

**TOWN OF ENFIELD  
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 2020**

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

**Excused:** Rob West, Phil Shipman

**Guests:** Emily Curtis, recording secretary; Jim Pulver, VP of Architecture at Bread Loaf; Phil Neily, Inspector; Melissa Hutson, Town Librarian; Roy Holland, Chief of Police (6:45); Jo-Ellen Courtney, Chair of the Energy Committee; Cecelia Aufiero, Gary Hutchins, Marjorie Carr, Dr. David Beaufait, Francine Lozeau

**Location:** Zoom Virtual Meeting

**The Public is encouraged to participate remotely** over Zoom by going to <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88555150229?pwd=NDkwWnFubHVhQ0VmYW8rdFc4TFdCdz09>, 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 **885 5515 0229**. 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**

Mr. Aylesworth called the meeting 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](mailto: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 –June 11, 2020**

Mr. Tarantelli requested to update details on page four to clarify his communications to include: 'Mr. Tarantelli noted that he received questions of building a fitness facility in **a secure section** of a public safety building.'

Ms. Green noted requested a correction to state: 'Ms. Green noted that if the municipal offices were moved to the Hewitt House **it would put the public library** on two floors.'

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 (6-0).

### **2020 Town Meeting**

Mr. Aylesworth requested to discuss the warrant article with regard to the MFAC presentation. He wanted to discuss the idea of tabling the article with other members of the Committee. He noted that, due to their absence, he spoke with Mr. West and Mr. Shipman with regard to tabling the article and they were both in support of it.

Mr. Young agrees, but noted that an explanation be made as to why the Committee decided to table it at this time.

Mr. Tarantelli, Mr. Russell, and Ms. Green noted their agreement with Mr. Young.

### **Review of LCHIP Stewardship Agreement Restrictions**

Mr. Aylesworth requested Mr. Pulver speak to the Committee with his thoughts and recommendations regarding the LCHIP Stewardship Agreement Restrictions.

Mr. Pulver noted he sent out a highlighted copy of the agreement with areas that should be considered, and that overall, he had two primary concerns. He stated that there was a potential loss of the right to do future development on the property – whether that be additional utility work or additions. He noted that it may be possible that the language could be negotiated. He also noted that a previous project in New Haven, VT, where a historic grange hall burned down several days before the construction was due to occur. He noted that the project insurance was based on the replacement value of the historic property, which did not include the full replacement value of the project. In the settlement there was a stipulation that if the building was not rebuilt historically, then the town would not get the full settlement. He noted that the LCHIP agreement noted that it must be insured for the full replacement value and that the town should have a discussion with their insurer to further research and understand those possibilities.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he spoke with a member of the grant administration with regard to some of the concerns. He noted that the Town has until the end of the week to submit an application and will not find out if they will receive funds until the fall. He added that once it is awarded it is not required that the Town accept it, and will allow for time to review further information regarding any restrictions or agreements to ensure their suitability.

Committee members agreed with Mr. Aylesworth's approach to proceed with the application and to review the information between now and the fall to be prepared to accept, or possibly reject, any funds that would be awarded.

### **Discussion of Bread Loaf's Latest Conceptual Designs, Project Budget, Design/Construction Timeline, and Narratives**

#### ***PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY***

Mr. Pulver began with reviewing the floor plans for the Public Safety Facility. He noted changes made to:

- Adjusted the width of the armory to 8 feet
- Adjustments to the armory caused change to adjacent spaces – booking/receiving, as well as the sally port,
- The height of the windows in the Police Chief and Supervisor offices were changed due to a change in window height, that eliminated the necessity for bullet resistant glass on those windows.
- The interior reception window is a level 7 bullet resistant glass, with an alternate for the bullet resistant glass be dropped to level 3.
- Changes to the interview room revised per discussion with Chief Holland, including changing a window to the Investigators space into a door.
- There is level 7 bullet resistant glass in the reception area
- In the electric maintenance storage room, as well as EMS secured storage areas to reduce them down to the original proposed program area.

