

**CITY HALL COMPLEX MASTER PLAN TASK FORCE
CITY OF REHOBOTH BEACH**

June 19, 2012

The City Hall Complex Master Plan Task Force Meeting of the City of Rehoboth Beach was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chairman Sam Cooper on Tuesday, June 19, 2012 in the Commissioners Room in City Hall, 229 Rehoboth Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, DE.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Sam Cooper, Greg Ferrese, Stan Mills, Jim Ellison, Jim Horty, Ken Simpler, Keith Banks, Dawn Lynch, Pat Coluzzi (arrived at 9:06 a.m. and left the meeting at 10:23 a.m.)

Audience: Patrick Gossett, Toni Sharp, Howard Menaker, Ryan Mavity of Cape Gazette

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the November 28, 2011 City Hall Complex Master Plan Task Force Meeting were distributed prior to the meeting.

Jim Horty made a motion, seconded by Stan Mills, to approve the December 8, 2011 City Hall Complex Master Plan Task Force Meeting minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

PRESENTATION by the City's consultant of concept plans for the City Hall Complex that they have developed based on a program created from interviews with affected City departments.

Rick DiSabatino and Rob of EDiS and Mike Wigley of Davis, Bowen & Friedel (DBF) were in attendance at the meeting. They were tasked with information gathering, conceptual design work and finalization of one or two concepts. The first two phases have been completed. Mike presented an existing aerial view and existing site survey of the City Hall Complex. An evaluation was done to identify all the departments and existing spaces which are currently used. Structurally, the City Hall Complex has minor areas of moisture penetration in the basement, minor wood roof deck deterioration, numerous masonry defects in brick walks and retaining walls, and beam supporting loading dock canopy appears undersized for snow loads. A Code evaluation was performed based upon current codes. The fire suppression system is non-existent. The first floor area exceeds permitted floor area for mixed-occupancy and is a non-separated building. The basement egress passes through storage areas in some instances. Some doors do not swing in the direction of egress travel, and there are several ADA deficiencies. A summary was provided on the program by department. The total net area for the buildings evaluated (City Hall, 306 Rehoboth Avenue, Parking Meter, Tech Services and Main Street) was 34,143 square feet. The gross area for all the buildings combined would be approximately 40,000 square feet. The study does not evaluate the Convention Center, but it is recommended that the restroom facilities be improved and the lobby be increased. The net area totals amounted to 45,518 square feet with an 11,375 square foot differential. Four concepts were presented with three phases to each concept. Concept A: Both Rehoboth Avenue access drives would remain. Existing City Hall building would be removed, and the open space would be removed in front of City Hall. Concept B: One Rehoboth Avenue access drive would remain. Existing City Hall building would be removed, and the open space would be removed in front of City Hall. Concept C: One Rehoboth Avenue access drive would remain. Existing City Hall building would remain, and the open space would be removed in front of City Hall. Concept D: One Rehoboth Avenue access drive would remain. Existing City Hall building would be removed, and the open space would remain in front of City Hall. Mike also provided the four (4) concepts three-dimensionally. Rob noted that the cost estimates are conceptual. The estimates consisted of temporary facilities (if any), demolition (if any) or renovation of the existing building and addition of a new structure. Also included were the construction costs, trade contract costs. For demolition, \$15.00 per square foot was used. The costs for renovation and new construction vary and are based on wage rates. Construction contingency is included for design, change orders, etc., and 20% is normal for this phase. As drawings progress, the percentage decreases to approximately 5%; and once the project is bid out, the 5% is held for things such as change orders, etc. The owner's contingency is for IT, furniture, legal costs, etc. The contractor costs are at 20% which are conservative. Typically, on a project this size, it should be below the 15% range which includes general conditions of the cost to run the project, project supervision, bonding, etc. With the phasing costs, there may be temporary facilities, modular construction, temporary entrances, safety, temporary walkways and phasing in general of moving from one area to another. The soft costs at 6.5% to 10% are everything above and beyond the construction costs such as the owner contingency, architectural, engineering, surveying,

testing, etc. FFE at 6% is for furniture. Technology is assumed at 2%. Concept A is at \$16,500,000.00, Concept B is at \$13,800,000.00, Concept C is at 13,100,000.00 and Concept D is at \$14,000,000.00. Concept A has the most new addition and little demolition. Concept C has a lot of renovation and little new addition. A little phasing was kept in all the concepts because of the temporary access. Concept A was the only scheme that showed the new Parking Meter building.

