

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 11, 2020

Present: Ryan Aylesworth (Town Manager, Phil Shipman, Shirley Green, Erik Russell, Maynard Southard, Tracy Young, Rob West (6:56pm), Jean Patten (7:44)

Excused: Mark Tarantelli

Guests: Emily Curtis, recording secretary; Jim Pulver, VP of Architecture at Bread Loaf; Phil Neily, Inspector; Dominic Albanese, Melissa Hutson, Town Librarian; Chair Library Trustees; Francine Lozeau, Library Trustees; Marjorie Carr, Dr. David Beaufait, Dan Kiley, Jo-Ellen Courtney, Gary Hutchins, Cecelia Aufiero

Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

Call to Order

The meeting was called 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.

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 –May 28, 2020

Ms. Green made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Russell seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Discussion of Hewitt House

Mr. Shipman noted that at the beginning of the Committee's process, the Hewitt House had been discussed as an option for housing Town Hall. At the time it was tabled, however, the owner, Mr. Lozeau has passed away and it is anticipated to be on the market.

Ms. Lozeau spoke to being interested in selling the house. She is one of the partners of the probate and is unsure where things stand. She noted there was a party that has expressed interest in buying the place. The building has been appraised and pricing is in the beginning stages of discussion.

Mr. Aylesworth discussed the possible implications on the current contract if the Committee wished to have Bread Loaf complete a relatively thorough analysis of the feasibility of locating the Town Hall in the Hewitt House property as well as what it means with regard to the scope of work that has been completed with Bread Loaf to this point. His understanding is that Mr. Pulver is comfortable with having Bread Loaf complete a broad overview of how the Hewitt House might work for municipal offices, which could give some information regarding the cost differentials between the projects.

Mr. Shipman requested feedback from Committee members on whether it is worth investigating or if it should be put on hold.

Mr. Young stated that there has been due diligence to show where the offices belong and it has been well discussed and expressed that he does not believe it should be pursued.

Mr. Russell expressed he believes it is a beautiful building in a great spot in town, but that the current plan is great to coordinate the location of the library and the municipal offices.

Ms. Green agreed that the library and town offices should remain together in Whitney Hall. She added that moving to Hewitt House would put municipal functions on two floors and it would likely be more expensive to have the two buildings. Ms. Green would not put the public library on two floors.

Mr. Pulver noted that it should also be taken into consideration that the property would be taken off of the tax rolls. It also changes how Whitney Hall might be used.

After discussing the Hewitt House, the Committee agreed that it should remain focused on the current drawings with Bread Loaf for presentation to the Board of Selectmen. The Committee then moved on to discuss the outcome of the School Board Meeting decision on June 9th.

Debrief on School Board Meeting (June 9, 2020)

Mr. Aylesworth stated that members of the Committee met with the School Board on June 9, 2020. During this meeting, a motion was made to have the school administration engage with MFAC and move forward with the site work. One member of the School Board raised concerns for liabilities of allowing people on the site, as well as the potential for site damage.

Mr. Shipman noted that one would hope that there would be an offset of the purchase price for the improvements that would be made by the implementation of the facility; however, it remains unclear if they are willing to sell the property.

The Committee discussed the site work that would be completed and the importance for it to be completed prior to engaging in a conversation about the potential purchase of the property.

Mr. Young noted that the site work is a typical development investment with regard to properties, and hopes that it will offer information to engage in conversation with the School Board.

Mr. Russell noted that he believed the Committee should move forward with the site work. He added that it appeared there was a misunderstanding of what the Committee was requesting; and that if the sale did not go through the information could still benefit the town.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that the property card values the entire piece of land with structures at \$550,000, and the land is valued at \$235,000. He noted that the portion of the parcel the Committee was looking at it only represents about three-sevenths the total parcel size, which means the value of the land is only a fraction of the assessed value. He also reiterated his hope that more favorable terms could be agreed to once full consideration was made regarding the value the school district would receive by having a public safety facility constructed on that site.

Mr. Shipman noted he would request a vote from members of the Committee to support moving forward.

Mr. Aylesworth made a motion to move forward with engaging Pathways on the scope of work most recently reviewed for approximately \$5,000 and to move forward as soon as possible. Mr. Southard seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).

Mr. Aylesworth added that the Selectboard could approve the purchase of the land via a public hearing process if it was a cash purchase, but if it was to be purchased with a loan then it would need to be voted on in a Town Meeting.

Mr. Pulver stated that the Committee should ensure that, in the terms and conditions of the site work being completed, that the Committee has the ownership of the information and has the rights to use the information.

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

Mr. Pulver began by discussing the project timelines, which included the design and construction of both projects. The entire process from one building to the next totals 145 weeks. He noted that there was an option where construction was overlapped, which would total around 93 weeks. The timeline included

RFP's, designs and document approval, permitting, bidding, construction, and temporary relocation. He noted that there are risks to bidding the projects on separate timelines, such as changes in cost which then changes the overall project costs.

Review of Draft Project Narratives and Presentation to Board of Selectmen

Mr. Pulver requested feedback on the project narratives that he had distributed to the Committee.

Mr. Shipman inquired if the conceptual designs were at their finality.

Mr. Pulver noted that he needs to add an alternate regarding lowering the first floor, which would be on page two of the Whitney Hall narrative. He did not believe that there were any other changes to be made to the Whitney Hall narrative.

Mr. Pulver noted that the narrative for the Public Safety Facility could be changed, including the height of external glass windows, which would not require bulletproof glass as currently quoted, as well as changes to the internal interview room glass. He added that there were different options for the grade of bulletproof glass available for the reception window as well. He added that there were still some questions on the locker room layout to be discussed and finalized.

In discussion of the locker room options, Mr. Pulver noted that there was no space saving if they were gender neutral locker rooms versus separate locker rooms. Mr. Pulver shared drawings of a gender-neutral option for locker rooms. He noted that the floor plan could be adapted to accommodate either approach and was not necessary to nail down right now.

Mr. Pulver discussed whether windows would be desired around the counter area in the library with Ms. Hutson.

Mr. Pulver noted that there was additional space in the drawing than what was requested in initial meetings with departments, about 78 square feet. He added that it would be adjusted by making changes to the North wall near the hazardous material storage area. He noted that the adjustments would have a fairly minimal impact on the overall costs.

After discussing details of the drawings, Mr. Aylesworth presented communications from Mr. Tarantelli, who was unable to attend the meeting, regarding inquiries about the necessity of a fitness room for the police and fire departments. Mr. Tarantelli noted that he received questions of building a fitness facility in the secured section of a public safety building and noted that alternatives had not been discussed by the Committee. He added that not all departments had current fitness requirements to support the need for a fitness room.

Mr. Aylesworth stated that he had discussed the fitness aspect with Chief Holland and it was expressed that a wellness incentive is important to be available.

Mr. Shipman spoke to his experience with the Lebanon Police Department and their facility, and that there is a mental and emotional benefit to exercise which is important to support.

Mr. Aylesworth added that there are physical fitness standards that the police must adhere to and that they are tested on their fitness every six months. He added that there are no current physical fitness requirements for fire department personnel, but that was likely going to be changing in the future. Regardless of what the present requirements are, it would still benefit the department and its members to have a fitness facility for convenience of use.

Mr. Shipman inquired if the Committee felt it important to keep the fitness room as part of the plan or not.

Mr. Southard noted that it is not convenient to rely on a local gym, and public service people need physical fitness and convenience can help facilitate that.

Mr. Russell stated he believed it was necessary to be included. He added that the police and fire departments need to be encouraged to stay fit to give them the best opportunity to keep them healthy and that mental health is a part of that as well.

Mr. West inquired what the size was of the gym.

Mr. Pulver noted that it was 530 square feet.

Mr. West echoed what other Committee members said and added that it may be hard to draw talent without it. He added that Chief Holland had said that a lot of the equipment could be acquired with a grant, so the cost was just building the space for it.

Ms. Patten inquired as to what the officers currently do and what would inspire them to utilize a gym.

Mr. Shipman noted that a former officer had a gym set up in his basement, which was shared with other members of the police department.

Ms. Green noted that they would be likely to utilize it if it is on site, and that it would be worth inquiring what the fitness room sizes are in other facilities for comparison.

Mr. Aylesworth added that it may be possible to open the fitness room to other municipal workers. He added that the commitment to wellness also helped when considering that it can reduce costs for the Town in terms of insurance and operational costs.

Mr. Pulver noted that at the end of the last meeting a gentleman offered his view that it is essential to make the public safety facility a net zero building. He looked at what was done at the Middlebury Town Offices and that the goal was to get more information and break out the costs to be shared with the Committee. Mr. Pulver believed that the total added design and construction cost associated with achieving the net zero goal was around 7 or 8%, but more analysis would be needed to confirm this and obtain a better sense of what the annual operating cost savings would be in the form of energy savings.

The Committee moved on to discuss the timeline and preparation of materials for presentation to the Board of Selectmen. In discussing the timeline, it was decided that the presentation materials would be completed by July 13th and submitted to the Board of Selectmen with the request to review the information at the July 20th BOS meeting.

Mr. Aylesworth, Mr. Russell, Mr. Young, and Mr. Shipman all volunteered to participate in the subcommittee for preparing the presentation materials.

Scheduling a Site Visit to Canaan Public Safety Facility

Mr. Shipman inquired about what might be possible with regard to a site visit with consideration to COVID-19 recommendations.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that most towns are preparing to reopen, and the gathering size is being lifted.

Mr. Neily noted that it was a comparison of apples to oranges, and that the buildings assembled together over time is different than what is being proposed. He noted that visiting newer facilities, such as Sunapee, have learnt a great deal more of information. He added that he is unsure what the Committee is looking for in visiting the Canaan facility.

Mr. Russell suggested that a flow chart outlining the history of the building would be ideal to outline and communicate how they did what they did, and make it clear what is similar and dissimilar.

Mr. Neily thought it would be helpful and would be willing to take that on if the Committee felt appropriate.

Mr. Shipman thought Mr. Russell had an excellent idea. He noted that the site visit could be mitigated by utilizing the timeline of information.

Ms. Patten agreed that it was a good idea, but that going a little further with the building size and the building costs at that particular time would be important data to have available as well.

Mr. Aylesworth noted that with more of the timeline information the numbers could be inflated to current costs fairly easy for comparison.

Mr. Pulver noted that it is recommended to add about 3% per year has been included in costs for escalation.

Mr. Neily noted that some costs may be hard to accurately reflect because the fire department purchased the materials and built some of the structure themselves.

Other Business

Mr. Shipman asked if there was any other business that was not already discussed.

No other business was brought forward for discussion.

Next Meeting: Monday, June 22 @ 6:30 PM

Adjournment

Ms. Patten made a motion to adjourn at 8:39 PM. Mr. Aylesworth seconded. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (7-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 pm.