

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 10, 2020**

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

Excused: Erik Russell, Mark Tarantelli

Administrative Staff:

Guests: Emily Curtis, recording secretary; Jim Pulver, VP of Architecture at Bread Loaf; Jo-Ellen Courtney, Chair of the Energy Committee; Dominic Albanese, Chair, Library Trustee; Jeff Durell, Pathways; Marjorie Carr, Cecelia Aufiero, Dr. David Beaufait, Gary Hutchins

Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

The Public is encouraged to participate remotely over Zoom by going to <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86837361414?pwd=a3lRZWWhYMS80cVF6RTJUT2JKVXpDZz09>, 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 868 3736 1414. 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 6:41 pm.

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 or text 603-309-6379.

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 –July 27, 2020

Mr. Shipman noted on Page 3, 4th paragraph down should be corrected to state: **Library Trustees** (not Library of Trustees).

Mr. Shipman noted that Page 4, the first sentence should be corrected to state: The subcommittee discussed **making** the recommendation.

Ms. Patten noted that on page 4, 7th paragraph down should be corrected to state: ‘...joint building when the Library Trustees may not have reached out to donors who had contributed to the stand-alone concept which is **not** being proposed by the Committee.’

Mr. Pulver noted that the two references to Mr. Wyncoop, on page 3 and page 4 should be corrected to reference **Mr. Bellucci**.

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).

Discussion of Preliminary Findings from Geotechnical Investigations (Public Safety Facility)

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he distributed the preliminary report from M&W regarding the soils engineering to members of the Committee. He said it appeared that the findings were generally quite favorable for the project as currently envisioned. He noted that Mr. Durell was present on behalf of Pathways and asked him to discuss highlights and updated costs for site work to the Committee.

Mr. Durell reviewed the preliminary report with the Committee noting that the soils study found silty sand soil, which is decent for construction and foundation placement on the site. He noted that ground water was found at shallow depths which would require some under draining of the building as well as consideration when preparing the alteration of terrain permitting. He stated that no ledge was found and that overall, the site investigation fared well.

Mr. Durell stated that he had prepared a preliminary estimate but that he would need to discuss and finalize it with Bread Loaf. He noted that the overall estimate is around \$1.09 million for the site work.

Mr. Shipman requested questions and comments from Committee members regarding the report and the estimate.

Mr. Durell confirmed that test pits, and not borings, were completed in the investigation. He noted that the pits were nine feet deep and the goal was to have a balanced site, where material would not have to be removed and could potentially be reused for the site work.

Mr. West inquired if the estimate includes creating access from the current Class VI road (Lindopp Lane) as well as from the School Administration Unit (SAU) entrance at 547 Route 4.

Mr. Durell confirmed he included both access points in the estimate.

Mr. West asked Mr. Pulver if the current conceptual design and site plan was dependent on having dual access, or if it may be possible to have access only through the current SAU access point.

Mr. Pulver noted that the access to the Sally Port was strictly through Lindop Lane to keep the traffic separate from fire and EMS. He noted that there was potential to cut into the hillside further to gain access to the back of the building, but that the expressed desire was to keep the access points intentionally separate.

Mr. Shipman inquired how much money would be saved if the development of Lindop Lane were to be removed.

Mr. Durell noted that it would cost \$25,000 less if reconstructing Lindopp Lane as a gravel road was not included. Mr. Durrell also clarified that it would cost an additional \$25,000 to pave Lindopp Lane.

Mr. Durell, Mr. Pulver, and Committee members discussed the development of Lindop Lane, including details of the estimate which involved developing it as a gravel roadway. It was noted that the site work to get from Lindop Lane to the Sally Port would need to be addressed in an additional surface to surface review.

Mr. Shipman noted that more information should be gathered to finalize the recommendation on behalf of the Committee, but it would seem advantageous to allow for two means of ingress and egress at that estimated cost.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that he discussed the timeline for the presentation with the BOS, and based off of their scheduling needs they proposed a date of September 14th. He noted that the BOS requested the presentation be no more than an hour, with an additional 30 minutes for questions at the end.

Mr. Shipman requested Mr. Durell and Mr. Pulver connect and finalize the information being requested by the Committee.

Mr. Durell noted that he would develop the information regarding Lindop Lane as an individual line item in the estimate.

Discussion of Updated Total Project Cost Estimates

Mr. Aylesworth noted that there were some overlapping costs that were being reconciled between the information Pathways provided, what Bread Loaf provided, and what the DPW has proposed.

Mr. Pulver noted that he updated the total project budget to include: the land cost for the Public Safety Facility site, estimates for the development of roads and infrastructure to the facility, paving costs for

upgrading roadways, changes with regard to the size of sewer and water lines, estimates for single phase overhead service from Route 4, and a fiber internet access point.

Mr. Shipman inquired if there was a cost estimate associated with the proposed gravel road to make it suitable for paving.

Mr. Durell noted that the gravel roadway, as it is currently proposed, would be suitable for paving in the future.

Mr. Pulver continued to review the proposed estimate with updates and any items that would remain To Be Determined (TBD).

