

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 28, 2020

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

Excused: Rob West

Guests: Emily Curtis, recording secretary; Jim Pulver, VP of Architecture at Bread Loaf; Melissa Hutson, Town Librarian; Roy Holland, Chief of Police; Phil Neily, Inspector; Dominic Albanese, Chair Library Trustees; Francine Lozeau, Library Trustees; Kate Plumley Stewart, Board of Selectmen Chair; Marjorie Carr, Gary Hutchins, Dr. David Beaufait, Dan Kiley

Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

The Public is encouraged to participate remotely over Zoom by going to <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89680857770?pwd=S1VLcGZCdnRZVFVRZ3l3bjFVbkV1Zz09>, 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 **896 8085 7770**. 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 6:31pm.

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 –May 11, 2020

Ms. Patten requested to add to the last page, 5th paragraph down beginning ‘Ms. Patten inquired...’ Ms. Patten noted the Strategic Governance plan is for 15,008 square feet, which she realizes does include the hallways, etc.

Mr. Aylesworth made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Young seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

**Debrief on School Board Meeting (May 26, 2020) and Discussion of “Next Steps”
Regarding Pathways Consulting Site Investigations**

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he, alongside Mr. Russell, Ms. Green, Ms. Patten, Mr. Young, Mr. Shipman, attended the School Board meeting on May 26th to provide context as to the work the Committee has completed in the last 13 months, as well as to enter a conversation into the site investigations the Committee wished to be performed on the property.

He noted that many questions or comments were geared toward how they believed the site would work as a public safety facility.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that after ample discussion regarding the ideas the Committee had developed over the past many months, the School Board did not ultimately make a decision to authorize the Committee to move forward and noted they would not be making a decision until the next School Board meeting to give the Committee an answer.

The Committee discussed how to move forward in the event that the School Board declines the Committee to perform the desired site work.

Ms. Patten commented that not knowing where the building might go impacts site work costs and other things and that there are going to be a lot of costs that will be unknown.

Mr. Aylesworth asked Mr. Pulver what his approach would be without having relative certainty regarding a desired site and the site work associated with making the site work for the building.

Mr. Pulver noted that allowances could be put in place in the estimate instead of leaving it as 'to be determined'. He added that other items such as utilities would also potentially be impacted.

Mr. Russell stated that, as part of the recommendation to the BOS, an outline of questions and determinations should be included to assist in finding a permanent site before the project is proposed to the voters.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that he would be writing the School Board a letter to thank them for their time and the opportunity to meet with them, noting that the Committee looked forward to receiving a decision at the next School Board meeting.

Discussion of Bread Loaf's Latest Conceptual Designs and Project Budget

WHITNEY HALL

Mr. Pulver began the meeting by requesting feedback from the Committee regarding the scope of the historic restoration and whether or not there is a desire to look at additional work on the Main Street façade of the building.

Mr. Shipman inquired if there was a cost analysis for the Committee to take into consideration.

Mr. Pulver stated that it was not currently estimated or put in the budget.

Mr. Shipman noted that costs would likely be a deciding factor and it should be looked at for further consideration.

Mr. Aylesworth informed the Committee that he submitted an intent to apply for an LCHIP grant. He noted that if the request for funding was \$400,000 or more, then the Town would have needed to enter into a permanent easement that would have restricted any alterations to the building in perpetuity. He noted that the intent to apply was submitted for \$390,000, which would involve the Town entering into a 20-year stewardship agreement. This would effectively limit the extent and nature of substantive building alternations for a 20-year period.

Ms. Carr inquired if Mr. Pulver would be returning to the 1976 design for the front façade of the building.

Mr. Pulver confirmed that the roof, entrance stair, walkway was intended to be like the 1976 design.

Ms. Carr noted that careful consideration should be taken with regard to keeping the walkways and stairways covered. She added that there would also need to be something done with the doorway that used to lead to the previous BOS office.

Mr. Pulver discussed details of the current project outline for restorations, which included the cupola. He added that he would speak with Mr. Wyncoop to discuss how to approach updates to the modifications that were completed in 1976.

Mr. Aylesworth and Mr. Albanese discussed details and possible concerns for the 20-year easement associated with the LCHIP Grant.

Ms. Green stated that, with regard to the front entryway updates, the new elevator is going to make the library much more accessible, and it will make it closer to the parking area. She noted it would probably be difficult to put a ramp on the front of the building.

Mr. Tarantelli agreed with Ms. Green, stating that it would be nice to be walkable, but that a majority of people drive.

Mr. Aylesworth spoke to specific LCHIP standards and guidelines that would be applicable if the grant funds were used. Mr. Aylesworth noted that the formal application needs to be entered by June 26th.

Mr. Shipman asked Mr. Pulver if that offered enough time to give the figures to the Committee by the next meeting for further consideration.

Mr. Pulver noted that Mr. Wyncoop is working on having it available to the Committee.

Mr. Young expressed that he would like to see the LCHIP grant applied to things already in the designed budget, such as parts of the building that are historically accurate and need to be preserved or enhanced, prior to using grant money for a front façade rehabilitation.

Mr. Shipman inquired if Mr. Pulver should look into the cost of the front façade, or go with what is currently outlined in the estimates.

Mr. Tarantelli, Ms. Patten, and Mr. Russell all expressed agreement with Mr. Young's statement.

Mr. Russell noted that he would like to see the front entrance expanded, noting that developing a walkable community was important to him.

Mr. Young added that it may not be in the best interest to put restrictions on the front entrance of the building by using LCHIP funding there.

Ms. Green noted that it would be important to have more information regarding cost estimates prior to making any decisions.

After discussing the historical restorations and details of the LCHIP grant, the Committee moved on to discuss other details of Whitney Hall.

Mr. Pulver stated that it is possible to have an elevator without an elevator machine room in the State of New Hampshire; however, it is considerably more expensive. He suggested to leave the plan as it is currently drawn with the elevator machine room. He noted that elevators are all manufactured with three phase motors, and if three phase power is not available to the building a power converter is a part of the elevator package. He added that the elevator speed is based on the amperage that can be provided to the motor. He suggested to leave the upgrade to three phase power as an alternate, and to leave the elevator machine room where it is in the current plans.

Mr. Pulver inquired if the Committee had discussed how to adapt to the possibility of future pandemics. He stated that a drive-up window was a possibility, with bullet resistant glass and payment drawer, and inquired if the Committee felt it to be necessary to incorporate. He presented different sketches for potential locations of a drive-up window, including traffic patterns.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he had discussed the possibility of a drive-up window with municipal staff members. He noted that they would be interested in drive up options and improvements at the front entrance that limit human contact but that would also promote efficiency and convenience for customers. He acknowledged that municipal offices are inherently 'people places' and it is not clear what long-term effects COVID-19 will have on municipal operations. There has clearly been a significant impact in the short-term, and staff have made major adjustments to the way they are completing work, but it is important to emphasize that this is not an optimal situation and staff are struggling mightily to sustain high levels of service under the present conditions.

Mr. Pulver and the Committee discussed elements of the proposed layout in terms of COVID-19 guidelines.

The Committee reviewed and discussed Mr. Pulver's mock up drawings for possible drive-up windows and logistics.

Mr. Shipman noted he would prefer a walk-up window where people would park and then walk up to the building and have it covered in a way to protect people from rain/snow.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that having a walk-up window as opposed to drive up/drive through could be taken into consideration, but it may be challenging to ensure it adheres to ADA compliance. Individuals approaching the window from a wheelchair would need to be able to receive service, so the window height would need to be designed accordingly. It was noted that any type of accessible service window would mainly be utilized by the Town Clerk.

After discussing the drive-up/walk-up window options for municipal operations, members of the Committee and public moved on to discuss how library operations would be adapted, both in current Whitney Hall, as well as the proposed drawings.

Ms. Hutson noted that the library is currently trying to navigate how to reopen under the current guidelines. She noted that the space inside does not allow a safe distance apart and that the current set up makes it hard to have plexiglass shields up at the circulation desks. She noted that in the new drawings there was room for people to come in and have safe distance to access the circulation desk and other areas of the library.

Mr. Shipman requested if there were further questions regarding Whitney Hall before moving on to the Public Safety Facility.

Mr. Young inquired about why Mr. Pulver eliminated the work to hammer the floor out to create a higher ceiling in the first floor. He added that in initial discussions it was recommended to lower the floor to have additional room in the ceiling for necessary additions, such as HVAC ductwork.

Mr. Pulver noted it was taken out to reserve funds for creating the higher ceiling in the library. He noted that if drop ceilings were in the first floor, ductwork could be put under it and then funds could be utilized in other ways to enhance the building.

Mr. Young inquired about the third floor on front stairwell and concern for the size and clearance of doorways.

Mr. Aylesworth requested more information about cutting out the lowering of the first floor and the costs involved with the changes proposed.

Mr. Pulver offered to include alternate options for the library ceiling and the lower floor in the quote.

Mr. Kiley noted that a drive-up window may not be welcoming to residents.

Mr. Aylesworth acknowledged that staff had also shared his concern when discussing the possibility of a drive-up window and the desire to ensure public accessibility to the building.

PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY

Mr. Pulver presented options to the Committee regarding cutting down the square footage of the proposed drawings for the Public Safety Facility. He added that a part of the needs for square footage will also need to be addressed by having a decision made regarding how many lockers the facility needs and how big they should be, as well as addressing the proper number of changing rooms and toilet facilities that need to be accommodated in the space.

Mr. Pulver offered to forward information regarding gender neutral bathrooms similar to the family changing room that were built at the Upper Valley Aquatic Center.

The Committee also had questions and concerns regarding the proposed space for the hazardous materials. It was noted that a definitive square footage had not been given when Mr. Pulver had interviewed with the Fire Department and it would need to be finalized to move forward.

Mr. Hutchins inquired if cutting space was advantageous at this point in time. He also encouraged the Committee to explore net zero possibilities for the facility and urged them to consider having outlets that could support the charging of electric vehicles.

Review of Draft Project Narratives and Presentation to Board of Selectmen

Due to time limitations, draft review was deferred to the next meeting.

Other Business

Mr. Shipman noted that he received an e-mail from Dwight Marchetti regarding the communications Mr. Marchetti had by email with the Board of Selectmen and by phone with the Chair of the School Board. Mr. Marchetti requested that Mr. Shipman read his memo into the record. Mr. Shipman noted that due to the nature of the letter it was not appropriate information for him to pass on as it pertained to conversations that Mr. Marchetti held with other parties.

Mr. Shipman noted that MFAC meetings are open to the public and that Mr. Marchetti was welcome to attend a meeting to express himself if he desired.

Next Meeting: Thursday, June 11 @ 6:30 PM

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

Adjournment

Ms. Patten made a motion to adjourn at 8:50 PM. Mr. Tarantelli seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm.