

PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE

Minutes – May 27, 2021

Present: Co-Chairs Michael Melnick and Elaine Jones, Nancy Rubenstein, Jennifer Pincus, Anuraj Shah and John Kraemer. Also present: Combined Facilities Director William Barletta; Compass Project Management representatives - Project Executive Jeffrey D’Amico, and Project Manager Christopher Eberly; Designer BH+A representatives – Principal Joel Bargmann, Project Manager Steve Shetler, and Pool Component Manager Tom Scarlata; User group representatives: Dennis Mannone (Director, Sudbury Park & Recreation Department (P&R), Mara Huston (P&R Commission Chair), Jeff Levine (Council on Aging (COA Chair), Ana Cristina Oliveira (Senior Center Acting. Dir.), Brad Crozier (Supt., Sudbury Public Schools (SPS), Fire Chief John Whalen., Jennifer Roberts (Sudbury Select Board (SB), Janie Dretler (SB)

The ZOOM meeting hosted by Combined Facilities Director William Barletta was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Co-Chair Elaine Jones.

Fairbank Community Center Project After announcing that the main purpose of the PBC meeting is to meet with Compass Project Management (CPM) and BH+A for discussion of the Fairbank Community Center project, Co-Chair Elaine Jones turned this portion of the meeting over to CPM Project Executive Jeffrey D’Amico.

Mr. D’Amico reported that the initial borings have been completed and the draft geotechnical report is due in the next week. The survey team has been notified of the missing utility locations and will be correcting for those.

The meeting was then turned over to BH+A Architect Joel Bargmann who prefaced the aim of the meeting stating that it would include the summary of four initial concept schemes for comments in an attempt to narrow the choices to a preferred choice and second choice, and also would provide cost options and a schedule overview, discussion of site considerations including parking and drop-off considerations, consolidated entrances or separate, and efficiency of operations necessary for a sustainable design.

The following concept options (attached) were presented for discussion.

Option 1 – single story with several outdoor spaces, an entry facing Fairbank with on-site drop off allowing access to the Sr. Center, SPS, and multipurpose rooms and another entry at the northern end of the building allowing access to the pool, P&R spaces adjacent to the Pool and the gymnasium fronting Fairbank Rd. Design options include the potential for reversing the placement of the gym and P&R spaces and the potential for reversing the placement of the Sr. Ctr. and SPS given that SPS requires a secure loading dock. It was noted that daylighting in the pool area is another important consideration. Option 1 is 1,000 s.f. smaller than the other options with comparable cost savings because there is no elevator or stairway necessary.

Option 2 – two-story with the gymnasium and pool located as in Option 1 with the P&R offices adjacent to the gymnasium off the parking area and the Sr. Ctr. area at the rear and entry as in Option 1. This option can be built without interrupting occupation of the existing building

and allows use of the second floor solely for SPS accessible by elevator and stairs. Bathroom accommodations would be required for both floors.

Option 3 – two-story with entries at either end, gym adjacent to pool with P&R offices in front of pool allowing good separation (gym and offices location reversible), an outdoor grassy common area at front between the multipurpose rooms and the Sr. Ctr., SPS occupying the 2nd story above the Sr. Ctr. requiring bathrooms, an elevator and stair access.

Option 4 – two story being a tight footprint, but not as efficient as first thought, entry at front to multipurpose rooms (Hudson Rd. side) with Sr. Ctr. to left of entry in front of P&R offices next to pool and gym at front of pool, SPS on 2nd floor at front over the Sr. Ctr.

Mr. Bargmann informed the group that the landscape architect will be looking at parking considerations, noting that SPS needs south side adjacent parking as would the Sr. Ctr., while P&R wants certain spaces convenient to the building but in consideration of space required for day camp purposes.

Compass Project Manager Chris Eberly informed the group that construction costs including the costs of material have been heavily inflated as a result of the pandemic and additionally there has been a slow ramp up of construction materials supplies. Stressing the need to stay within the budget, in Compass' opinion it is not clear if there will be even more of a construction cost increase when project construction bids are solicited in February/March 2022.

In order to test the designs for cost, CADD drawings of the four conceptual options have been prepared with the same size gym and program spaces in all four options. Some items not considered in the ICON study were required to be added including additional SPS restrooms to meet code.

