

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 11, 2020

Present: Phil Shipman, Shirley Green, Erik Russell, Rob West, Maynard Southard, Tracy Young, Jean Patten, Mark Tarantelli

Administrative Staff: Ryan Aylesworth (Town Manager)

Guests: Emily Curtis, recording secretary; Jim Pulver, VP of Architecture at Bread Loaf; Francine Louzeau, Library Trustees; Melissa Hutson, Town Librarian; Roy Holland, Chief of Police; Dan Kiley, Dr. David Beaufait, Phil Neily, Building Inspector; Cecelia Aufiero, Fred Cummings, Chief of Fire Department; Dominic Albanese, Chair Library Trustees; Kate Stewart, Board of Selectmen Chair; Bridget Labrie, Marjorie Carr

Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

The Public is encouraged to participate remotely over Zoom by going to <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86382578892?pwd=bUtEM3oveEtrcFpiNVVMU00yU3Zadz09>, using the Zoom App on a smart phone or computer and entering **03748** as the password. Additionally, you can participate via phone (audio only) by calling **929 205 6099** and entering Meeting ID **863 8257 8892**. Please try to log in 5 minutes before the meeting's scheduled start time in case you run into any technical difficulties. If you run into difficulties contact: 603-309-6379

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:32pm.

Virtual Meeting 'Preamble'

TOWN OF ENFIELD BOARD/COMMITTEE COVID-19 ELECTRONIC MEETING CHECKLIST

As a member of the Municipal Facilities Advisory Committee of the Town of Enfield, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that this is a virtual meeting only, as authorized by the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;

We are utilizing the Zoom platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board/Committee have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Zoom platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone # and using the password provided or by clicking on the following website address: that has been provided in email.

b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;

We previously gave notice to the public of how to access the meeting using Zoom, and instructions are provided on the Town of Enfield's website at: <https://enfield.nh.us>.

c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access;

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-309-6379 or email at: raylesworth@enfield.nh.us.

d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, we will adjourn the meeting and have it rescheduled at that time.

At this time, I also welcome members of the public accessing this meeting remotely. Although this meeting is being conducted in a unique manner under unusual circumstances, the usual rules of conduct and decorum apply. Any person found to be disrupting this meeting will be asked to cease the disruption. Should the disruptive behavior continue thereafter, that person will be removed from this meeting.

I will follow the agenda items in order unless otherwise explicitly stated and ask the Board and town department and/or committee stakeholders for input first. Then I will specifically ask for public comment. I will ask you to unmute and will call on members of the public. I ask that you endeavor to not speak over one another or interrupt in the interest of fairness to all present in the call and to our minute taker. I acknowledge timing is a challenge and there will be occasional, intentional lags to allow for responses from participants. Please be patient and the meeting will flow along nicely.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their presence, also please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to-Know law.

Roll Call – Attendance of Committee members and members of the public

Review and Approve Meeting Minutes – April 27, 2020

Mr. Shipman made the following requests for edits:

- Page 3, paragraph beginning ‘The Committee and members...’, add at the end: as well as cost/value comparisons.
- Page 4, third paragraph down, remove one ‘is’
- Page 6, edit 5th paragraph, should be ‘outlined’ not outline
- Page 7, in Other Business, correct to totaling instead of totally
- Page 8, last sentence before next meeting should state: ‘\$15,954 had been expended.’

Mr. Aylesworth made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Ms. Green seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (8-0).

Review of Bread Loaf Contract Billings/Expenditures to Date

Mr. Shipman addressed questions related to the billing and expenditures of the Bread Loaf contract as discussed in the previous meeting. He noted that about 85% of the contract, or roughly 24,000 of the total \$29,000, has been paid to date. He added that an additional sum of up to \$5,000 had been approved by the Board of Selectmen to complete a portion of site work at the Supervisory Union property.

Review Board of Selectmen Approval of Pathways Consulting Site Investigations

Mr. Shipman noted that after the Committee had received approval for up to \$5,000 worth of site work, the Committee received a letter from Superintendent, Amanda Isabelle, regarding permission to move forward with site work. Mr. Shipman read the following correspondence to the Committee:

Ryan,

The Town of Enfield's interest in the property at the SAU site has reached a troubling pinnacle this weekend. In light of the rumors adrift in all the towns in the district, I am officially requesting that the Town of Enfield cease any further exploration of the property until a formal presentation has been made to the Mascoma Valley Regional School Board. The next anticipated availability for this presentation would not be until August 2020.

