Public Building Commission  
Special Meeting  
January 25, 2010  
Room 210 Cheshire Town Hall

Members Present:  
Mr. James Brennan  
Mr. James McKenney  
Mr. Joseph Barba  
Mr. John Purtill  
Mr. Mark Nash

Members Absent:  
Mr. Keith Goldberg  
Mr. Vincent Robitalille  
Mr. Jay Hershman  
Mr. James Lami

User Members Present:  
Mr. Bill Kunde  
Mr. Kevin Wetmore  
Mr. David Gavin

User Members Absent:  
Mr. Bill Jacques

Others Present:  
Mr. James Sima, Town Council  
Mr. Joseph Michelangelo, Director of Public Works  
Mr. Lou Cohen  
Mr. Doug Levin  
Mr. Jesse Buchannon, Record Journal

Mr. McKenney called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum determined. The assembled group recited the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. McKenney explained to the audience how to exit the chamber in the event of an emergency, in compliance with the Fire Marshal’s order.

Mr. Michelangelo read the motion of the Cheshire Town Council of January 12, 2010 which assigned this project to the Public Building Commission. Minutes to the Town Council meeting are attached.

Mr. Purtill gave a background of the RFP process to date which started with six submittals, four of which were invited to the Town Council for presentations that have been narrowed down to two firms and assigned to the PBC. The question going forward is how the PBC best prepare its recommendation report to the Town Council by March 15, 2010.
Mr. Purtill gave a background of the usual Public Building Commission procedures. Since this is a design/build project, it will be approached a little differently. Normally, the PBC evaluates the needs, have schematic plans prepared, review them and have final plans prepared, review them again before it is placed out for public bidding. The design/build process is similar but different. There are a lot of goals to accomplish before the March 15th date to design some design criteria, finalize a footprint area for the building. The PBC is have to an analysis of the needs of the pool community and see how much we can receive from these two firms as far as advancing schematic design before we are set to commit to them.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that the footprint can be an alternate and, even if there is no definite by March 15th, it can always be expanded or decreased by the incremental square footage size.

Mr. Purtill mentioned that there has been some discussion last week regarding field trips and there is a field trip scheduled for Sunday, January 31, 2010 at 12:00 which he feels will be a great beginning point to this project. Once again, even though we have user members, we may want to inquire to the swimmers themselves, to the coaches, to the personnel that actually runs the pool, what they feel are the needs of the facility in addition to the user members present.

Mr. Wetmore commented that he is a frequent user of the pool and, as a user member, the use of the pool now has many great features such as the diving platform area, the picnic tables the kiddies pool and the size of the pool could provide for 250 athletes and 300 spectators. We have a status quo what the pool services as existing and as a user he would not recommend a downsizing of the existing facility.

Another item mentioned by Mr. Wetmore, that he feels is important is the lighting issues. He has seen pools that are not properly lit especially at night and it just changes the whole atmosphere of the pool.

Mr. Purtill mentioned that one of the hardest things about this project is to define a scope for a fixed fee. We don’t want to go down this road and be suddenly hit with change orders so there must be a great deal of involvement in the design even though this is a design/build project.

Mr. McKenney asked Mr. Michelangelo what has been found out thus far with the issue of polycarbonate meeting fire code. Mr. Michelangelo said that both the issue of the code compliance of the polycarbonate has been forwarded to the Town Building Official and the Town Fire Marshal. Both have received and reviewed the information presented to them but, until they receive a design or a plan in how it will be used in a particular building, it is really difficult whether it complies or does not comply based on a narrative request. They will really need to see something as far as a design plan on paper to evaluate whether it meets code or not.
Mr. Nash said this was a definite answer that we should talk to the two firms about but there are many other questions to ask them.

Mr. McKenney since the entire PBC has not heard the presentations yet, the entire PBC should hear the original presentations and follow up questions. Although it may be better to break into a subcommittee in a few weeks, the PBC is ultimately going to be endorsing this report so the entire PBC should be aware of the project at its onset and has some input and contribution at that point. The two presentations on the same night would be preferable, as the PBC has a tight time frame to meet and they do not want to burn out members with multiple meetings on consecutive nights.

Mr. Gavin mentioned that they have been given the presentations and we are in the area where we need specific answers to our questions. The committee needs more detailed energy calculations. We need to know some of their rationale for the design, and if there are areas that need to be requoted, we need to present the items to these firms to get responses. Mr. Gavin also mentioned that the two footprints of the size buildings from both firms are relatively close.

Mr. McKenney mentioned that the March 15th deadline may be too ambitious regarding all the work that has to be done before then, although he appreciates the time deadline, “you can’t put a square peg in a round hole”. The PBC has to do the project correctly and with the understanding that it may not be able to be done in six or seven weeks.

Mr. Barba also mentioned that March 15th does seem like a very tight time frame also.

Mr. Sima mentioned that there may be some room for flexibility in the March 15th date but March 15th was a target date based on a conceptual June 1st referendum time. So there may be several days or a couple weeks leeway but there is not much more than that. An important item for a June referendum is to time everything so that the downtime for the swimming community is important. We have to think not only of the our schedule but project out to a construction schedule, when that will happen and how that effects the Town. Mr. Sima believes that a November referendum does not work well with our pool usage and proposed shutdown. That is why the Council has suggested a late spring early summer referendum.

The issue of validation of the design that was mentioned in the motion was basically that the proposal meets the intent of the RFP in respect to the functionality and other criteria that must be met.

Mr. Wetmore mentioned diving as an example of the functionality. Whatever designed is chosen, not just for diving, must meet the use. Obviously, reducing volume is important but diving is something that must have aerial clearances.
Mr. Purtill once again stated that we must get as much of the design nailed down as we get closer to a decision. He questioned what will be the role of the PBC or the Town Council of the Town in general in supporting or selling this project to the voters.

Mr. Sima once again mentioned a field trip on Sunday, January 31st at 12:00 noon and he will get the notices to call for a public hearing later this week.

**Mr. Nash moved to have a full PBC meeting to conduct interviews with the two firms on Wednesday, February 10th.** Mr. Purtill seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Gavin said we should prepare a list of issues which the firms should be prepared to address such as the lighting issues, fire code, especially for Open-Aire, energy unit calculations, volume considerations and other audience members mentioned the pool cover detail and how it will be accomplished, and is it a suggested or included means. Mr. Wetmore mentioned the practicality of a cover, which raises some issues. The consensus was to include all this in the request to the two firms in their invitation to the meeting.

**All PBC members voted in favor of meeting on February 10, 2010. No one opposed. The motion carried unanimously.**

It was mentioned that there is the regular monthly PBC meeting scheduled on February 3, 2010 so this could be an opportunity to review some of the distributed material. If necessary, Mr. McKenney stated that after the February 10th meeting, the process would probably be better to be handled by subcommittee status.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Purtill moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. Mr. Barba seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. James Purtill, Vice Chairman
Public Building Commission
in the absence of the Secretary

Attest:

Joseph Michelangelo, PBC Liaison
Town of Cheshire