

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2019

Present: Phil Shipman, Rob West, Jean Patten, Erik Russell, Maynard Southard (3:32), Shirley Green (3:32)

Excused: Tracy Young, Mark Tarantelli

Guests: Ryan Aylesworth (Town Manager); Roy Holland (Chief of Police); Dr. David Beaufait; and other members of the public

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM.

The meeting began with the approval of the August 26, 2019 minutes.

Ms. Patten motioned to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Shipman seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Review and Reminder of the Committee's Specific Roles and Responsibilities

Mr. Shipman began the meeting with a reminder of the objectives and responsibilities of the Committee.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that it would be beneficial for the Committee to outline the current focus on public safety, municipal offices, and library facilities. He noted that in the near future, it would be ideal to set a priority focus and create secondary items so that the timeline can be met without detriment to all areas of planning for the projects. He also noted that an architect can serve to help the Committee understand what would be feasible in terms of evaluations and recommendations based off of the various possibilities. Architects could also assist in understanding the need for new buildings versus renovations, as well as the potential warrant articles necessary to execute.

Report on Architecture and Design Firms that Responded to the Request for Qualifications

Mr. Aylesworth presented the Committee with the RFQ responses. He noted that an RFQ is a little more challenging because there is not a set project and that meeting with firms in person may be beneficial.

Firms that submitted RFQ's:

- Park Architecture of Hanover, NH
 - Would collaborate with VIS Construction and Chris Ross Architecture
 - Estimated Fee of \$32,800
- DCVL Design of Somerville, MA (municipal only)
 - Did not submit cost estimate or fee schedule
 - Would collaborate with Energy Vision and Cost Pros'
- Breadloaf (Middlebury)
 - Estimated 338 hours, but did not give fee estimate
- Barrett Architecture – (only bid regarding Public Safety)
 - Fee \$29,750
 - Collaborating with Shawl Engineering, Brooklands, and Electrical Systems Engineering, and Trumble Nelson (cost estimation)

- Warrenstreet of Concord, NH
 - Subconsultants – Engineering Ventures, WVA Engineering Associates, and Trumble Nelson
- SMP of Concord, NH
 - No subconsultants
 - No cost estimation
- Banwell (Quechee, VT)
 - Project cost not to exceed \$20,000
 - Would work with Pathways, Engineering Services of Vermont, and (FBR) and Steve Horton Construction (cost estimation)
- Harriman (Portsmouth, NH)
 - Preferred Construction Management
- Lavalley/Brensinger (Manchester, NH)
 - Consultants Fuss & Oneil, F/B/R, Yeaton Associates, and Jobin Construction (cost estimation)

Committee members inquired if Peter Tenant had reached out regarding the RFQ. Mr. Aylesworth confirmed that he did not, but it appeared to be lack of availability and not lack of interest in the project.

Ms. Patten inquired what the determining factors were for how the Committee would choose a firm.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that cost will play a role, but that fit, and past experience will also be key components to understanding the best match for the work. The Committee could also consider seeking a firm who has completed work related to what they are seeking consultation for – for example, a firm who has designed ten public safety complexes instead of two. He noted that there are also intangible qualities, which include working styles as well as giving priority to the project.

Mr. West inquired as to if it was typical for a Committee to be involved in the selection process.

Mr. Aylesworth responded that it is not, but he wants to ensure there is group support for whichever firm is ultimately selected. Mr. Aylesworth noted that he wants to involve a larger number of people based off of the size of the project and the level of needs it will address. He noted that a subcommittee would be appropriate to assist him in the process.

Mr. Shipman expressed support in that the project was a large undertaking, and with the current timeline, as well as consideration for Mr. Aylesworth's regular workload, the request for a subcommittee to consult with the firms was within the appropriate boundaries for Committee involvement.

The Committee discussed and agreed that a subcommittee would be appropriate. Mr. Russell and Mr. Shipman both volunteered to be involved with the process. Committee members also noted that Mr. Young may be interested and will confirm his interest to participate.

The Committee agreed that the subcommittee, comprised of Mr. Aylesworth, Mr. Shipman, Mr. Russell, and Mr. Young (pending his acceptance of the nomination), would conduct interviews in September so that the projects could begin in October.

Mr. Russell stated that it would be ideal to have one firm that focused on all of the needs of the Committee instead of involving multiple firms for different aspects of the project. The Committee discussed the process in choosing a firm and supported Mr. Russell's observation.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that the RFQ's received were strictly regarding the conceptual phase and cost estimation phase and another set of proposals will be solicited with respect to preparation of construction level plan(s) and ultimately the (re)construction work itself, depending on what voters support at the next

Town Meeting. Removing a firm from the conceptual design and cost estimation phase of the project does not prevent them from bidding on the next phase of the project.

Mr. Shipman noted that the quality of work will be of the highest priority when selecting a firm. He also noted that it is not in the best interest of the town to make a choice solely based on a low-cost estimate and that interviews would be necessary to make an informed decision. He stated that the Committee should feel their project is a priority to the firm.

The Committee recognized that there were three areas that the Committee was trying to address and some firms only bid on one aspect of the work such as public safety or municipal/library buildings. Mr. Shipman asked the Committee if they felt it appropriate to vote to begin to eliminating some firms based on the current recognized needs of the Committee. All members unanimously agreed.

Mr. Shipman made a motion to select a company that can assess all aspects of the project. Ms. Green seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

DCVL and Barrett Architecture were removed from the list for further inquiry.

Communications – Memo from Library Trustees

Mr. Aylesworth noted that there would be a focused library discussion at the next MFAC meeting.

Ms. Patten noted that the space inventory the Committee received was extremely helpful, which included additional information of 'nice to have' versus 'required'. She was also glad to see the plans for previously drafted library renovation and expansion projects.

Mr. Aylesworth addressed the Committee with concern for posting the documents with the MFAC meeting minutes in that it could be misconstrued that they are plans currently being proposed, instead of previous plans that are being presented as historical information for the Committee's analysis.

Chief Holland suggested to write that copies of previous plans are available at Town Hall offices upon request.

Mr. Russell noted that a watermark could also be placed on each page of the document to help avoid confusion.

The Committee then discussed the amount of library funds available based on income and expense reports provided to them from Mr. Albanese of the Board of Library of Trustees.

Review of relevant past Town Meeting votes/action on municipal buildings/property

The Committee discussed reaching a consensus on where the structure and/or structures are, or potentially would be, located.

It was reported to the Committee that the town voted to demolish the Shedd Street buildings with Union Street station upgrades, but those actions have not taken place as of yet. In 2006, upon the opening of the new Department of Public Works building, a town report indicated that it was intended to sell the Shedd Street property, but it was never acted upon. During a Town Meeting, authority was given to the BOS to sell off the Shedd Street property once the buildings were demolished.

Of all the records reviewed by Mr. Aylesworth and Ms. Bonnette, nothing was found that would inhibit the Committee from moving forward with any current discussions on land use.

Continued Review of Public Safety Facility Needs and Discussion of Potential Sites for a Public Safety Facility

Chief Holland indicated to the Committee that he and Mr. Neily (Building Inspector) drove around to perform a very preliminary assessment of properties currently for sale on the Route 4 corridor that may be of adequate size and other characteristic to support a public safety facility.

Chief Holland drove Rte 4 from Brownies to Shaker Granite to take a look at properties. Mr. Neily offered insight as to what would and would not be able to build on based off of his professional knowledge. A total of 8 properties were identified that had a minimum of 1.55 acres.

Properties included: Lacroix sales lot, Anderson lot, Covac lot, a second Lacroix lot, Staggs & Warren Lot, J&B Auto lot, the Avalon Property (listed as two separate parcels), SAU lot, and Hawthorne Lot. Some of the properties identified were of concern because they were located in flood plains. Mr. Aylesworth noted that some architects saw that many places were in flood plains and that there were solutions available to address it. He noted that some architects are prepared to build the parcel up to make it higher than the flood plain, and that this option could be a more reasonable route than, for example, knocking a structure down that already exists to build on the site.

Mr. Shipman asked if the Committee wished to decline any specific properties based on the cost.

Committee members agreed it was in their best interest to exhaust all options and possibilities. It was also ideal to be able to rule things out and justify why decisions were made based on concrete evidence versus speculation. It was also acknowledged that a firm may have better insight on what properties would be ideal for town needs.

Chief Holland noted that the current PD building was built in the early 90's, and by 1996 a former committee identified that the PD had already outgrown the space.

Mr. Russell noted that looking at library plans from 2006 and seeing issues from the police building from 1996 was insightful the process the Committee is currently going through.

Chief Holland inquired if there was consideration to separate PD from emergency services.

Mr. Shipman stated that the Committee needs to take all factors, including currently standing structures, into consideration. While the Committee has agreed there is merit to having all emergency services in one location, it is not the only option and the Committee will go through all of the information available to make the best assessment for next steps.

The Committee then discussed how to organize the information they have received based off of current structures, current needs, and departmental requests. The Committee also discussed the potential necessity to prioritize some departmental needs over others.

Continued Review of Municipal Office Facility Needs and Deliberation on Possible Redevelopment Options of the Existing Whitney Hall & Police Station Buildings/Property for Municipal Office and Library Use

Mr. Russell stated that he believes some of the conversation will take place as part of the design process.

The Committee discussed the Whitney Hall and police station properties and how the current PD could be used if the PD is moved to a new public safety complex. In acknowledging the PD outgrew the space

back in 1996, it was noted by members that it is possible to spend as much if not more to retrofit an existing space versus building new.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that firms may have institutional and professional knowledge that can help drive the process.

The Committee discussed the potential for resident opposition depending on what possible future modifications might be proposed for Whitney Hall, and that to fix the building such that it meets the Town's current needs is going to take a lot of money. The Committee discussed the potential to spend a significant amount of money with regard to preserving historic value versus finding a way to (re)build which would come at a lower cost to the town. Ms. Green echoed that the firms may be able to direct the Committee on what is worth pursuing.

The Committee then discussed how the subcommittee is going to handle the decision process for choosing a firm from the RFQ. The Committee agreed to entrust the selected members of the subcommittee to handle the selection process based on their professional and working knowledge of the process.

Mr. Shipman made a motion for the subcommittee to be the group to determine the architecture firm that the Committee will work with regarding the next phase. Ms. Green seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

Other Business

Mr. Aylesworth is going to bring an update to the next meeting regarding the borders to current town owned properties.

Mr. Aylesworth informed the Committee that the environmental assessment of the Shedd Street property could be completed in the coming weeks. The firm completing the assessment would look at available information on what the parcel was used for in the past, as well as obtain new soil samples for evaluation.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that the assessment and clean up are two different processes. The assessment would be completed in late-fall and would cost \$10,000-\$15,000, unless the Town was successful in getting the regional planning commission's firm to complete the work at no direct cost to the Town (it would instead be covered by a federal grant). He had inquired as to if it was possible to complete a smaller scope for less money, but he was informed that was not an option given that the majority of the project cost is driven by the fieldwork.

The Committee then discussed timelines, including the timelines necessary for actions such as a major bond for any buildings.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that warrant articles will spell out funding sources and how much the town would be responsible for.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 24, 2019 @ 6:30 PM (DPW Facility)

Mr. Aylesworth will send an e-mail to the Committee after he confirms Mr. Albanese can attend.

Adjournment

Mr. Southard motion to adjourn at 5:22. Ms. Patten seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).