



Meeting Attendees

Date of Meeting: May 4, 2011
Subject of Meeting: Building Program
Location of Meeting: Feeney Conference Room, Cumberland County Courthouse

Project Name: Cumberland County Civic Center Renovation
Project No: 11042

NAME:*

John Menario
Jim Cloutier
Neal Pratt
Linda Boudreau
Joe Bruno
Don Gerrish

Susan Witonis
Peter Crichton - absent
Vic Labreque
Bruce Tarbox
Steve Crane
Brian Petrovek - absent
Brian Arsenault - absent
Elizabeth Trice
Joseph Gray

Richard Feeney - absent
Mark Eddy
Steve Duethman
Scott Sayers
Dan O'Neil
Arthur Thompson
Paul Stevens
Mike Chonko
David Cook - absent
George Liming
Steve Kelly
James Paulson

TITLE:

Co-chair, Civic Center Trustee
Co-chair, County Commissioner
Civic Center Trustee
Civic Center Trustee
Civic Center Trustee
Committee Member (Former Brunswick Town Manager)
County Commissioner
County Manager
County Director of Finance
County Facilities Director
Civic Center Manager
Portland Pirates Managing Owner/CEO
Volunteer (Re: Communications)
Cumberland County Grants/Special Projects
Committee Member - former Portland City Manager
County Commissioner
Civic Center Controller
AECOM
AECOM
AECOM
SMRT
SMRT
SMRT
Allied Cook Construction
Allied Cook Construction



Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: May 04, 2011
Date of Issuance: May 20, 2011
Location of Meeting: Feeney Conference Room, Cumberland County Courthouse
Attendees: See attached list

Project Name: Cumberland County Civic Center Renovation
Project No: 11042
Subject: Building Program

Topics:

1. John Menairo opened this meeting by showing perspective drawings done for a past study and pointed out that images such as this would help sell the project to voters.
2. Paul Stevens summarized the consultants activities since the previous committee meeting:
 - Completed building condition assessment.
 - Met with Civic Center & Pirates staff to discuss needs.
 - Prepared a draft of the building program.
 - Began work on the cost model.
3. Paul listed major pros and cons of the building condition
 - Pros:
 - Well maintained
 - New chiller
 - New Roof
 - Up to date fire alarm system
 - Cons:
 - Seating
 - Cooling tower
 - Generator System.
 - Fire pump.
4. Paul reviewed the vision statement and asked if the text in the interim report was correct.
5. Linda Boudreau suggested that the words “without raising taxes” be eliminated and all agreed.
6. Paul introduced the program presentation by noting that the program as written would likely exceed the budget construction cost available and that the committee should be thinking of ways to reduce the overall program area.
7. Steve Duetterman presented the program draft as outlined in the interim report. He clarified that “circulation” area contained in the administrative sector was internal & that

circulation for ticket queuing was accounted for elsewhere in the program.

8. Paul referenced a discussion with Brian and noted that Pirates office space was not included in the program (Brian would like it to be included) the Pirates are considering an off site practice facility which might eliminate the need for a dedicated team locker room & training facility. Response from the committee supported the need to include team facilities in the design. A successor team to the Pirates may need them.
9. Steve D in concluding the program discussion noted that the construction cost projections included in the Brailsford & Dunleavy report were based only on proposed new program area and did not include code updates, system upgrades/repair, renovated spaces & upgrade of the exterior other than the new additions.
10. Paul introduced Steve Kelly's discussion of the cost model by reviewing the project priorities previously agreed on by the committee.
11. Steve K reviewed the methodology for assembling the cost model for the project.
 - The costs are based on AECOM's previous experience with many similar projects with local cost input from Allied Cook.
 - The goal is to create a working model to understand where we are spending the money & facilitate decisions that will create a design that meets the budget.
 - Based upon a stated project budget goal of 28,000,000 the construction cost needs to be in the 23-24,000,000 range.
12. Neal Pratt asked if the program and budget included loading docks that would utilize some of Center Street. The answer was "yes", Center Street is the most effective way to solve that problem.
13. Neal also asked if club seats were different from loge seats. The answer is, yes-that club seats are individually purchased and include amenities. Loge seats are contained within a defined area and sold as a group.
14. Linda B asked about "green design" Paul referred her to the sustainability section of the interim report and noted that a balance will need to be sought between the budget and doing energy upgrades to existing systems that still have useful life remaining. James Paulson noted that it is not difficult to achieve LEED Silver status with this building type and that new construction would seek to meet LEED standards.
15. Don G asked for clarification re: current program and B&D report. Steve responded that the current program and cost model include renovated areas in the existing building and the B&D report did not. Our program does not have as much new construction area as the B&D report.
16. Paul noted that on a major renovation such as this it is hard to pin down cost based on program areas. We need to have a design. As we develop this design we will need to consider cost/benefits strategies. For example in reconfiguring the seating bowl for ADA and premier seating we may find that the construction cost to configure to maintain the current 6700 seats may not be justified by the revenue from retaining the seats.

17. Neal - Will you for present the options we need to make these decisions? Paul - yes and another consideration will be how we phase the construction.
18. Paul asked if we should consider space in the city parking garage for program. Previous reports included this. The space would most likely be for administrative use, as it is now used.
19. John M noted that the garage was designed to add 2 more floors. Could we take advantage of this and - could we bridge across Free Street to utilize upper vacant floors?
20. Jim C - rather than doing heroic things to existing small spaces I would rather see square footage added.
21. Jim C asked how we could integrate retail and restaurant use into the design & Paul responded that the budget did not allow the space required and John M responded that the trustees had no interest in doing that. Experience in other venues has demonstrated that it is not financially feasible & we do not want to compete with local business.
22. Elizabeth - can we do some things to expand the types of events that will attract more voters to support the project? John M responded that a PAC committee will develop the case for why the public will support the building. We need to first protect erosion of events. Neal is interested in what types of events might be attracted if there were devices to make this space more intimate for smaller audiences.
23. A discussion ensued regarding the best methodology and timing for reaching out to the voters/stakeholders. There were strong opinions expressed on the side of seeking input before designs are developed and also on the side of waiting until we knew more about the design and particulars of the project. Suggestions ranged from a press release seeking input to focus groups. Neal noted that the renovation had been studied for years and there had been a lot of public input.
24. Jim C referred to the agenda item "communications plan" and confirmed the need to be open to the public. He suggested that Peter C. head up the effort. The design team noted that feedback from focus groups would be useful but not critical to their work. Joe Grey suggested that this committee review the alternate design concepts at the next meeting and then go out to the public.
25. Susan W supported the idea of a press release and suggested that the most appropriate way to receive feed back would be through each county commissioner for their district.
26. Vic L noted that we need to develop an FAQ document.
27. John M noted that he had already written a 12 page response to all of the questions that might be raised which would be useful.
28. It was concluded that Jim C, John M Neal P and Susan W would develop a communications concept to be discussed at the next meeting.

27. Next meeting is scheduled for May 25th at 8am.

Attachments: None.

cc: File 11042/28.3