Mr. Aylesworth noted that Mr. Taylor assisted in preparing the figure for permitting based off of an assumption that the majority of the work could be completed in house by municipal staff. He said that if an engineering firm was retained to lead preparation of permit filings the estimated \$1,000 permitting cost associated with the Whitney Hall project would need to be increased to something closer to \$5,000 or \$7,000. At this time it appears staff would have the capacity to complete the work. He added that Ms. Bonnette is working with the telephone company as well as the IT company to assist in developing those aspects of the estimate. He noted that furniture and fixtures estimates were based on furnishing a commercial building on a per foot basis, and may change slightly in the coming weeks as well.

Ms. Patten inquired about cost currently estimated for acquiring the land for the public safety facility.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that the approximation came from taking the total assessed value of the whole parcel, removing the building value, and breaking down the approximately 8-acre parcel to the land anticipated to be requested. It is essentially a prorated value based on an assumed roughly 3-acre subdivision.

Ms. Patten noted that in some area of the presentation, it should be clarified how much land is being proposed for the site.

Mr. Shipman agreed with Ms. Patten's suggestion and added that the cost as presented in the estimate was a guestimate and did not involve any discussions or agreements on the with the SAU.

Mr. Pulver and Mr. Durell discussed the size of the area as outlined in the soils investigation and believed it was around 3 to 3.5 acres.

Mr. Aylesworth asked Mr. Pulver to speak to whether 3-phase power was included the proposal for Whitney Hall.

Mr. Pulver noted that to upgrade to 3-phase power would require an additional \$125,000, and it was currently listed as having 1-phase power, as well as an elevator that comes with a 3-phase to single-phase converter.

Members of the Committee discussed whether 3-phase power should remain as an alternate option for Whitney Hall. They also discussed whether 3-phase power is necessary for the Public Safety Facility. It was discussed that the proposal would not include 3-phase power to Whitney Hall as the only impact it would have would be on the elevator.

Mr. Pulver noted to the Committee that he added an alternate \$48,000 premium for ICF, instead of wood framing and insulation for the Public Safety Complex.

Mr. Young agreed that it would be appropriate to include, and suggested it may be something that should be incorporated into the budget and not as an alternate.

Mr. West made a motion to make the ICF the base option. Mr. Southard seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (5-1).

Mr. Young requested additional clarification to understand Ms. Patten's stance.

Ms. Patten did not feel that there was enough information regarding pros and cons to fully understand ICF and if it was the appropriate choice.

Mr. West requested to amend his motion to state:

Mr. West made a motion to make ICF system the default budgeted number with an alternate "deduct" option for wood framing. Mr. Southard seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (5-1).

Mr. West noted that he was suggesting that the ICF be the base design presented on the estimate and for the wood frame to remain as the alternate – therefore swapping the two placements in the current proposal.

It was noted that the suggestion to change the ICF to the base option was not a final decision, but would send the signal the Committee preferred this option.

Mr. Young inquired as to if the siding remains the same in the estimate when placing the ICF as the base frame.

Mr. Pulver confirmed it would remain the same.

Mr. Shipman requested to fill in what the alternate siding options would be for the Public Safety Building.

Mr. Pulver noted that the alternate sidings were listed in the narrative and would be updated in the estimate.

The Committee and members of the public discussed radiant heat and heat sources with regard to the bays of the Public Safety Building.

Mr. West noted that perhaps the DPW could come up with data to indicate how much it takes to heat their garage space with propane to consider when discussing heating the bay spaces.

Mr. Shipman requested that Mr. Pulver add alternates for radiant heat in the bays, with Modine heaters, as well as stucco for the exterior of the building.

Mr. Pulver noted that most places that utilize radiant heat in the bays use some type of back up heat to allow for quick recovery of heat when the bay doors are opened.

Discussion of Committee Report and Presentation to Board of Selectmen

Mr. Shipman noted that the presentation would need to be shortened based on the timeframe proposed by the BOS.

Ms. Patten inquired if feedback was still being requested from the Committee regarding the slideshow presentation.

Mr. Shipman noted that feedback was still welcome and requested the communications as soon as possible to be able to integrate into the presentation. He requested if any members of the Committee had a conflict with the September 14th meeting date as requested by the BOS.

Mr. Aylesworth reviewed the new slides with members of the public and the Committee.

Mr. Shipman recommended the Committee move the meeting from August 24th to August 31st. It was noted that the slide presentation would be the main focus, with some updated project budget information, as well as any updates from Pathways.

Mr. Young requested an update from the Library Trustees at the next meeting.

Ms. Green and Mr. Albanese agreed to update the Committee with regard to the upcoming Library Trustees meeting.

All Committee members were in agreement to move the meeting to the 31st.

Other Business

Mr. Shipman requested if any members of the Committee had other business to discuss.

No other business was presented.

Next Meeting: Monday, August 31 @ 6:30 PM

Adjournment

Ms. Patten made a motion to adjourn at 8:14 PM. Mr. West seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).