The target construction cost for all options was \$23,050,000. Tests involving all four options revealed that at this point Option 1 and Option 2 were both within striking distance of the budget with Option 1 over by \$207,000 and Option 2 over by \$1,698,000. Option 3 was over by \$2,542,000 and Option 4 exceeded Option 3.

Comments were solicited from the user groups and others present on the framework of the various options:

COA Chair Jeff Levine – separation of entities and entries important with ability to lock off space appropriately; shared space mostly used by Seniors with need to close off from noise particularly from the gym; liked Option 3 but has no problem with one floor as long as there is a separate entry, consolidated space for Seniors with no program effect, and the ability to close off and limit noise.

P&R Director Dennis Mannone – concerned that the new building would be a repeat of what is here in the present building; liked Option 3, but thought the second floor could be rearranged with more room above the gym. Mr. Mannone noted also that the recreation offices could be placed next to the front of the gym.

In response, Mr. Bargmann stated that given the project budget constraints, the cost of elevators required with the two-story option would preclude adding more space to the second floor.

Superintendent Crozier stated that with the placement of SPS on the second floor, an elevator must be available to transfer equipment and supplies to the offices. Option 1 with a side entrance for loading would also work providing parking would be made available.

P&R Commissioner Mara Huston commented that the shared space would not only be used by the Seniors but by P&R later in the day.

SB member Jennifer Roberts indicated that although she liked Option 3 she realized that with the budget concerns Option 2 as modified might be better. She also noted that the summer day camp location needed resolution.

SB member Janie Dretler indicated that given the small number of recreation staff there is a need to ensure that the allotted P&R room space is consolidated to allow coverage. Fire Chief Whalen opined that all the schemes would work but stressed that the storage space for the large cots and equipment used in the gym during an emergency must be adequate. Mr. Barletta, the Combined Facilities Director, stated his shared concern for support space storage. In reply, it was noted that 400 s.f. have been added for that purpose.

PBC Co-Chair Michael Melnick stated his preference for a one-story option.

PBC Co-Chair Elaine Jones noted that in designing the gym, consideration for both access and egress as related to use for voting be considered. She also noted that perhaps a climate controlled storage area for emergency shelter cots and equipment could be found elsewhere than the new building, allowing only a minimum requirement for the building.

PBC member John Kraemer reiterated that the recreation department provision for its school programs is an important consideration as to location. He also expressed his concern about the implications of the rising cost of construction materials.

PBC Project Manager Nancy Rubenstein suggested pausing the decision process to allow the BH+A to apply the comments received this evening for further consideration and decision. Project Manager Jennifer Pincus and PBC Member Ahnu Shah stated their agreement with this approach with Mr. Shah suggesting that we should move into the schematic phase as soon as possible.

After additional discussion it was decided that BH+A would pursue hybrid schemes based on Options 1 and 2 and input from this meeting with the intention of meeting with the user groups on June 3 with a PBC meeting to be scheduled for June 10.

Fire Station No. 2 Ms. Jones summarized the history of the replacement project reporting that in July 2017 execution of a contract for \$71,600 with the Architectural firm of Kaestle Boos for Phase I Schematic Design of the entire Fire Department facility on the present Boston Post Road site, completed with National Development funding and without the hiring of an Owner's Project Manager, failed to receive funding at the ballot. Since that time Kaestle Boos was requested by the Fire Chief, with the approval of the Town Manager at the time, to divide the project into two

phases with the living/office space to be constructed first. That plan formed the basis of the favorable 2021 Annual Town Meeting vote under Article 16 in the amount of \$4,300,000. The budget which formed the basis for this amount was prepared by Kaestle Boos and set the architectural design development through construction and closeout at \$375,900.

There are several steps to be taken which include the following in no certain order:

- Revision of the existing draft RFP for an Owner's Project Manager in accordance with M.G.L. for this phase of the project and subsequent advertisement (Project Manager Craig Blake and Co-Chair Elaine Jones)
- Prepare a new Agreement for Design Services for the Town Manager's approval and signature (Co-Chair Elaine Jones)
- Meet with Chief Whalen and review of budget (PBC).

Minutes The minutes of May 13, 2021 were approved as written.

Meeting Schedules The PBC will plan to meet on the Fairbank project on Thursday, June 10 at 6:30 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine L. Jones