# TOWN OF ENFIELD MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### **MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 24, 2019**

**Present:** Ryan Aylesworth (Town Manager), Phil Shipman, Tracy Young, Rob West,

Mark Tarantelli, Erik Russell, Shirley Green, Jean Patten, Maynard Southard

Guests: Jim Taylor (Director of Public Works), Phil Neily (Building Inspector),

Dr. David Beaufait (public)

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM.

The meeting began with the approval of the June 10, 2019 minutes.

Mrs. Patten questioned the reference from the Union Street Fire Station stating: "It was noted the furnace died in 2018". The Committee unanimously agreed that the phrasing was unclear and irrelevant and should be striked from the minutes.

Mrs. Patten questioned the notation on page 5: "Mrs. Patten and other committee members inquired about the Firefighters Association Fund – specifically where the money comes from and how it is utilized." Committee members agreed that the discussion regarding the Fire Department Governance and the Fire Department Association could be revised to better clarify the context. Mr. Aylesworth suggested that the minutes be revised to read that "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." Mrs. Patten signaled concurrence with this revision as stated.

Dr. Beaufait inquired about the discussion with Chief Cummings and if renovations would be adequate to update the Union Street location. It was clarified that Chief Cummings was in favor of combining all three public safety services into one facility, and that expanding and renovating the Union Street property to provide for an adequate fire facility was not seemingly feasible. The Committee agreed there was a difference of opinion when it comes to optimal site to locate a public safety complex, but all three public safety chiefs expressed strong support for a combined facility.

Motion to approve minutes with noted changes was made by Mrs. Green. Motion seconded by Mr. Tarantelli. Approved unanimously.

The Committee began the meeting by touring the Department of Public Works grounds and facilities. During the tour Committee members were encouraged to inquire about the use and structure of the building, as well as possible other municipal functions that could be delivered from this property.

## **General Property**

Mrs. Patten inquired about the size of the property. It was stated that the entire property has twenty-four 'usable' acres, and seven acres which are dedicated to conservation. The property abuts residential properties on Kluge Road. The property has areas that are difficult to access due to steep drop offs or difficult to utilize due to the terrain, such as swamp areas.

## Back Lot – mainly used for storage of materials

- Stone
- Brush/leaf recycling
- Pipe storage
- Screening tower
- Reclaim piles -this is crushed and then reused
- Metal discard pile, which is disposed of occasionally
- Organized 'bins' of materials such as spec rock, etc.
- Tools excess of which has been sold off

## Main Area surrounding building structure:

- Two large containers with chloride
- A six-bay shed two salt bays, two salt/sand mix bays, two sand bays; holds 1,800 tons of salt at maximum capacity
- Snow plow storage
- A 16 by 50-foot temporary bridge

## The main Department of Public Works building:

- Built in 2002
- No overhang off the back of the building (the standard is two feet of overhang)
  - Ice falls off the roof and hits the lighting fixtures as well as the siding on the back of the building. A majority of the lights were visibly damaged and have not been repaired as it is a reoccurring problem
- There is a drop off near the back of the building. No foundation drains were installed at the time it was built.
- Also located outside
  - o A standby generator
  - o Tanks for waste oil
  - o A pile of tires all illegally discarded on roads and picked up by the crew
- It was specifically noted there is damage to the southeast corner of the building external damage to cinder blocks from water and weather exposure.
- Existing office space is adequately meeting personnel needs, although it was noted that the Planning/Zoning and Building Inspection functions would likely be more effectively performed from Town Hall (if there were more space than is currently available in Whitney Hall)

## **Public Works Bays:**

- Far south end of building is a wash bay
  - o Used for storage in the winter months
  - o Siding damaged on exterior of wash bay
- Area is used by groundskeeping as well as water and sewer
- Some mold was found in the internal southwest corner relative to location of damaged cinder blocks
- It was noted there is minimal storage for other departments which include items for Old Home Days, bulbs for other buildings, an ATV for the cemetery, and minor odds and ends.
- Committee members commented positively on how well organized and maintained the equipment appeared to be

## **Internal, Mezzanine:**

- Currently used as storage for Planning and Zoning, Public Works, and project files dating back to 1972
  - The Committee inquired if any of these documents had necessity to be stored in a fire proof location it was confirmed they did not
- Parts inventory
- Sand bags
- Signs
- The fiber optic network for the town
  - o Mr. West noted that heat regulation was of concern for the technology components; overheating could cause system failure
- The mezzanine does not have a fire suppression system, but the building does have a fire alarm
- There were holes drilled through the back wall of the building, roughly three inches in diameter. It was unclear if they had a specific purpose.
- Mr. Taylor noted that a 'wish list' would include a catwalk to allow for heaters and vents to
  internal offices to be serviced. Currently, with the drop ceiling tiles and many wires dropped for
  offices, it is difficult to access and requires different strategies that can be time consuming.

#### **Highway Bay:**

- Bays are in excellent condition and allow for town property to be well maintained. Mr. Taylor noted that the vehicles can be prepped and loaded for winter needs and there are no issues with cold starts.
- Mr. Taylor noted that it would be ideal to have a proper exhaust handling system for when vehicles are services. They currently use large fans to be able to run and test trucks indoors. This is particularly difficult in the winter.

Mrs. Green inquired as to how many miles of road the Town services. Mr. Taylor noted the Department of Public Works maintains 66 miles of town roads, of which roughly half is gravel and half is paved.

Mr. Southard inquired if there were any issues with water coming into the building or pooling. Mr. Taylor noted that there were no issues with the slab.

When the Committee asked Mr. Taylor if there were any deficiencies or specific needs, he indicated that it would be ideal of have some "cheap" dry storage for items such as plows to be stored. A structure with a roof and no sides would benefit the longevity of the equipment by better protecting it from the elements. Mr. Taylor also noted that some lighting had been updated to LED for better energy efficiency, but the complete upgrade would be ideal. He is currently working with Liberty Utilities to get energy efficiency recommendations for the building. Mr. Taylor also noted specific projects that would be of benefit to the facilities: insulation updates, electrical upgrades (i.e. circuits near welding), installing ceiling fans in the south bay, and paving the driveway down to the road.

Mr. Shipman inquired about the possibility of the sand pile next to the building could be moved to put something in its location – for example, a building for Emergency Services. Mr. Taylor noted that it could be moved to the opposite side of the building but would cause problems with having more limited access for the loaders and sand trucks. Mr. Taylor also noted that where the sand is currently placed there is also room for a second pile of black sand, which is of higher quality. The sand is used for traction on roads during the winter months. Mr. Taylor also noted that the lighting on the side of the building where the sand pile is currently located is ideal for regular operation. There is currently no lighting on the opposite side of the building which is necessary for daily operations.

The Committee discussed the circumstances surrounding the funding of the structure. The project was proposed as \$1.4 million and the budget assigned to construction was \$1 million. The Committee agreed that the building was structurally good but needs more water management, including prioritizing the roof overhang and repair to the southeast end cinder blocks. Mr. Young asked Mr. Aylesworth if he was aware of information related to that expense. Mr. Aylesworth noted he had not seen any quotes for the project, nor a budget related to the project as this is the first time it has come up.

The Committee agreed it would be advantageous to pursue: the roof overhang and cinderblock repairs as the utmost priority, dry storage options, an exhaust system for the Highway Bay, and complete the changeover to LED as secondary priorities. The Committee noted that it would be ideal to maintain the building as it has served its purpose well.

The Committee discussed if the property would be effective to make additions to the building and add on an Emergency Services component to the currently owned and operated property. Mr. Taylor expressed concern with operational conflicts between two different types of facilities. For example, during winter when plows are out and coming back to Department of Public works to refill the trucks and possible cross traffic with emergency services responding to calls. Siting a public safety complex on the parcel would likely also necessitate the Department of Public Works to make sweeping changes to where and how materials were being stored to provide adequate space. Mr. Aylesworth acknowledged that there is only one way to pass onto the property via Lockhaven Road, so there would not be options for multiple driveways. The Committee also acknowledged that there would be concerns with public safety for parking and access, for example, community members visiting the police station while having large construction vehicles accessing the same area.

At the end of the discussion, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Neily were excused from the meeting.

Mr. Aylesworth inquired how the Committee saw fit to move forward with any further site visits.

The Committee discussed concerns about the ability to have all members present and how information could best be sourced and presented. Mr. Shipman recommended whoever tours a facility takes pictures and videos to tell the story. Mr. Tarantelli agreed with the ideas for a brief video tour to be presented to the Committee. Mr. Shipman also offered that the Committee could invite representatives to the Municipal Facilities Advisory Committee meetings for discussion on their facilities.

Mr. Southard inquired if there are any more buildings on the list for the Committee to visit in the Town of Enfield. Mr. Aylesworth confirmed the Committee had not visited the Enfield Community Building or the Recreation Department facilities. The Committee agreed that the Enfield Center Townhouse is a separate discussion as it is not an actively used space and has processes for assessment and repair already in progress.

Mr. Tarantelli revisited the discussion on the priority to digitizing storage as it would require one mass physical space for the current records to be consolidated. The Committee discussed what it would take to digitize the files. It was agreed this would be of benefit, but would take a separate process to manage and organize such a large quantity of scanning and storing materials.

The Committee discussed the goals and objectives of the information and what was to be presented to the town and how that should shape the conversations of the Committee going forward. Mr. Russell noted the goal should be to assess and compile information and recommendations to be turned in to the Capital Improvement Program and Budget Committees. The Committee agreed that there was a priority need to assess the fire, ambulance, police, town office, and library facilities and the remainder of the maintenance items should go through the normal capital planning and operating budget development process.

The Committee discussed the utilization of the Enfield Community Building. While the Committee planned to visit the facility, it was not anticipated that there would be recommendations to move, reutilize, or change anything at this time. Dr. Beaufait inquired if there was a perception of the Enfield Community Building being utilized less than anticipated. Mr. Aylesworth noted that the space is very well utilized, particularly after 3pm during the week days. In fact, it was difficult to find a time to tour the facility because it is well booked for use. Mr. Tarantelli noted that the food pantry would be more ideally implemented at the Community Building. The Committee agreed that it would be ideal to find a location for the pantry that would be more welcoming and accessible for community members.

Mr. Aylesworth presented the Committee with information about the possibility to utilize an existing structure, such as the Hewitt House, for the use of Town Offices. It was noted that the building has two stories, is located across the street from the Enfield Community Building, and has a fair amount of square footage available for office use. It was also noted that there was adequate parking already available for town employees and residents seeking town services. The space would potenteially meet the core needs of the Town Offices without requiring major construction of a new facility. The Committee agreed that the space was worth exploring to see how it would work and if it would require any major renovations. Mr. Shipman noted that the Town Offices cannot function at their best capacity where they currently are and supported the Committee getting more information to assess this as an option.

Mrs. Green shared an idea offered by a community member to lease, sell, or rent the Depot Street property to a business that might cater to the community and traffic on the rail trail. Mr. Shipman noted that the property ownership would need to be cleared up for this to be a viable option. Mr. Aylesworth noted he was still in the process of doing research on the deed of the building and any possible status for redevelopment.

The Committee then discussed the focus of the emergency facilities and how to proceed with recommendations. Committee members noted that there have been discussions around where the facilities could be located, if they would utilize current or new structures, and what services would potentially be combined. The Committee discussed the merits of having combined emergency services and what service would be most ideal to combine. It was agreed that the fire and ambulance would be the most natural fit to combine two of the three services.

Mr. Tarantelli challenged the creation of a new combined facility because fire and ambulance services are having difficulty to procure the staff for coverage. It has been presented to the Committee that a combined facility would be 'easier to manage'; more information regarding what is involved in the management would be helpful to understand the extent of the benefits for a new facility.

Mr. Young noted that it is the town's responsibility to provide sanitary and appropriate facilities for emergency responders, but the facilities the Committees have toured are noted to lack proper training facilities, locker facilities, etc. MR. Young expressed the view that the existing Fire and EMS facilities were completely inadequate to accommodate current and future needs. Mr. Young also added that separate structures mean separate training facilities, creating a redundancy. Having separate buildings would also be harder to maintain, cross train and/or cross facilitate. There is the possibility that the volunteer Fire Department will not last forever, at which time it will be necessary to have a paid employee. If emergency functions are separated it will be harder to maintain. Mr. Young agreed that combining the Fire Department and EMS services makes the most sense, but it was clear in the tour that the Enfield Police needs room to grow.

Mr. Tarantelli noted the location of the Town Offices were among the most urgent needs. However, he noted that among options available, the town offices don't make sense to be housed with emergency facilities.

Mr. Southard noted that the Committee is benefiting to form ideas based off seeing the current properties. He recommended that the Committee develop ideas and specific notes for options in a new meeting.

The Committee then discussed newly built structures that were built in the surrounding areas that could be toured to get more information regarding benefits, drawbacks, and feedback on the process and utilization of the facilities. The Committee agreed it would be ideal to see what surrounding towns have done before settling on options to propose to the Capital Improvement Program and the Budget Committee.

The Committee discussed ideas for facilities to tour, including:

- Moultonborough Combined public safety
- Litchfield Combined public safety
- Guilford Town Hall and Police Station
- Grantham Town Hall and Police Station
- Sunapee new public safety and new library
- Canaan public safety complex that includes fire, EMS, and police (but was not originally designed to accommodate all three functions)
- Hartford, VT Combined public safety, separate town hall

The Committee acknowledged they should tour two types of emergency facilities – those that combine all three emergency services, and those that only combine fire and ambulance. It was also acknowledged to visit multi-story and single-story libraries. Details such as new versus old construction would be taken into consideration when presenting the material. The Committee inquired if the Library of Trustees has a list of libraries that could help the Committee when looking for libraries to tour.

The Committee then discussed how to logistically make site visits work. It was agreed that the ideal situation would involve at least three people on the Committee who commit to tour together. It was also proposed the possibility to 'divide and conquer' to get as much information as possible. Mr. Aylesworth confirmed that if the tours take place outside of the regularly scheduled meeting, a subgroup can record their impressions which would include information that is presented at the following Committee meeting and recorded as part of the minutes. Mr. Aylesworth also noted that due to time limitations, there may be an option for the town to hire a freelancer to research and collect information regarding each site which would be presented to the Committee. Mr. Shipman inquired what the town budget could accommodate and Mr. Aylesworth noted he would gather additional information.

Mr. Shipman inquired if the previous library proposal was still desired? It was suggested this would be a great question for Ms. Hutson and the Library of Trustees. The Committee also requested consideration for the library to be located in Whitney Hall, with the idea that Town Offices would be relocated and renovations made. Mrs. Green agreed that Whitney Hall would be the ideal location for the library.

The next meeting is to take place on July 8th at 4:00pm at the Enfield Community Building and will include meeting with the new head of the Recreation Department. The Committee agreed to meet even though Mr. Aylesworth would not be available to be present on July 8<sup>th</sup>.

It was agreed that site visit recommendations would be further discussed in future meetings.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 pm.