He noted that the fitness facility is in a secured building, but it is not in the Police Department and access to the fitness center could be allowed through the reception area.

Mr. Aylesworth confirmed with Mr. Pulver that the size of the EMS bay had not changed. He noted that Mr. Neily had specific concern for accommodating the future size of ambulances in the bays and it was not recommended to change the size of the bay from previous drawings.

Mr. Pulver noted his agreement with Mr. Neily's assessment and confirmed it was not changed.

*WHITNEY HALL*

Mr. Pulver discussed having snow guards on the roof, with an awning over the transaction window. He noted that the transaction window included level 3 bullet resistant glass with a transfer drawer as well as an intercom. He noted that glass was added to the transaction counters as well.

Mr. Pulver noted that he worked with Mr. Wyncoop to develop an alternate for the lowering of the floor, which would include lowering all areas but the library area, the building and maintenance space, as well as a split level in the vault space. He noted that foam blocks and a concrete slab could be used to raise the historian's side of the vault, which could be removed if it was ever found to only need the vault for the Town Clerk, and would be one level within.

Mr. Aylesworth requested that an additional transaction window be quoted in the event it was found to be necessary for a second window for the Tax Collector.

Mr. Pulver noted that it would cost about \$39,000 for an additional transaction window, which included the additional canopy and snow guards, etc.

Mr. Russell suggested the possibility to shift the location of the vault, the property file storage area, and the customer service areas.

Mr. Southard inquired about if the walkway on the Southside of the building would conflict with the current location of the backup generator.

Mr. Pulver confirmed that the backup generator would need to be relocated, with a new concrete pad.

Ms. Green noted she liked the idea of having multiple services at one window.

Mr. Pulver noted Mr. Russell's suggestion to change the location of the customer service area would change the layout so that the customer service area was near an exterior wall and enable it to have its own window.

Mr. Young noted that he'd like to see the money for one window and put it into further developing the software for functions such as electronic payments including taxes, registration renewals, etc. He noted the money for the window would go a long way with developing further

Mr. Aylesworth noted that the municipal offices had discussed the possibility of a kiosk that might be able to offer those services in the Town Hall.

The Committee moved on to discuss the second floor of Whitney Hall.

Mr. Young asked Ms. Hutson if the book processing and tech services area should have glass to look out of the room.

Ms. Hutson noted that due to a low number of staff members it would be ideal for the staff members to have a way to see out of that area. She noted that having glass facing the Adult Fiction area as well as the information desk would be ideal.

Ms. Green noted that the Library staff as well as Library Trustees would like there to be wood floors instead of carpet.

Ms. Patten noted that carpeting would help with sound issues, which are concerns that have been raised previously.

Ms. Hutson noted that she was open to options that were not carpet, but noted that there was concern for keeping it clean and well maintained, particularly in the children's area.

Mr. Pulver noted that the narrative proposes carpet tiles, which are ideal for maintenance and dealing with sound concerns. He noted there are a wide variety of carpet tiles available. He noted the sound concerns were also for the floor below, as well as for the second floor itself. He added that the Adult/fiction area could have one type of floor, with the teen/children's areas with another type of floor.

It was noted that, once the existing floor condition is known, it can be later assessed what type of floor would work for each space, including the option to refinish what might already be present.

Ms. Hutson noted that Lebanon did something similar when they renovated their space and found wood floors that could be refinished. She noted that they refinished the adult areas and then used carpet tile in the children's area. She offered to find out what type of carpet tiles they used and pass the information on to Mr. Pulver.

The Committee moved on to discuss the third floor of Whitney Hall.

Mr. Pulver began by discussing the entrances to the hearing room, including changing where the doors were located to allow for a full 180 degree opening. He noted there were concerns for the current condition of doors that wish to be utilized in the current plans.

Mr. Young discussed possible changes to the doorways into the two conference rooms located on the third floor, which would accommodate a more direct entrance and exit from the hearing room.

