

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 28, 2019

Present: Phil Shipman, Tracy Young, Mark Tarantelli, Shirley Green, Erik Russell, Rob West, Ryan Aylesworth (Town Manager)

Guests: Dominic Albanese (Chair; Board of Library Trustees); Phil Neily (Inspector), John Dale (Bread Loaf Architects)

Excused: Maynard Southard, Jean Patten

Call to Order

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

Review and Approve Meeting Minutes –October 17, 2019

Ms. Patten submitted a written request to add the physical address of 492 US Route 4 to the Raphael's/Avalon Property description. Mr. Russell supported that all of the sites should have the physical address listed going forward.

Mr. Tarantelli motioned to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Young seconded. Vote in favor of the motion (5-0). Mr. West abstained.

Summary of Bread Loaf Meetings with Fire/EMS and Library of Trustees

Bread Loaf began by reviewing their discussion with the fire department, police department, and the Library of Trustees.

Bread Loaf and the Committee discussed details of utilizing one public entry point for a safety complex, with a secure lobby space where a receptionist would be available to direct to the fire or police as necessary. Mr. Young noted that the ideal set up would be what the Committee saw in Sunapee where they have an airlock entryway with an emergency phone located in the airlock for when the lobby is closed. It was noted that the glass on the inner doors to the main lobby in Sunapee is bullet proof.

Bread Loaf noted that each department chief would get an office, and there would also be offices for supervisors and a joint work area for fire and EMS to complete computer reports. They noted that a large conference space would be the ideal for an Emergency Operation Center (EOC) – which has its own requirements for communications systems, ventilation, etc. The Police Chief believes the Town can secure a federal grant to help cover up to \$150,000 of the costs for equipping the EOC. The conference space could be regularly utilized for community meetings. It was also noted that the room would include an exterior access door, restrooms, and a kitchen area. The room would be secured so as not to allow access to the rest of the facility.

The Committee discussed the potential to also use the room for an emergency shelter with the possibility to utilize locker rooms on as needed basis for bathrooms and showers.

Bread Loaf continued to discuss the possibilities of drive-through garage bays. They noted that one challenge of a two-sided garage is that there are many areas that require direct ventilation, such as gear storage. These areas should be located near an external wall, but in the case of a two-sided garage, would need to be located on the end of the bays which may not be ideal for operational purposes.

Mr. West inquired as to how many modern day emergency facilities have entrances/exits only on one side of the building vs. drive-through bays.

Bread Loaf noted that many emergency facilities, including some more recently constructed facilities they are aware of, operate with a one-sided garage. They noted that in conversations with the fire department, Chief Cummings reported they would primarily back in the trucks, particularly the boats and trailers that they have that they don't utilize on a regular basis.

Mr. Young inquired about the ability to plan for knock out walls for doors or additions if found necessary in the future. Bread Loaf noted that was a strong possibility.

Mr. West inquired about possibly having one bay with one entrance that would be reserved for storage and then having the remaining bays as through-and-through bays. Other Committee members indicated that this might be a sensible "hybrid" solution.

The Committee discussed the number of bays that would be necessary to accommodate the current fire and EMS vehicles. The Committee also discussed if they should plan for the possibility of housing the engines currently stored in Enfield Center, even though there would be no present plans to consolidate down to a single station.

Bread Loaf agreed to develop diagrams with five or six bays for comparison. They also noted some of the efficiencies of having a one-sided entry for the bays, including having better capabilities for direct ventilation for items such as gear. It was noted that the efficiencies can also be beneficial to the budget when it comes to building costs.

The Committee then discussed the possible merits of having an external structure on the same parcel for storage, as opposed to using a bay for less frequently utilized items. Mr. Aylesworth noted that, although not common, there are scenarios where the department would need to utilize the boat during the winter months and that it is preferred to keep some of the equipment in heated areas, instead of winterizing it, to be ready to go in an emergency.

The Committee discussed the goals to receive requests and feedback from the departments while also balancing the needs of the town and keeping an open mind as they move through the process.

Library

Mr. Albanese inquired as to how many meeting rooms were being discussed among the current requests the Committee has received. Mr. Aylesworth noted that each facility had made their own requests about what their ideal set up would be and noted that there may be redundancies that would be mitigated as progress was made with planning. He noted that the Committee will keep this in mind as they move forward in conversations with Bread Loaf.

Bread Loaf reviewed the ideas discussed with the Library of Trustees and Ms. Hutson including programming spaces and the goal to have lower book shelves to allow clear vision across the space. They also discussed the advantages for having one continuous floor and the ideal lay out being 6,000-7,000 square feet. They discussed the idea of a straight floor, an L-shape, or utilizing what is currently available to make it more accessible.

Bread Loaf offered the idea for the library to be located on the 3rd floor, but Ms. Hutson noted that the haul up the stairs would be difficult for parents with young children and for senior citizens.

The Committee discussed the use of the elevator and challenges with its current age and operation.

Mr. Russell noted that it is the norm to have public spaces and public events held on the first floor of a building.

The Committee discussed whether putting a public space on the 3rd floor would reduce the utilization by the public.

Bread Loaf noted that the goal was to make the utilization of the space as efficient as possible.

Fire/EMS

The Committee discussed community spaces available and what is currently utilized for emergency shelter situations.

Mr. Neily noted that there are certain legal requirements in order to be designated as an emergency shelter. He noted that the local school or the Community Building are sometimes utilized for emergency shelters, though they are not ideal.