I am fully aware that under no circumstance, as Superintendent of Schools, that I may either gift this land to the Town of Enfield or approve the sale of this property without approval of a Warrant Article as voted and approved by the voters.

It is my understanding that the Town of Enfield is moving forward with a barrage of site testing for the SAU property. This testing may not be conducted without the approval of the School Board. Please hold any plans for testing until after the Board has met and approved your request.

My apologies for any confusion that may have resulted from previous conversations and hope this email clarifies the situation.

*Amanda Isabelle
Superintendent SAU 62
Mascoma Valley Regional School District
603-632-5563 ext. 3602*

The Committee members discussed the letter and how to proceed with the finalization of the recommendations to be made to the BOS.

Mr. West inquired if the Committee was somehow sending the wrong impression or if the District was receiving incorrect information from somewhere.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that, to the best of his knowledge, it was a single resident who had contacted the School Board Chair regarding the situation. It appears that the School Board Chair was provided inaccurate information about where things stood in process, but it is not clear that this was intentional.

Mr. Shipman noted that Mr. West posed a great question. He added that the meetings and minutes are open to public, and to date, it is not believed the person who raised concerns has participated in any of the meetings. He added that perhaps there is confusion regarding the Committee's role in the process or a disagreement regarding municipal facility needs.

Mr. Shipman stated that he wants to ensure that the Committee is all on board with the current proceedings.

Dr. Beaufait noted that the Committee has been open, transparent, and thorough, even when he doesn't personally agree with every conclusion or recommendation.

The Committee discussed the implications of possibly waiting until August for a meeting with the School Board meeting and questioned why it would take so long to get on the agenda.

It was noted that the Committee would be unable to move forward until the site investigations are completed.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that communications between the Committee and School Board have primarily gone through the school district's business manager, as authorized by Ms. Isabelle, and there has been open lines of communication. Mr. Aylesworth noted that he was not aware that the School Board had not previously received information regarding the conversations and requests for prior site work done on the property.

Mr. Young inquired if there was any known opinion of Enfield representatives on the School Board?

The Committee discussed concerns for the timeline of the School Board agenda and questioned why it would take so long to get on the agenda.

Ms. Stewart, Board of Selectmen Chair, noted that Bridget Labrie, a member of the School Board, was present for the BOS meeting where the site work expenditures were approved. Ms. Stewart noted she was a previous member of the School Board and added that the School Board Chair does not have legal authority over the Superintendent when it comes to operations-level actions, such as allowing a third party to gain access to a site for evaluation. The School Board is a policy making body and directs through policy. She encouraged the Committee to reach out to members of the School Board. She also added that there were boundary line disputes with Family Dollar and their driveway, which was later voted on in a Warrant Article. She noted that the situation also builds a precedent to the School Board for facilitating communications and following proper procedures regarding school owned property.

Mr. Shipman noted that a letter or e-mail should be sent to the School Board Chair on behalf of the Committee to request being added to the agenda as soon as possible.

Mr. Shipman added that it hinders the Committee's project process, but more detrimentally, it inhibits the Town's process. He added that, on behalf of the Town, he believes it is in our best interest to make the School Board meeting and potential site investigation happen as soon as possible.

Mr. Young made a motion to e-mail all the members of the School Board, and if there is Committee consensus, to formally request permission for the Committee to discuss the property and allow research into the property without initiating purchasing negotiations. He noted the letter should be written to all School Board members from all Committee members.

Mr. Shipman seconded, and noted that, while it would be ideal to have unanimous support from the Committee for this action, only a simple majority was required.

The Committee discussed details of the motion and how to approach communications with the School Board.

Committee members inquired as to why the School Board may be uncomfortable with the Committee moving forward with the planned site investigations.

Mr. Russell suggested sending a letter as a formal request to be on the agenda, which would include information regarding the intention and need for the site work.

Mr. West supported Mr. Russell's suggestion. He added that the School Board is under pressure from constituents with anything regarding new buildings and that while the Committee's path seems clear at this point in time, it is still in preliminary stages and the School Board should be open to discussions with the Committee.

Mr. Tarantelli reminded members of the Committee that this information comes on the heels of previous rumors regarding the possible closing of an elementary school and may be why people are taking a different approach.

Mr. Kiley noted that a member of the Committee could attend a School Board meeting and could request to be put on the next meeting agenda.

Ms. Stewart noted that the Chair of the School Board controls the agenda and has recently been denying agenda items to be added.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that there were valid reasons not to push for being on the agenda tomorrow so that the School Board did not feel that the Committee was applying excessive pressure. He added that the school superintendent has the authority to approve permission for the site investigations, but, it is clear in this situation the School Board wants to weigh in. He added that any discussion surrounding the terms of a potential sale would of course need to include the School Board, but we hadn't gotten to that point yet.

Ms. Patten agrees with Ms. Green's and Mr. Russell's approach. She added that, from her personal perspective, the Committee should have been clearer in its intentions about the property. She noted that the Committee was operating without School Board approval and while she agreed that the site work should be completed, she also feels the Committee could have done a better job about communicating their intentions from the beginning.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that nothing was done in the process without notifications being provided to or permission being sought from the superintendent, including making arrangements to gain access to records or even stepping foot on the property. He added that he was given full permission to coordinate with the schools business manager regarding record requests. He added that the Committee could have asked for a meeting with the School Board right out of the gate, but at the time it appeared that communication at the level of school administration was sufficient.

Mr. Russell noted that he understood the point that the School Board may not technically need to take a vote, but it is clear from the superintendent's e-mail as to how the Committee should proceed, which includes a formal request to be put on the agenda and not just showing up.

Mr. Pulver wanted to be sure the Committee was aware that, given the conditions to do wetlands determination, it needs to be spring, summer, or fall to complete the site work. He noted that after you've had a hard frost, you may need to wait until the next spring to finalize the tests.

Mr. Young requested to modify his previous motion to include a request to be added to the next possible agenda to discuss permission to do testing for a soil's investigation. Mr. Shipman seconded the amendment.

It was noted that the terminology of 'soils investigation' would include investigation of the vernal pool and wetlands.

Ms. Green noted it would be important for the Committee to explain why we want these things and express intentions to try to mend the disconnect.

Mr. West inquired if there was a precedent for sending to all members versus just the chair.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that it was common for requests sent to the BOS to include all members of the board, not just the chair, so he would recommend things proceed in that fashion in the case of making a formal request of the School Board.

Ms. Stewart added that it was standard for people to e-mail everyone and not just the chair and that e-mail the whole board is preferable so the communication gets full circulation.

Mr. Young added that details of the soil's investigation would be included in the discussion with the School Board, but were not necessary for the purposes of the motion or the letter of request to initiate the conversation. He added that background information would be appropriate to integrate into the conversation held at the School Board meeting.

Mr. Shipman agreed that the appropriate place for more information is in discussion with the School Board, after the Committee is put on the agenda.

Mr. Kiley noted that the Committee could submit a request to be put on the agenda as 'Discussion of School Board property' within the next month.

Mr. Young made a motion to request sending an e-mail to be addressed to all School Board members, and sent with permission by all members of the MFAC, to be added to the next possible agenda to discuss permission to do testing for a soil's investigation. Mr. Shipman seconded the amendment. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (8-0).

Timeline for Completing Project and Issuing Recommendations

Mr. Shipman recommended that the Committee come up with a conclusion for the recommendation date for presentation to the Board of Selectmen. He noted that if the Committee could not have an immediate response from the School Board, that they could continue with their conceptual building plan and present to the Board of Selectmen, which would not include information regarding the proposed building site. The presentation would include possible modifications in the event it would need to be put on a different property.

Mr. Russell acknowledged that the Committee could still submit the conceptual designs and include recommend sites for the BOS to pursue further. He added that the design included a single-story building with modules that could change. He inquired if building costs would change based on a different site based on the building, not on the site.

Mr. Pulver stated that, off the top of his head, the changes in cost would be related to the site and not as much related to the building.

Mr. Russell noted that the Committee could still recommend the Supervisory Union site, but that the full cost would be incomplete and would require a conditional recommendation based off of the completion of the site work.

Mr. Young noted that the end of June may be a little soon and that the general idea is to conclude and present ideas in the middle of summer.

Mr. Shipman stated that he does not want to leave Bread Loaf hanging in the wind and that it may be appropriate to finalize the programmatic buildings to complete the current contract and then move on to site recommendations.

Mr. Pulver noted that, if not completed prior to the end of the contract, site work costs are listed as TBD instead of representing a value for the site work. The site work in the current estimate is based on the Supervisory Union property, but that it would be acceptable to back out the site development costs in the estimate for presentation. He added that if the current costs were left in but the proposed site was changed then the goal would be to have site costs that do not exceed the cost of the current proposal.

Ms. Patten supported moving forward with preparation for what is being presented to the Board of Selectmen and added that at the time of the meeting it can be made clear that the information is based on a particular property with the acknowledgement that if there is a change then adaptations may need to be made.

Mr. Shipman supported Ms. Patten's statement and noted that the Committee would wait to hear more from the School Board before continuing the conversation on how to bring the process to finality.

Discussion of Bread Loaf's Latest Conceptual Designs and Property Site Investigations

Mr. Shipman noted that the discussion would be based on information for any site, not specifically for the Supervisory Union site.

Mr. Pulver noted that he updated the project narratives based on feedback. He noted that to keep the pricing from one scheme to the other consistent, the asphalt shingle is in the estimate as the base. He added that a number of alternates have been identified for Whitney Hall as well as Public Safety Facility.

Ms. Patten inquired about the May 8, 2020 total project budget spreadsheet and why the measurements went from 16,000 square feet to 19,000 square feet.

Mr. Pulver noted that the 16,003 square feet was 1,800 square feet less than what the initial published program was supposed to include. He noted part of the increase is changing with alignment to the current program operations and that about 745 square feet is difference where the design is in addition to the current programs. He noted that the majority of the increase was related to designing to the program that was provided to Bread Loaf.

The Committee moved on to discuss details of the PowerPoint provided by Bread Loaf regarding cost estimates.

Mr. Aylesworth inquired if COVID-19 might have an impact on construction costs. He noted that in the last two months that contractors are coming in with much different numbers on current bidding processes than they did back in February. He wondered if this might not suggest the potential that the overall project budget could be a bit lower than previously contemplated by Bread Loaf's cost estimator.

Mr. Pulver noted that prices in the estimate were based on historic data and may not reflect changes in the construction sector due to COVID-19.

Mr. Pulver noted that he would be reviewing formulas in the spreadsheet and publish an update to the Committee.

Mr. Shipman requested that it would be beneficial to add columns with regard to noting the current state of affairs as well as the proposed program space to represent what is being requested in the drawings.

Mr. Young noted that it may not be a direct comparison because some of the spaces don't currently exist.

Mr. Shipman acknowledged his observation and noted that it would encourage the Committee to explain why we need something that doesn't currently exist.

Members of the Committee supported having the information available, if not directly in the report than in some capacity that could serve for comparison and conversation.

Mr. Shipman and Mr. Pulver discussed details of how to represent the information and where the information on program space could be retrieved from.

The Committee moved on to review specific details of the alternates in the narrative and revisions that Mr. Pulver had made including details regarding storage, bullet proof glass requirements, and roofing options.

Consideration of How the Design of Municipal Facilities Can be Adjusted to Maximize Usability During a Pandemic or Other Emergency Event

Mr. Aylesworth noted he has received suggestions regarding design adjustments with regard to the current pandemic. He noted most of the feedback he has received has to do specifically with the municipal offices, including the inquiry about a drive up or walk up to the outside of the building, as well as changes to the lobby and vestibule area.

Mr. Shipman suggested that members review the narratives and reflect on how they might work in light of the current pandemic to be discussed at the next meeting. He added that notes as to what has been done as well as well as list of alternative suggestions regarding how to immediately remedy current circumstances would also be helpful.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he was looking for further staff consensus with regards to the space needed for the hazardous waste area.

Other Business

Dr. Beaufait recognize contributions of the Committee over the last year and acknowledged that he doesn't always agree with their choices, but respects their perspective. He recommended that the Committee complete the review of the combined Canaan/EMS facility which should include a discussion regarding advantages and disadvantages. He also recommended that, rather than providing a single take it or leave it proposal that the Committee should offer a range of options for voters as well as explanations for recommendations that have been made.

Mr. Shipman noted that the Committee agreed to provide a list of costs and explanations.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that the Committee had made an effort to tour the facility, but they were unable to follow through due to the beginning of COVID-19 restrictions. He added that, regarding Warrant Articles, it was appropriate to present a singular set of recommendations to be put to vote.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 26 @ 7:00 PM

The Zoom Meeting link can be found on the Town of Enfield, NH Website.

Adjournment

Ms. Patten made a motion to adjourn at 8:30 PM. Mr. Aylesworth seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (8-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.