

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2019

Present: Ryan Aylesworth (Town Manager), Phil Shipman, Tracy Young, Rob West, Mark Tarantelli, Erik Russell, Shirley Green, Jean Patten, Maynard Southard

Guests: Fred Cummings (Fire Chief), Richard Martin (EMS Chief), Wayne Claffin, (Fire Ward), Rob Taylor (Land Use & Community Development Administrator)

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

The meeting began with the approval of the May 28, 2019 minutes. Motion to approve was made by Mrs. Green. Motion seconded by Mr. Tarantelli. Mrs. Patten abstained. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Aylesworth explained that the primary order of business for the meeting was to tour the Union Street Fire Station, the Depot Street ambulance building, and the garages on Shedd Street. Mr. Aylesworth encouraged Committee members to ask questions regarding the each building's history, current condition, pros and cons, and general ability to meet the mission of the department at present and in the future.

The next order of business was a tour of the Union Street Fire Station, and Mr. Aylesworth turned things over to Mr. Cummings to review the history and current use of the structure.

Mr. Cummings began by reviewing the equipment present on site which included:

- Engine 4
 - Mr. Cummings noted that Engine 4 is due for replacement. It is 30 years old and the recommendations for replacement is at 25 years of service. The goal is to replace this vehicle with a rescue pumper that will combine the utilization of two engines. Mr. Cummings noted that the ideal truck would not fit in the current bays due to lack of space from utilizing bays for storage. It was asked by the committee what the restriction was and Mr. Cummings confirmed that the entry doors were sufficiently sized but due to the bay being used for other storage it would not be able fit a vehicle any longer than the current one.
- Engine 5
 - Is currently 18 years old and seven years from replacement
 - Mr. Cummings noted that the last time the town got new Engines they were simultaneously replaced; this should be avoided so that the town doesn't have compounded costs in one budget year. The replacement of Engines should be offset to better balance the budgetary needs of the town.
- A search and rescue boat with trailer – recently purchased by the Firefighters Association and donated to the Town of Enfield
 - Mrs. Patten queried how frequently it is utilized. Mr. Cummings noted that it is used six or seven times per year. He also noted that it can be utilized for aiding someone with a turned over boat, search and rescue operation, and in the event the town ever flooded and roads were not passable.
- A 2017 Polaris All-Terrain Vehicle
 - Mrs. Patten queried how frequently it is utilized. Mr. Cummings noted five to seven times per year. He also noted it can be used for mutual aid to other towns and can easily

access more areas than a typical motor vehicle for incidents such as brush fires, search and rescue, etc.

- A Forestry Truck – Mr. Cummings noted it has been retained and preserved for its history. It is functional; however, it is not a necessary or heavily utilized vehicle.
 - The bay where this vehicle is currently stored was formerly the ambulance bay, prior to services being moved to Depot Street
- A 30-foot trailer that held a full track all-terrain vehicle (for snow)

Mr. Cummings noted that the all-terrain vehicles and the boat were all moved to the Union Street Fire Station recently as they were formerly stored at Shedd Street. They are currently stored inside the station for security purposes. He noted it was possible to remove them from their trailers and park the trailers outside; however, this would also change the readiness and response time in the event they are needed. It was also stated that if the boat was properly winterized it could be stored outside during the winter.

The physical structure of the Union Street Fire Station:

- Is serviced by town water and sewer lines
- Current land usage poses limitations on possible expansion as well as challenges to potential resale value due to setback from railroad
 - If the town were to sell the parcel as a house lot, they would have to evaluate how much land was available to locate a structure due to railroad setbacks
- Is heated by oil with a forced hot water furnace
- Mr. Cummings and a Committee Member both agreed that the furnace was scheduled for replacement as part of the capital improvement plan two or three years ago, but the replacement was not completed by the Department and the funding approval subsequently expired
- Meeting space is too small to hold trainings
 - Mrs. Patten inquired as to what the ideal space would be for a training room. Mr. Cummings estimated at least 40' X 40'.
- No lockers for gear and equipment
- No lockers for personal belongings
- No shower station (particularly of concern for carcinogens that firefighters may be in contact with during a fire)
- Additions, such as a door that would allow for cold storage under the building, have been added to try to accommodate storage needs.
 - This space is not heated, but does have sprinklers. Mr. Cummings noted it was recently cleaned out to have better access. He also noted it would be possible to store an all-terrain vehicle in this space; however, problems such as snow in front of the outer door, or other storage items in the way have potential to cause impediment to access.
- The installation of the sprinkler system was completed with free labor and only at cost of the piping and sprinkler heads
- Insulation of the building is poor.
- The large bay door in front of Engine 5 should be replaced due to damage
- The roof is in poor condition and needs replacement. This too was previously approved as part of the capital improvement plan in recent years and the Department did not follow through with replacement
- The hose tower has not been utilized for an extended period of time.
 - To manage the space and maximize capacities, the hoses for the hose tower have been removed from their original storage locations and moved to secondary storage within the building. The area that formerly stored the hoses is used for storage of equipment that is used on a regular basis such as the chainsaw and the Jaws of Life.

The Committee asked Mr. Cummings if, in the event the town does not build a public safety complex, would it be possible or realistic to combine the fire and ambulance needs of the town into the Union Street building. Mr. Cummings noted that with some adjustments of storage and vehicles it would be possible to store the ambulance, but not ideal in this location to merge both department personnel due to lack of space. Mr. Cummings reiterated that, assuming that the Town could make the financials work, it would be highly advantageous to construct a public safety complex.

During the tour additional questions were raised:

Mr. Southard asked Mr. Cummings if a second floor would add value to the current station. Mr. Cummings replied that yes, it would add space for administrative services, a larger meeting space, and a locker room.

It was asked if there were advantages to having a Command Center that included all three public safety agencies (police, fire, EMS). Mr. Cummings indicated that it would be of great benefit.

Mrs. Patten inquired as to how many firefighters are currently associated with the Union Street Fire House. Mr. Cummings noted that there was an active roster of 32 members that were split between the two stations – Union Street Fire Department and Enfield Center Fire Department.

Mr. West also acknowledged that if further renovations were done to the building that it was likely that the building codes would require that many other upgrades be completed, and would thus add significantly to the overall level of investment needed to make the building better meet the Department's mission.

Mr. Cummings also noted that there is no space in the Enfield Center Fire House for any further storage. He noted that the tow behind generator was moved from Shedd Street to the Enfield Center Fire House. He stated it was functional as a satellite station and accessible, but that it also has an issue with the sewer pipes freezing during the winter.

The Committee engaged in conversation about the need and utilization of the Enfield Center Fire House. It was noted that in the process of discussing a new structure of emergency services for the Town of Enfield, it would not be advantageous to shut the Enfield Center station down or remove it due to concern for citizens and the relationship between the residents of Enfield and Enfield Center. This was the same finding offered in the report issued by Barrett Architecture. Mr. Cummings also noted that the removal of the fire station could impact citizens not only by response times, but by the fact that the vicinity of emergency services is an important factor when it comes to homeowner's insurance. It was discussed that anyone on the squad that lives on that side of town can take the trucks from the Enfield Center Fire Station out on an emergency call. Mr. Cummings also noted that the Enfield fire operations do not run off of typical 'zones' for response, rather, they are based on relative location when someone receives a page for an emergency.

The Committee then convened at the Depot Street Ambulance Building where Mr. Richard Martin, the EMS Chief, discussed the buildings history, usage, and current condition. Details included:

- The use of the building for Ambulance services dates back to 1977
- The FAST Squad, which existed before Mr. Martin's time with the ambulance services, put money in the maintenance of the building.
- The building is placed on a four-inch concrete slab (poured over the existing stone foundation and wood framing) and stands on Lally columns – many of which have needed replacement due to water damage and rust issues
- The ambulance is parked in the building with a very small margin in front or behind. The back door cannot be utilized when the ambulance is parked in the bay because it will hit the ambulance and potentially cause damage. There is little to no room to pass through between the front of the ambulance and the bay door when it is closed.

- No trainings are currently held in the building due to inadequate space and poor conditions
- The building is poorly insulated
- The building is heated with oil
- There is a shower that is used minimally
- The roof was replaced in recent years and cost approximately \$28,000
- There are issues with rusted out pipes and the heating of the building
- There are current issues with flooding in the basement. Mr. Martin provided the Committee with pictures from recent flooding so they could see how high the water gets in the basement. The basement cannot be used for storage due to consistent water and flooding issues. There is currently a pump set up to help remove excess water; however, shallow pools of standing water were still present when the Committee toured the basement.
- An apron and some new pavement have helped the water issue, but has not resolved the problem.
- Security cameras are in use within the facilities
- There are annually about 300-350 calls that the Town of Enfield responds to
 - There are currently 476 shifts to cover; however, on at least 42 occasions no one is on call and/or able to respond.
 - The schedule is currently maintained within Google Docs
 - The cost-benefit analysis suggests it is advantageous for the town to continue offering ambulance services when contrasted with the fees billed by the City of Lebanon for ambulance services provided between 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM Monday-Friday
 - The Town of Lebanon has acknowledged a decrease in number of calls they have had to respond to in Enfield over the past year due to an improved level of response by the Enfield Ambulance.

Questions from the Committee during the tour:

Mrs. Patten asked if the size was adequate for use. Mr. Martin noted it was minimally acceptable for current use and would not allow for growth. He noted the bay could not fit a larger ambulance, nor could it fit more than one. Mrs. Patten inquired if there was a need for two ambulances. Mr. Martin advised that planning for two would be in the best interest of the town given the Town's aging population and trend toward rising calls volumes. There would need to be three to four feet between the front of a parked ambulance and the bay door to allow for unimpaired movement. Mr. Martin stated he did not advocate for a larger ambulance size but encouraged the Committee to think about the many benefits of having more ambulance services available.

Mrs. Patten asked how many current members there were on the EMS Team. Mr. Martin replied there are currently 12 members, including six active members that cover the majority of call shifts, and three paramedics that respond to calls when available. Mr. Martin noted that there are cost differences between hiring paramedics and EMTs for emergency services. He confirmed that the most frequent responders on the squad were EMTs which are appropriate for the emergencies that they most commonly respond to. Mr. Martin noted that calls relating to major injuries such as a gunshot wound or CPR in progress would involve dispatching an ambulance from Lebanon.

Mr. Southard noted that while that basement causes many problems, the building itself is good and structurally sound.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that the land is owned by the New Hampshire Department of Transportation, but that the physical building is owned the Town of Enfield. He reached out to the state to discuss the possibility of either the Town acquiring the land or the state buying back the building, but he has not received further communications. Mr. Southard inquired if the Town is currently paying the Department of Transportation for use of the land. Mr. Aylesworth confirmed the town does not currently pay for use of the land.

Mr. Young inquired that if the building wasn't used for the Ambulance anymore if it could be utilized for other purposes, such as storage. Mr. Aylesworth confirmed that there was nothing in the deed of the building that regulated how it must be utilized by the Town. Mr. Aylesworth confirmed that the building, being an old train station, was significant in historical value to the Town.

After concluding the tour of the Depot Street Ambulance building the Committee moved on to the structures located on Shedd Street. Mr. Cummings gave the Committee a tour of the facilities which included the following equipment:

- A decommissioned fire engine; built in 1989, put into service for Enfield in 1990. The vehicle needed to be decommissioned because it was over 25 years old and no longer met safety requirements. The Committee inquired as to the condition of the vehicle. Mr. Cummings confirmed the vehicle is still operational but has not been used in three years. It has been stripped of all usable parts. It has a good motor, low mileage, and a good transmission. It is possible to sell the engine, but the exact pricing for this was unknown. Mr. Cummings estimated the town could get anywhere from \$5,000 to \$10,000
- A red trailer which is used for the toy drive as well as for the town fair. Mr. Cummings noted this was an old water and sewer trailer which the Fire Department inherited at no cost to the town. Mr. Cummings noted that the trailer was not in excellent condition and would need replacement in the next couple of years. It is anticipated the Firefighters Association will be a part of that process.
- A 1959 Dodge Firewagon
 - The vehicle runs on gas and has not been inspected in two to three years. This could be sold for an estimated \$5,000
- A white Saab that was seized
 - Mr. Cummings noted that this vehicle has the potential to be auctioned.
- The building was heated until recently. Once items such as the all-terrain vehicles and the boat were moved out of storage the heat was turned off. Mr. Cummings noted that the furnace is not in good working condition.
- The building is currently connected to town water supply, but it is turned off while the building is not in use.

On the property there is also a salt shed and a small 'building' built of plywood and filled with hay to be utilized for fire safety trainings. On the edge of the property there is a large garage with bay doors that is in extremely poor condition and unsafe for use.

Committee Members also made inquiries during the visit:

Mr. West observed what looked to be a former fueling station. Mr. Cummings confirmed it was a former fueling station. It is not known if the tanks are still located on the property or not.

Mrs. Patten and other committee members inquired about the Firefighters Association Fund – specifically what impact, if any, the changes in Fire Department governance recently approved by Town Meeting will have on the activities/function of the Firemen's Association. Mr. Aylesworth and Chief Cummings both confirmed that changes in Fire Department governance should have no impact on the role, importance, or activities of the Firemen's Association. Mr. Cummings confirmed the money is raised by the Association with particular emphasis on money raised from the Enfield Family Fair, which is organized annually. Mr. Cummings also explained how the Association purchases items such as the boat and the Jaws of Life and donates them to the town. It is the responsibility of the town to register, insure, and maintain all equipment that is donated. The intention is that the Association continues to fundraise to be able to purchase new and/or replacement equipment when it is needed. For example, over the years, the Association has donated three sets of the Jaws of Life, one set that is left in Enfield Center, and two that are located in the Union Street Fire Station.

Mr. Southard asked if the association is mainly comprised of firefighters and how they continue to recruit. Mr. Cummings confirmed the association is mainly firefighters and their family members as well. Mr. Cummings noted that it has been difficult to find younger recruits. Using himself as an example, he noted he was a member of the local Fire Station and association when he was under 20 years old, but it is harder to recruit the younger generations and get people involved.

Mrs. Patten asked how much land is on the Shedd Street property. It was estimated by Mr. Aylesworth that the two parcels together comprise slightly over two acres of land, which would enable the Town to subdivide the parcels into up to four house lots (each at least 0.5 acres in size to conform with the requirements of the R1 Zone) if that was the direction the Town wanted to head.

Mr. West acknowledged that since the town already owns the property there would be no additional costs of purchasing land to build on the Shedd Street property. It was added that, if sold, the money from the sale of the Shedd Street land could be used to help offset the cost of purchasing another parcel of land for a public safety complex.

Mr. West inquired if there is any indication that the members of the Department who primarily work out of the Enfield Center station object to the Town spending money on a new public safety building located in the Enfield Village Area. It was noted that the personnel at Enfield Center are happy with the equipment and facilities that they have and acknowledge that a majority of the calls take place in Enfield Village as opposed to Enfield Center.

Mr. West inquired if there might be pushback from neighbors to put a fire station or emergency command center on the Shedd Street property. Mr. Cummings did not think so and noted that many of the residents in the immediate area were involved with the local fire department.

The Committee also discussed environmental concerns such as the potential for contamination, if runoff would create issues, and if the Mascoma River is a protected river. The Mascoma River is a protected river, but due to the location of the property being at least 250' from the river, there should not be any added regulatory hurdles.

Mr. Cummings strongly advocated for using the Shedd Street property to construct a public safety complex, and went on to express concerns relating to the residential aspects of other proposed sites on US Route 4, as well as the concerns for traffic and possible safety issues. Mr. Aylesworth indicated that it was important to note that the Police Chief had offered a more favorable assessment of at least one location on US Route 4, and that all of these perspectives should be taken into account. Mr. Cummings suggested that the Shedd Street property is central to the town and there would be less concern for traffic, weather, and accessibility related challenges. Mr. Cummings also expressed concern for the purchase of additional property when the town had property available. He suggested it was possible for the tentative dimensions of a public safety complex as recommended by Barrett Architecture to be adapted to fit within the footprint of currently owned town property on Shedd Street.

At the conclusion of the discussion of the Shedd Street property, Mr. Aylesworth suggested that any discussion related to "Big Ideas" (a recurring item on the agenda) be tabled until the next meeting on account of time. The Committee unanimously agreed.

Mr. Shipman and Mr. Aylesworth briefly updated the Committee on ongoing communications with Town Counsel regarding the use of Whitney Hall by the Library. It was emphasized that everyone was on the same page in terms of striving for a consensus-based approach whereby the Board of Selectmen and Library Trustees ultimately arrived at the same preferred option. Mr. Shipman and Mr. Aylesworth went on to mention some public feedback they had received in which residents seemed to suggest that they expect the Committee to be devising detailed design plans for any proposals they recommend. The Committee agreed that their job as a committee is to formulate ideas and general conceptual proposals, and corresponding "word case scenario" cost estimates for the Board of Selectmen to consider and ultimately advance (or not advance) at Town Meeting.

The Committee then discussed a recent Request for Proposal that was put out to fix the floor in the Enfield Center Town House. At the time of the meeting there were no active bids on the project and the deadline to submit proposals had passed about one week earlier. Mr. Aylesworth noted he had a conversation with a local contractor who expressed the opinion that bidding interest was suppressed because the RFP only requested that a section of the floor to be done. As a contractor, it made little sense to replace one section and not the entirety of the floor in one project given that there are likely issues with the entire floor (even if the damage is most apparent in just one section). The request for a section of the floor was made to reduce the cost to the Town for repairs given limited available funding; however, in light of the results it may not work out as originally proposed. Mr. Aylesworth noted that it may be possible to obtain a second Moose Plate Grant and request extensions to tie two grants together in an effort to budget the full floor replacement at a cost of closer to \$30,000, instead of just one section. He proposed that the grant would still uphold the stabilization effort to make the building usable, but would not address lingering issues such as the need for a septic and well if the Town plans to begin making the space more usable for a variety of functions.

Mrs. Green inquired if the minutes being posted on the Town web site were generating any conversations from the community. Mr. Aylesworth mentioned that several residents who had requested to be on the Committee but were ultimately not selected have followed the minutes and expressed positive sentiments to him how things were progressing.

The next meeting is to take place on June 24th at 6:30pm at the Department of Public Works building. The meeting will focus on the condition and needs of the Public Works Facility and associated property.

Mr. Aylesworth requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Tarantelli motioned to adjourn. Mrs. Patten seconded. All committee members were in favor (9-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:52 pm.