The Committee discussed the potential to have the emergency shelter located at an emergency response building. Mr. Neily suggested that there could be issues associated with having the traffic of an emergency shelter where an EOC would potentially be operating. There are certain advantages to keeping these functions physically separate so that personnel in the EOC can operate most efficiently in the time of a real crisis.

Mr. Aylesworth suggested that it would be beneficial for the Committee to reach a final decision regarding whether the police department would be co-located with fire and EMS. He noted that it was going to be exceedingly challenging for Bread Loaf to develop conceptual plans regarding the municipal offices and library and have the committee react to them until such time as it was decided whether or not the Giese building would continue to house the police department.

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of having the police department together or separate from Fire/EMS. The Committee asked if Bread Loaf had any recommendations.

Bread Loaf noted that there is value to having the police department with the rest of the emergency services, including the shared utilities, training/meeting spaces, and administrative functions. They also noted that there was a question of where and how the police department would operate if their current building were to be renovated. Bread Loaf noted that the fire department is the biggest element of a shared facility, EMS is the smallest, and the police department would make up about 40% of the facility.

Mr. Shipman asked Bread Loaf if it would be more economical to add the police department to the current discussion of a public safety facility than it would be to renovate the existing Giese facility and find a temporary location for them while renovations were taking place.

Bread Loaf noted that renovating and expanding the Giese building to serve as a proper police station and building the necessary police facilities within a three-function emergency services facility would ultimately cost about the same either way. As such, the driving force behind the decision is which option is the best from the standpoint of mission delivery and operation efficiencies.

The Committee discussed what avenue could be more cost effective to solve the current problems as well as provide for the future needs of the town.

Mr. Young asked that regardless of other factors, such as Whitney Hall or the current police building, what would be the best situation for the operation of the police department. Bread Loaf stated that putting them in the new safety facility, with the fire department and EMS, would seem to be the ideal scenario for the departmental needs.

Mr. Tarantelli raised concern for having all three departments together because they do their jobs differently and a shared facility's primary advantage is the economies of scale. He questioned whether it was the right choice for all of the departments.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that in his meetings – both individually and in a group – with each of the three public safety chiefs, they unanimously preferred to be under one roof. Mr. Aylesworth noted that he sees advantages in the police department present in a public safety building due to their nearly 24/7 presence. In addition to ensuring that there were always “eyes and ears” on the building, this setup would likely also improve the stewardship of the building.

Mr. Aylesworth encouraged the Committee to consider making a definitive decision on whether to include the police department in the shared facility or not to give Bread Loaf much needed direction and ultimately enable them to move forward.

Mr. Shipman inquired if it was possible to make a police station that is functional and fits the needs for the next 50 years outside of adding it to a safety complex. The Committee went around the table and discussed their personal opinions on the matter, and all unanimously agreed it was

in the best interest to move forward with conceptual plans by having Bread Loaf operate under the understanding that the three public safety departments would be located within one structure.

Mr. Tarantelli motion to go forward with all three emergency services in one building. Mr. Young seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

Mr. West expressed his support for the decision but noted that the Committee will need to outline financial considerations for community members when the time comes to thoroughly explain the rationale behind the Committee's final recommendations.

The Committee then discussed what would be done with the current PD building once the police department vacated the space. All Committee members agreed that the decision would not be made as part of the motion, but that plans for the building would be central to discussions regarding municipal offices and public library moving forward in the planning process.

Mr. West asked what the process would look like if the Committee could not find a property that can meet all the criteria for siting the ideal public safety facility. If a preferred parcel cannot be identified in the short-term, consensus emerged among the Committee that it would be sensible to wait – perhaps up to one year - to see if more desirable property became available that could support the appropriate plan.

Whitney Hall

The Committee moved on to discussing possible configurations for Whitney Hall. Bread Loaf and the Committee members discussed various ideas for use of the property. Mr. Aylesworth inquired as to if the property would be at all conducive for the use of a public safety complex if the library and town offices moved, but offered that it would seem difficult to envision how this would work given the historic nature of Whitney Hall and limitations of trying to incorporate the existing structure into a larger facility that houses public safety departments.

Bread Loaf offered the idea of moving the library and turning Whitney Hall into the Town Offices and have the lower level as the police department, but that would be contrary to the vote the Committee just took. Other possibilities included having the library located in the current police department with an addition onto the building.

Shedd Street

The Committee acknowledged that if the town did not already own Shedd Street, the property would not be appealing for purchase to develop for public safety purposes. Consensus emerged that the Shedd Street property has many negatives that seem to make it an inferior option for the siting of a public safety facility.

Bread Loaf stated they would return to the Committee with several different scenarios. They noted it would be unrealistic to have specific prices, but they would have them ranked from the most expensive to the least expensive options.

Bread Loaf distributed an updated site analysis to Committee members before being excused from the meeting.

Mr. Aylesworth made a motion to go into nonpublic session pursuant to RSA 91-A Section D, with regard to the sale or lease of real property.

A roll call vote was taken to enter non-public session at 8:16 PM. Each Committee member stated their name and approval of the motion. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

Mr. Shipman made a motion to come out of nonpublic session at 8:46pm. A roll call vote was made to exit non-public session. Each Committee member stated their name and approval of the motion. Vote unanimous in favor of motion (7-0).

Other Business

Next Meeting: Tuesday November 12, 2019 @ 4:00 PM (DPW Facility)

Adjournment

Mr. Tarantelli made a motion to adjourn. Mr. West seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion. (7-0)

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 pm.