

**ECKERSLEY HALL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2012  
POLICE DEPARTMENT COMMUNITY ROOM  
6:00 PM**

**Members Present:** Ron Klattenberg, Phil Pessina, Trevor Davis, Augie DeFrance, Ed Dypa, Ryan Kennedy, Annabelle Malone, Ed Monarca, Larry Riley  
**Members Absent:** Bill Wasch  
**Others Present:** Ron Organek, Mike Rogalsky, Stephan Allison, Ed Rubacha, George Zepko, Acting Chief Bill McKenna, Beth Lapin, John Marion, Off. Bill Warner  
**Guests:** David Stein and Chris Nardi, Silver/Petrucci

**1.0 OPEN MEETING**

Chair Klattenberg opened the Eckersley Hall Building Committee meeting at 6:01 PM at the Police Department Community Room.

**2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**UPDATED PROJECT CONTACT LIST**

An updated Project Contact list was distributed to committee members. They were asked to submit any changes or additions to Beth Lapin.

**DECEMBER 12, 2011 MINUTES**

Chair Klattenberg indicated that the minutes from the December 12<sup>th</sup> meeting required approval. Ed Dypa made the motion to accept them, seconded by Augie DeFrance. The vote to approve was unanimous.

**3.0 FINANCIAL REPORT**

**FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

Beth Lapin distributed the Eckersley Hall Financial Statement for January 6, 2012. This included all expenses and income thus far in the project, which were allocated to one of five budget accounts. Stephan Allison noted that the soft HUD money is \$38,000 -maximum and the hard funds are \$152,000. It was also noted that the date of the final expense was incorrect. Beth will make these adjustments.

**BUDGET ITEMS**

There were no new budget items for review or approval.

**4.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**5.0 OLD BUSINESS**

## **STATUS OF BUILDING**

Chair Klattenberg reported that Bob Dobmeier and the police have installed the previously discussed sensor light in Eckersley Hall at a cost of \$20. If the temperature drops below 45 degrees, the light will go on and be visible from the south side of the building. Police and several city employees are monitoring on a regular basis. Phil Pessina has a set of keys and he will also be checking.

## **UPDATE ON SPECIAL REFERENDUM**

Chair Klattenberg indicated that there would be a presidential primary in April, during which it isn't legitimate to have a referendum. Guy Russo indicated that the additional funding for the sewage treatment plant might be up in a special referendum in May or June, possibly as early as April. If the Eckersley Hall committee needs to add to the bond fund, that would be the time to do so.

## **6.0 NEW BUSINESS**

### **SILVER PETRUCELLI (SP+A) PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

SP+A representatives David Stein, principal, and Chris Nardi, intern architect, initiated a discussion of their plans. (John Ireland was not able to attend, but the group uses a team approach). Having now visited the building, they began a presentation of the first pass of their ideas. Their goal was to review program allocations, overall layouts, with floor plans, conceptual plans (parking), and preliminary budget figures. David emphasized that this was just an initial framework and its development will be an evolving process.

Chris gave an orientation of the schematic diagrams through use of a power point slideshow. He indicated that one of the biggest challenges has been addressing the accessibility requirement, particularly with the multi-level entrances and the cafeteria and stage being even lower. He also indicated the three main stairways with existing classrooms upstairs.

### **PROGRAMS**

SP+A estimated space requirements for each of the items listed on the RFP, to determine if the summary fits inside the building. They found that the building space is adequate to meet all Senior Center and police sub-stations needs; this did not include municipal space requirements. Because no decisions have, yet, been made to determine the Senior Affairs organizational structure.

They asked the committee to review these numbers. Ron commented that he could decide if the programs were still the right programs but he wouldn't have any idea of appropriate sizes and how they fit. David said that would be SP+A's job, based on details of the components in that room. Trevor asked about shared or multiple use of space. David said that if other municipal space were required, they would need to make modifications. At this point, they identified each item in the RFP as a separate space, even though there eventually might be some overlap. He noted that finishes and lighting differ for various uses.

### **FLOOR PLANS**

Chris then introduced three preliminary floor plan options. He emphasized that key items to review were: entry points, accessibility, spaces, and relationship to adjacent spaces (e.g. dining room next to kitchen). Color codes on plans indicated space functions.

*Option 1:* midlevel, main entry. To the right is the reception and office suite. Police substation at left, with easy access. Game room to the left away from office functions to isolate noise. Main dining room would hold 90, kitchen and pantry near service entry, as required. Toilet and boiler room would remain as it. This would require filling in this area 2-2.5 feet, so ceiling would be 9 feet; Ed Dypa projected it would look like a cave. David indicated they might be able to open the ceiling to address issues.

Second floor; elevator in center, library (with fireplace), two meeting rooms, three multipurpose rooms, arts and crafts, socialization area. There is also a mural on canvas and think they could move it. Ed Dypa pointed out that there are two kilns in the building. Phil asked if there would be moveable walls and Chris indicated there would be an operable partition (fabric panels) to make one large or two small rooms. Toilets are in original locations.

*Option 2:* main entry at lower level that would require some exterior site work with a ramp to drop three feet. Entrance would then be at the reception area, small lobby, with stairs up, and an elevator, which would drop down to the lower dining area. First floor has arts and crafts, health screening, reception, police station, and game room. This option uses most of the same walls for cost savings. Dining would hold 70, with toilets to the right and kitchen to the left, with a ramp up to reach the service entrance. Phil questioned the exterior ramp access in bad weather. Trevor indicated that using this entrance has some vehicular issues, which David indicated that would be addressed in the site plans to follow. He noted this provided more of a grand entrance and gathering space. When asked, he stated that the elevator holds 3-4 people.

Second floor: two offices (split from downstairs), three multipurpose rooms, and bathrooms on each side. Stairway can continue to attic if desired (not elevator), two meeting rooms, library, and socialization. Using this greater staircase would revitalize some of the building's historic nature, while retaining as many walls as possible.

*Option 3:* Using a side entrance (either north or south, but this version uses north), with split-level entrance. Come down to offices, reception and sub-station. Filled in the current cafeteria floor and are using space as multipurpose rooms. Also exercise (larger than other plans and offers more zones), arts and crafts, and game room.

Second floor: two small dining rooms, their opened walls supported by columns with 30-40 people each, with kitchen and pantry where toilets were. Also this includes two meeting rooms, computer, library and health/screening upstairs. Service to kitchen and pantry would need to use elevator, but its location could take it into attic. Toilets set above each other on the floors.

Ron asked about meeting fire codes; David indicated three staircases and sprinklers were adequate. Ron asked if one of the end entrances could be eliminated; Chris said that they would need to eliminate the center entrance, if any.

Later in the meeting, Ed Dypa asked about moving the elevator west to be able to reach dining area without fill. Phil suggested it might add more expense to take it from the existing open area. Chris said it would require three doors in the elevator, which increases the cost. Ed said he liked option 1 except for the fact that the dining is filled in. He didn't want it to look like an institution and was looking for a user-friendly atmosphere. Ron said when they come in the building, people need to feel that they belong. Ed indicated that the open pipes in the ceilings didn't provide that for him.

## SITE PLANS

Entry was a key design element and a challenge here. Using site plan, parking currently on south and north side, with main walk on east side.

*Option 1:* add bus drop-off in central entrance. Need new electrical service with transformer behind the building. Likely will need new condensing units perhaps near the boiler room, hidden by fencing. No canopy at front door, but it could be incorporated in any of the options.

*Option 2:* still bus stop but added a new ramp from parking lot and bus drop off, to address drop in entrance, expanded parking lot if needed. Trevor asked about the proportion of handicap spaces and David indicated our group would determine the need. Phil wanted to keep the green space (instead of expanded parking) for outdoor activities, such as picnic tables, bocce, etc. Perhaps off street parking analysis might help. Related to parking slot numbers, there are 20 stalls in existing lot, and expanded would be about 40-50 including both sides of building.

In answering a question, SP+A indicated that dumpster access will be near electric room and transformer.

Larry asked how decisions about the amount of required parking could be made before knowing if there would be more municipal usage of the building. Ron said he asked the architects to include office space for the senior center, based on previous experience. Reviewing plans indicate there is room for a director, assistant director, plus reception and other space to accommodate 3-5 staff. These plans demonstrate needs of senior center and police substation without any other municipals rooms.

*Option 3* site plan would include a new bus drive through the parking on the north and canopy. Ron asked about the need to replace the roof and Chris indicated that it had some structural rotting. David said the ventilation needed improvement to address that. Ron said the structural engineer's previous survey didn't indicate this, but SP+A reported that the roof is asbestos shingle and soffits have problems.

Phil mentioned that the current veterans' building is portable and not permanent and could be used for something else. Question was asked about parking for the museum; John Marion asked about pull-in parking to facilitate plowing. David indicated that there would be the need to balance paved vs. green space and determine the parking needs.

