parties, get down to 3 vendors, possibly reducing the project cost to \$2.3 million or less, nailing down firm numbers. There should be a firm number/contract price with a selected contractor for the Town Council to take to the voters. It is an all inclusive project, and there have been meetings with building officials on all the Town requirements.

The committee was told by Mr. Schrumm that the project must go through bond counsel for legal writing, with a firm number.

At this time, Mr. Purtill said there are no firm proposals from any contractors, and none will be gotten until the Council approves the tension membrane option. Then, the committee comes up with prices. If a number is picked, it goes to the voters, and then if goes out to competitive bid with a higher number than what was approved...the question is what happens. If the Council tells the committee that "x" dollars can be approved by the voters, the committee can negotiate and fine tune the offering to come in with what the Council says is affordable.

Mr. Wetmore said there will be no surprises at the end, and if there are any, they will only be on the positive side. In looking at what contractors have brought forward, the highest budget is taken. Going through an RFP and expanding that, the expectation is getting bids with few hundred thousand dollars in savings.

It was noted by Mr. Schrumm that every project at referendum is an estimate, and final numbers are gotten after the design and it goes out to bid.

The committee must live with what contractors provide, and Mr. Purtill said CCP must do a value analysis. There is concern about playing on the edge or playing conservative. Once we are through the RFP process, the committee can state firm costs of the pool structure.

Sixty days before the referendum date of November 5th the project cost estimate must be stated and it cannot change. Mr. Schrumm suggested \$3 million as the number for the ballot to be set by August 27th. He commented on the contractors knowing that Cheshire has \$3 million for the pool project and their going to that number. If \$3 million will cover everything, he stated that the CCP should go with that number. The \$3 million number includes a 10% contingency.

According to Mr. McIlhargy the \$3 million number is very solid and comes from the three vendors. 50% of the project is a pre-engineered building; there is a 5% contingency on the building; and 10% contingency on everything else. Some of the numbers have already been beefed up, and there are some unknown things.

Since this will be design-build, Mr. Noewatne said the Town will have to hire an architect and design firm, and there will be costs associated.

8/15/13 proposed T.C. Presentation

Mr. Purtill distributed copies of the tension membrane structure Council presentation to the committee for their review. Copies of the presentation will be forwarded to Councilors prior to the meeting.

The meeting with the Council and Budget Committee is Thursday, August 15th, 7:00 P.M. in Council Chambers, Town Hall.

Tuesday, August 20th, 7:30 p.m. Public Hearing on the Capital Budget.

Tuesday, August 27th, 7:30 p.m. Adoption of the Capital Budget by Town Council.

Tension Membrane Structure – would be 60% open in the summer time; it takes a few hours to totally enclose the structure; this is the primary design from which the committee will work; the structure has lots of light at lower cost than a polycarbonate structure. Specs indicate the structure can handle a 50 pound snow load and 120 mph winds. The option plan (23 pages) will be on the web site on Friday morning.

Temporary structure for winter 2013-2014.

CCP is not in a position to make a decision other than there will be something provided, if affordable, and proposals will be looked at. Mr. McIlhargy is working on this for CCP separate from the pool structure work. A temporary winter structure will be less cost than the loss of revenue if the pool were closed, and will enable use of the facility by the public, teams, programs, lessons, events.

Winterization of the pool will be very expensive, will require major renovation to the mechanicals and equipment, purchase of a cover, and will result in loss of use and zero revenue. CCP will provide the information on the costs and process for winterizing the pool to the Council and Parks and Rec Commission. Of major concern is the pool being uncovered for the winter. There are insurance claim funds to cover the costs of winterizing the pool, and there is a rental market for temporary solutions. One of the contractors has advised that if they get the contract for the pool enclosure, they could install the temporary cover at no charge to the Town.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Levine; seconded by Mr. Urquhart.

MOVED to adjourn at 8:15 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk