

Police Station Building Committee Meeting

March 9, 2017

The Police Station Building Committee met on Thursday, March 9, 2017 in the Police Commission Conference Room at Milford Police Headquarters. Chrmn. Smith called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Committee Members Present

R. Smith, Chrmn.
S. Bergami
P. Vetro (BOA)
J. Carissimi
T. Holland

Also Present

Chief K. Mello
Deputy Chief K. Rahn
Capt. B. Marschner
Brian Humes, Jacinski Humes Architects
Ald. Giannattasio

Consideration of minutes of the November 19 2016 meeting.

Remain on the table until the next meeting.

Chrmn. Smith reviewed efforts made to purchase the designated parcel before the entire area was complete and that could not happen. He added the City Attorney has informed Chief Mello that the purchase of the property for the proposed headquarters may be tied into the entire piece. Chrmn. Smith did not have concern over that and felt it would not impact the timeline of the project. He suggested this committee meet again in 2 weeks to review the RFP.

Chrmn. Smith explained the owner has option on the entire parcel with someone else but has not exercised that option yet.

Ald. Giannattasio referred to 830-G discussion with regard to this property and Chrmn. Smith stated that is no longer on the table for discussion.

Presentation by Brian Humes

Mr. Humes referred back to the original space needs assessment and noted it was important for him to provide all of the needs in that assessment. He presented documents reflecting exterior of facility and adjacent areas noting the building would be on the Boston Post Rd side of the parcel, include 2 curb cuts off the road, have horizontal parking in the front of the building for public use. The structure is a 3 story building, slab on grade (no basement) and will include access control gates at 2 points. In addition to the public parking in the front of the building, there is additional parking for dispatcher and civilian use at the side of the building. Further Mr. Humes noted in the rear of the building is parking for fleet vehicles and official vehicles and also from that lot is pedestrian access to the building. Staff will access the building from the rear lot. He stated the plans include fencing around the rear lot and that fencing is attached to the back of the building; however the dispatch entrance is separate and not within this fenced area.

Mr. Humes pointed out the sally port on the left side of the building, within security gates and includes 2 bays, triple deep with adjacency to detention area. The impound lot is in the rear of the fenced area. He also explained official vehicles will have covered parking area in the rear of the building and can enter the building completely under cover. As well the

plan includes emergency egress (gated) to Honey Street which connects to Erna Street. Mr. Humes added the plan provides for adequate public and staff parking with overflow areas if needed.

Further, behind the fenced staff parking area there is an "out building" (280 ft x 46 ft) which provides the ability to house a pistol range, bulk evidence, found property and mechanics. This structure is 1 level with overhead doors and has walking path from headquarters. The impound lot is fenced in.

Chief Mello stated he was pleased with having the pistol range separate from the main structure.

Mr. Humes distributed chart reflecting space needs assessment of the 3 floors and schematics reflecting what is included in that chart.

He noted the plan includes a southern exposure structure with a glass façade; public can access upper floors only by elevator.

First floor plan includes public area, community room, main desk, stenographer area, Records Div., Traffic Div., Crime Prev., sally port, prisoner processing, detention area, evidence/property.

Second floor plan includes Communication Center, Patrol Function, Training, Civilian lockers, data center, toilets/janitorial area, driving simulation and there is access to this floor from the back of the building. It was noted the sally port is not part of this 2nd level. Emergency generator is on the 2nd floor as well.

Ms. Holland questioned if there could be viewing windows from this floor to the sally port.

Third floor plan includes M.I.S., computer equipment, administrative offices, payroll, detective area, interview rooms, tactical area, special investigations, Comp. Crime, break room, toilets/janitorial area, Mechanicals.

Discussion ensued as to what type of mechanical equipment will be used.

Mr. Humes directed comments to future expansion and potential for the building to expand (east/west) in the future.

Ald. Vetro asked if there is a facility the members could visit that is similar in structure and he was told not identical but similar and Mr. Humes could provide him that information.

Mr. Carissimi asked Chief Mello if he was anticipating the use of the Simon Lake building indefinitely and Chief Mello explained indefinitely further explaining that building is in need of repair and eventually the department will vacate the portion of the building they are using. Chief Mello added it will be necessary to make a decision in the near future as to how long the department will need the space in that building. He added if it is necessary to use the building for some needs, it will be a much smaller requirement as the new building will be available.

Mr. Carissimi noted the proposed headquarters has a flat roof and he felt that would not be aesthetically attractive and he questioned if there will be a façade.

Mr. Humes noted the building is proposed as a metal supported structure with a metal roof.

Mr. Carissimi asked where the line up room would be and Chief Mello stated it is included in the space needs but where it exactly will be has not yet been identified.

Mr. Carissimi asked if the building would be constructed to add a 4th floor if necessary and Mr. Humes stated the future expansion he had pointed out on the right side of the building, including future parking expansion, would be more cost effective. He added in his opinion going vertically on an expansion is not effective.

Chrmn. Smith added aesthetically it would look nicer expanding out and not up.

Mr. Carissimi congratulated and thanked Chief Mello and Chrmn. Smith for their presentation on the purchase of the parcel to the Board of Aldermen. He also asked at what point would it be necessary to go back to the aldermen for funding.