The Committee discussed details of the layout and the flow of traffic through the front conference room and how it might conflict with the hearing room, including doorways.

Ms. Aufiero stated that there was concern for not keeping the stage and not taking more consideration for the history of the town. She questioned when the changes were made.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that a variety of options had been explored dating back months, but that the Committee and Bread Loaf concluded that there was no practical way to integrate the stage into the plans while enabling the space to more efficiently be utilized for a wide range of public purposes. He added that efforts were being made for historical preservation of the curtain and the front of the stage to be integrated into the design out of recognition for their historical significance. He noted that her point of view was respected and understood.

Ms. Aufiero conveyed her strong opinion that the Committee has the wrong priorities in this respect.

Dr. Beaufait noted that the Committee had extensive discussion regarding the stage and other features of the third-floor.

Mr. Russell stated that the stage was not currently being used, other than for storage, and has not been used for anything other than storage in over 20 years. He noted that the stage could not be used as it, and using the space the stage currently occupies expands the functionality. He added that the hearing room remains the same, with full possibility for Shaker Bridge Theatre. He noted that the front of the stage and

the curtain would be utilized and maintained within the existing plans to honor the history, while also developing the functionality of the space.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that Ms. Aufiero's sentiments are understood and respected, and have been voiced in previous meetings by other members of the community; however, there is also an effort to maximize the functionality and utility of the space.

Mr. Young inquired about the details of how the curtain was incorporated to the room.

It was noted that the curtain will be functional and can be drawn open so the wall behind it can be used as a projection wall.

Mr. Pulver moved on to discuss exterior elevation and parts of the narrative relative to the walk-up window on Whitney Hall.

The Committee then moved on to discuss the Public Safety Facility narrative.

Mr. Pulver noted changes made from Level 7 bullet-proof glass down to Level 3 in the reception area.

Mr. Young requested Chief Holland to speak to the difference between level 7 and level 3 glass.

Chief Holland noted that level 3 was the minimum to protect against handguns, and level 7 was the highest level which protected against larger rifle rounds.

Mr. Pulver then went on to review details of the total project budget and identified variables that would need to be addressed to get the final total, including the site development costs beyond the property boundaries, such as the driveway.

Mr. Aylesworth indicated that he would like the DPW to take a look at the scope of work as some work for development of the infrastructure and utilities could potentially be completed by municipal employees.

Mr. Aylesworth asked Mr. Pulver about the possible impact of COVID-19 on market pricing for construction costs.

Mr. Pulver noted that Mr. Wyncoop has a specific formula from historic data that he uses to project costs and he is not changing that formula based on COVID-19.

Mr. Young inquired if it was possible to identify some of the savings in energy when utilizing some of the alternates, such as the low temp heat pump system as opposed to the standard system that has been built in.

Mr. Pulver noted that he did not believe that there was an energy savings, but more so an efficiency of the system.

Ms. Courtney inquired about the current narrative and budget regarding the heat pump system.

Mr. Pulver noted that the base heat pump can provide head down to -13 degrees, and the alternate would provide heat up to -21 degrees, as they are air source heat pumps.

Mr. Hutchins inquired about the overall goals and vision for energy efficiency.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that the Committee has been trying to be pragmatic in their approach to balance the project budget. He acknowledged that some upfront costs for energy efficiency were cost prohibitive and noted that the Committee has kept energy efficiency in mind, including by means of reducing or minimizing operating costs while also achieving environmental responsibility goals.

Mr. Russell inquired if Bread Loaf was using a thermal model to drive the design and if there was any information available for the Committee to review.

Mr. Pulver noted that the energy modeling and evaluation was not a part of the project scope at this time.

Mr. Russell noted that that met his expectations, but he had seen the tool utilized in other construction projects and felt it was worth inquiring. He noted he believed there was room to still make those changes prior to the final phase of the project.

Mr. Pulver acknowledged that it was beyond the current point in the project, and the time to evaluate pros and cons of different systems comes later in the process. He noted upfront cost and operation costs would be discussed at that point, which is not typically done in this stage of the process. He noted that the overall construction costs for the Hartford Town Offices came in a \$197 per square foot at net zero, and Whitney Hall is coming in around \$216 per square foot. He noted that the Town of Hartford laid out their energy goals from the beginning, but other projects, such as the Town of Middlebury, had a different process where they started with the design and then integrated energy efficiency later in the project.

Mr. Hutchins noted that he had mentioned the Town of Warner built with ICF and inquired if the Committee had reached out for more information from them as of yet.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that no one had yet reached out but that it would be helpful to do so.

Mr. Pulver discussed the heat system currently slated for the bays in the Public Safety Facility, noting that the sally port and the apparatus bays were proposed to have LP gas fired heaters that would be mounted to the ceiling.

Mr. Hutchins and the Committee discussed details of air stratification versus radiant heat options and what the Committee had observed on site visits to other buildings in the area.

Mr. Aylesworth requested Mr. Neily to discuss his perspective on radiant heat.

Mr. Neily noted he was very supportive of radiant heat without question. He noted that a cost comparison should be done, but the advantage is that it can be a more efficient use of the heat sink in the space, especially with losing heat when the bay doors open and reheating that space once the doors close.

Mr. Tarantelli noted that he supported Mr. Hutchins idea of building as efficiently as possible, but did not believe that fossil free would be possible due to specific NFPA restrictions on lithium storage.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that out of respect to the Committee members who were not present, a vote would not be held for the Committee to make any type of commitment to the energy use or savings in the facilities.

Mr. Young noted that he believed that radiant flooring was discussed when visiting Sunapee and the Committee discussed it, but that detail may have fallen by the side as the Committee moved forward.

Mr. Pulver noted he sent out a set of comparable projects and noted that cost adjustments were made to represent what the cost would be in 2020. He noted he would go back through to see if any of those projects had radiant heat in the apparatus bays.

Mr. Hutchins encouraged the Committee to think about other options for office spaces that don't involve hard walls, as well as to consider if the bays can accommodate all of the police equipment.

Mr. Southard noted that Hanover is building an external garage to keep all of their vehicles housed, particularly during the winter.

Ms. Green noted that as far as offices, the Corona Virus has pointed out that we are better off having offices rather than open space under many circumstances.

Mr. Pulver noted a cost escalation index that Mr. Wyncoop started updating with regard to historic costs. It was noted that a \$1 million project from 1987 would be the equivalent of \$2.73 million in 2020 dollars. It was noted that the estimated cost total in 2021 would be \$2.83 million.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Pulver noted he did investigation on the ICF forms and they appeared to be available from an R value of 22 up to an R value of 60. He noted that the current code is based on R21 to R23 to be the basis of design. He added that the code minimum could be a starting point, and then run up the R value on the exterior wall, noting that savings and utility costs are improved for the higher R values. He noted that there are a lot of different systems to be able to make buildings air tight. He added he did not have the numbers available, but the cost is higher as the gross square footage would go up based off of the thickness of the walls, and a fire rated covering would need to be put on the walls.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he had discussed ICF with Mr. Neily and it was noted he received favorable reviews and that it was worth getting pricing.

Mr. Pulver did not present any projects that were completed with ICF.

Ms. Patten stated that, as a Committee, they need to be financially responsible to the community members and to her understanding this just adds a lot of expense.

Mr. Hutchins noted that there were advantages such as being more structurally sound, energy savings, and being bullet proof. He indicated that the trade-offs made it worth-while and that Warner should be contacted for more information as to why they used it.

Mr. Aylesworth inquired if Mr. Pulver would be willing to discuss ICF with their architectural project lead and noted he would reach out to Warner for more information.

The Committee discussed the possibility of getting hard copies of Bread Loaf documents, in full size, available in Town Hall for Committee members to review.

**Next Meeting:** Monday, July 13 @ 6:30 PM

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Tarantelli made a motion to adjourn at 8:48 PM. Ms. Patten seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 pm.