Augie asked if we might consider solar if the roof is being replaced. Trevor asked how this building would coordinate with energy efficiency in the city. Ron reported that this building was

not included in Honeywell's work but SP+A has had experience in the field and can do it. They could apply for grant for clean energy fund for solar (have some free units) or geothermal. Trevor suggested making the energy component more efficient. David indicated that their firm's standard is to design energy efficient buildings that exceed baseline minimums. To improve, they include solar and geothermal and these will be discussed, related to long-term paybacks. Current plan is to gut what's there and start new, so there is a choice on how far to go with energy. But first the programmatic issues must be solved first. So, the question is does the architect understand the committee's vision.

Ron asked if people could receive copies of the plans and have time to reflect on them. PS+A will email the power point presentation to Beth who will send it out to everyone. They distributed seven paper copies of the plans, programs, and budget, and Officer Bill Warner made additional copies, so everyone who wanted a copy received one.

## BUDGET

Chris reviewed budgets for each option, which include replacing all electrical, mechanical to make it more energy efficient. Chris went over the determination of the numbers. Stephan Allison asked if there would be funds for video monitoring of two other entrances. Chris indicated that the numbers were currently broad enough that something like that could be included. Chris also stated that soft costs included design contingency.

Chris said that what was unique about this building is that the existing infrastructure would stay and the funds would go into the MEP systems which will pay itself back in the life of the building. He also noted that their current options included no additions to the building.

S/P presented several budget numbers for planning purposes. These estimates are very preliminary and can not be fully estimated until the Committee provides input. The budget for Option 1 totaled \$3.5 million. Option 2 required more site work and more interior with extra stop on the elevator, which totaled \$3.9 million. It was noted that some items could be phased in to defer initial costs. Option 3 has more construction costs for a total of about \$4.3 million. Things such as the canopy can be added to any option.

Ed Dypa pointed out that some changes might require going to the design review board to protect the overall architectural character.

Ron said, if there are no other questions, that the next meeting is Jan 30<sup>th</sup> at 6pm. He asked everyone to look at the drawing and programs to decide what needs to be brought up for the next meeting.

David asked if we could gather questions ahead and send them to them, so they would be prepared to answer the questions at the January 30th meeting. He indicated that the next step isn't to pick one of the options but more to look overall to see if the programs' needs are being met and how the site plan works. Ron suggested that we imagine walking through the building to see if there is anything odd or unusual. Trevor proposed that we limit our questions to the program and not on the layouts, but David said we needed to combine the two. He suggested the committee look at the big picture, where would the entry be (north or east) and so on.

Staff will also review the plans, especially Stephen. John mentioned that two concurrent programs might cause parking problems.

Ryan wondered about considering the center as a shelter. David said that calling it a shelter requires many additional structural and programmatic issues that, in most cases, it can be used but not officially designated as a shelter. Annabelle asked if showers were included and David indicated these are exactly the kinds of questions that would help them make appropriate adjustments.

Questions should be emailed to Ron, Phil, and Beth by January 25<sup>th</sup>.

### **APPLE REHAB LETTER OF INTENT**

Phil Pessina said he, Ron Klattenberg, and John Ireland met recently with Apple Rehab. They will be getting back to the committee, but Apple representatives verbally expressed interest in providing staff to come do some programming and also donating a large flat screen TV, weights, treadmills, and bicycles, which would be a significant donation in support of and in partnership with this project. Phil expects to hear more by the middle of next week, after which a letter of intent would be sent and reviewed by the committee. Annabelle Malone indicated support of this plan. Trevor asked if this would be used, discarded equipment and Phil assured the group that this was not the case.

Related to this, Annabelle asked how people could donate to the new senior center. Chair Klattenberg said that checks made out to the Middletown Senior Center Fund should be mailed to the City of Middletown, Eckersley Hall Building committee. Two accounts, both currently with the same wording, exist; one for current senior center activities and the other for Eckersley Hall; this problem is now under study by ordinance committee which is working to modify wording so they are distinct.

### **7.0 OTHER BUSINESS**

Stephan Allison has provided a section for a monthly update about Eckersley Hall in the *Senior News*. Deadline for text inclusion is the 10<sup>th</sup> of each month.

### **8.0 ADJURNMENT**

As there was no further business, Chair Klattenberg asked for a motion to adjourn. Made by Ed Dypa and seconded by Larry Riley, the vote was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 7:53pm.