Chrmn. Smith stated he was not sure how many phases there would be for bonding but felt there would be at least 2 phases.

Mr. Carissimi asked if at some point will we have the opportunity to discuss more details of the interior and he was told yes.

Discussion ensued regarding keeping the current location of the communication tower.

Ald. Giannattasio directed comment to the proposed area for possible expansion and asked how much more square footage would that provide.

Chief Mello explained built into the plan is room for expansion (20 year growth).

Mr. Humes stated expansion area could be 80 x 80 times 3 but that will be very far in the future.

Ald. Giannattasio asked what drives a police department facility needs to grow.

Chief Mello explained the complexity of the population and policing drives a facility to grow.

Chief Mello expressed concern about building in phases and he asked to save money now, what would we not include and how much would it cost to build that structure and add additional features later.

Mr. Humes stated that way of thinking is not feasible for a police facility design.

Chrmn. Smith noted all areas are integral to each other.

Chief Mello noted with regard to design, this façade is not what we would see in the center or downtown area.

Mr. Humes explained the proposed building wants to convey progressive sleek, conventional, professional and modern design. It is not the New England conservative design but would fit the Boston Post Road.

Ms. Holland asked if the building required to have bullet proof glass and she was told no.

Mr. Carissimi noted the New England look is classing and when something of modern design is built, it is only modern for a short period of time.

Ms. Holland stated she would not want the building to resemble the structures in the auto dealer corridor.

Chrmn. Smith stated the committee could get into more discussion about the building design later in the project.

Ald. Giannattasio asked if there was a cost difference between modern vs. classic and he was told no.

Chrmn. Smith noted he and Chief Mello met with Mayor Blake and the Finance Director to discuss the RFP process. He stated the proposal is to reconvene in approximately 2 weeks and during that time the Chief will work on this RFQ and plan and will present a draft back to this committee for approval at the next meeting.

Further, he explained that earlier they discussed with Mr. Humes different ways to go out for proposals.

Mr. Humes stated the committee must decided what is their choice for project delivery method:

- General contractor, hired designer and design team
- Construction manager, hire desire professional and hire construction manager early in the process and they work together updating design and costs.

He added as each area of the package is done, the committee is able to go out to bid at that point. The bids reviewed, accept site work contractor and begin to work on the site. He further stated when the drawing designs are done, all bids are in and contract for construction manager is flipped to a guaranteed maximum price.

- Design build and you will still need construction manager, design team but then the architect works for the contractor.

Mr. Humes did not favor the option of the committee not having a direct line to the architect but would have it through the construction manager.

Mr. Humes added that no matter which choice is made, it is necessary to get proposals from the same pool of contractors and in the end it is the project delivery method and what control this committee has over each area of the project.

Ms. Holland noted if the committee hires a construction manager, it can be a construction manager at risk and the contracts for all trades are between the construction manager and the trades. She noted one of the things she has seen is that you do go out before you have all your design and construction documents nailed down. She noted there is a risk that other bids come in at a number that the committee would not like. She added there is no requirement to bid this now as the committee can bid all packages at the same time. She also offered the committee can hire a construction manager as advisor and the town holds all the contracts with the sub contractors.

Mr. Humes noted if the committee is interested in the lowest number to get the building built, the committee would go with a construction manager as you will get a better built facility because a general contractor submits bid, low bid contractor always trying to save and are in for the profit at the end of the job.

Further he noted a construction manager will charge a fee and that fee is due to them from start to end of the project. They are in it to make sure you get what's in the drawings. They are not in it to cut corners but to make sure the sub contractor performs and you will end up with a better quality project. He noted both Bethel and North Haven have elected to go that route.

Chrmn. Smith stated he would prefer the committee have the ability to talk directly to the contractor.

Ald. Vetro noted the city used design built process for the new fire headquarters.

Chrmn. Smith stated if Chief Mello is going to work on the RFQ's, what model would we want to build around and he noted it is Mr. Hume's recommendation to go to construction manager a risk.

A motion was made by Mr. Bergami and seconded by Ald. Vetro to have RFQ drafted separately, one for construction manager at risk and one for architect engineer. Motion carried unanimously.

Chief Mello added that he has discussed Mr. Hume's expertise in this type of project with other area chief's who have endorsed him and Chief Mello stated he is happy to have him working on this project.

It was the consensus of the committee that they were pleased with Mr. Hume's presentation and work.

Chrmn. Smith stated the committee will reconvene on Thursday, March 23, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. He stated a draft of the RFQ will be provided to members in advance so they will have time to review the documents for approval to be considered at that meeting.

Ms. Holland recommended that professional services include a lot of flexibility in negotiating and there can be language included that the committee would want the fees noted upfront.

Discussion ensued regarding costs and negotiated fees as well as specifics in the RFQ's.

Chrmn. Smith stated if we have the fees come in as recommended, will there be pressure to go with the lowest fee.

Chief Mello stated it should include language that states we are looking for the best qualified who can deliver the product that meets the standards we are looking for.

Chief Mello noted to Ms. Holland that her input will be important to this committee.

Being no further business to discuss, Chrmn. Smith adjourned the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Candido
Recording Secretary

All drawings and documents presented are attached to the original set of minutes.