In the discussion among the Committee members, it was noted that the City Manager feels that having everyone under one roof gains control and efficiency. The ideal situation is to make every attempt possible to get all City functions under one roof excluding Alderman Court and Main Street. Data is needed to be taken into account with regard to the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building and its current functions as part of the entire project. It is important to take a comprehensive look at all the physical resources the City has which includes the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building and see if that building could be re-purposed for other people, such as Main Street and Alderman Court. The Parking Meter Department should be the most visible in the City and should be easily accessible and easy to find. The notion of adjacencies such as what departments need to be closest to other departments was not presented in any of the material or the presentation. The consensus of the Committee members was to make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners to seek an appraisal of what the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building is worth. Designated parking would be needed for the Police Department to remain separate from public parking. With regard to the various concepts, room would be needed for police vehicles to enter onto Rehoboth Avenue. An evaluation of the current HVAC system would need to be done. An option for the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building is to hold onto it and lease it out. The building could also be used as swing space.

Mike commented that there is enough information to back numbers out of the scenarios to see what the value is of keeping City functions at the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building and not importing them into the City Hall Complex. He suggested adding line items to each concept. One item would be to assume the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building would remain where it is and the City uses. A difference in construction costs could then be determined. Mike would also like to isolate the scenario of a new Parking Meter Department facility and Main Street facility to see what the value would be of that vs. just adding on to structures.

Questions/comments for Mike and Rob to answer for the next meeting:

1. Property off of Second Street at the Parking Meter Tech building and the impound area could be utilized for a building such as Alderman Court, Main Street, etc. An impound area could be located in the secure area at the water tank, and the recycle area could be located somewhere else in the City.
2. Have a breakdown of the Parking Meter building and what is deducted from the costs for the concepts.
3. Flipping Concept A to retain the public parking lot on the west side of the complex.
4. A level walking entry into the Convention Center.
5. Possibly have the Commissioners Room on the first floor of the complex.
6. Appraisal of the 306 Rehoboth Avenue property by Lingo and ReMax.
7. What it would take to move Main Street and Alderman Court to the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building. The proposed space for the Alderman Court is almost identical to the existing IT Department space.
8. Other options for moving other departments to the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building.
9. Options of what can be done at the 306 Rehoboth Avenue building.
10. Parking requirements on the secure side with public parking on the east side.
11. List of everyone who requires a parking space.
12. Consideration of an Emergency Operations Center.

Jim Ellison was inclined towards Concept A because both of the access opportunities stay open to Rehoboth Avenue and the block gained under that scheme will look less like added bits and pieces to an existing building. This would be the cleanest layout, but ways need to be looked at for trimming the costs because it is higher due to the additional new building or at least making the costs comparable across the board.

Stan Mills was concentrating on Concept A for many reasons such as the dual entries off of Rehoboth Avenue, flipping it to maintain a level entry from the parking lot on the west side, and the City will end up with a better product if existing City Hall is demolished.

Howard Menaker, 16 Dover Street, suggested the possibility of having rooftop parking.

Jim Horty will try to find out by June 21, 2012 about any possible change in future plans for the M&T Bank property.

Mike noted that the least obtrusive to the current operation is Concept B which does not require a temporary facility.

Greg Ferrese suggested with regard to Concept A and temporary facilities, the Administrative Office could be moved into the Conference Suite, and Alderman Court could be moved into the Caucus Room. Rick noted that the chosen concept could be fine tuned and the numbers shrunk once it is known how the space will be utilized.

Mike will provide six more sets of copies of the various concepts for the remainder of the Task Force to review.

Discuss additional process and steps for plan development.

Additional process and steps for plan development were included in the previous item.

Discuss items to be included on future agendas.

There were no new items.

Discuss setting next meeting date.

The next meeting will be held on July 11, 2012 at 9:00 a.m.

There being no further business, Chairman Cooper declared the meeting adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

(Ann M. Womack, CMC, City Secretary)

**MINUTES APPROVED ON
AUGUST 8, 2012**

(Sam Cooper, Chairman)