

Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, August 19, 2021
4 PM
Town Offices, Nowak Room
Final Minutes

1. Call Meeting to Order

Members present: Kris Weeks (Chair), Peter Lennon (Vice-Chair), Rob Corson, Mark Leighton. Also present were Town Manager Russ Dean and Assistant Town Manager Melissa Roy.

Members Absent: Amanda Kelly; Select Board Rep Daryl Browne

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Weeks at 4 PM.

1. Approval of Minutes

a. July 15, 2021

Corrections: Mr. Lennon said on the final page, it should read “if they saw examples of the product which they get from the RFP process, that will be more compelling.”

MOTION: Mr. Corson moved to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Leighton seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

2. Old Business

a. Milestones

Mr. Lennon reviewed the FAC Milestones. They missed developing CIP questions and attending the initial Planning Board CIP meeting to ask questions, but there's still the meeting on August 26 they could attend, where the Planning Board will vote. Mr. Leighton said the Facilities Condition Assessment is in the CIP, so they should at least speak to that at the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Lennon said if there are changes to the FCA, they should have Mr. Sharples get it into the draft presented to the Planning Board, rather than presenting the changes at the meeting.

b. Public Safety Complex Study

Mr. Weeks said that originally, Mr. Leighton was going to participate on the interview team for the Public Safety Complex study, but he was unable to meet the schedule due to prior engagements, so he [Mr. Weeks] filled in for the interviews. The five firms were all quite strong. The town has started to engage with the preferred designer to see if they can strike a deal. There won't be a big push to put this on the next warrant article; they need six to eight months dedicated to developing public input and feedback. Mr. Leighton said they also wanted to explore what could be accomplished with the \$100,000 already allocated. If that's not enough, should there be a CIP for 2022? Mr. Weeks said Mr. Sharples and Mr. Dean would have the flexibility to put something on the

town warrant if necessary. Mr. Corson said they should decide whether they support or don't support having an interim budget for this project in 2022. Mr. Leighton said it's a 2023 CIP article. There's nothing planned for 2022, but that may develop.

Mr. Leighton said they should phase the public meetings so the feedback is fresh and they're getting input from the community in a timely way. Mr. Corson suggested having feedback sessions just prior to the 2023 budget season. Mr. Lennon said there's a Budget Committee meeting in July where the Town sets the stage for the Budget process; in August the Planning Board looks at the CIP; and in September the BRC gets the draft budget. The feedback sessions should be no later than the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Corson said that during the budget process, there's a CIP night in October or November, so perhaps there could be an October timeline for a final public meeting where they present the preferred option. If they wanted to present multiple options for feedback, maybe they could have one session closer to the August meeting and one closer to the final budget vote.

Mr. Leighton asked if the budget allocated for FY 2021 has to be spent in 2021. Mr. Corson said no, it can roll over. Mr. Lennon said they should ask the town that question to make sure. [It was confirmed that it can be encumbered.]

Mr. Weeks said Mr. Sharples will have to put something in the CIP in July. Mr. Lennon asked how they can put information into the process when there's still a ways to go with townspeople weighing in. Mr. Leighton said it depends on how long the approach is. They want money in the CIP for design and construction. The processes can happen concurrently, where a number gets into the CIP while it's still under review and public input.

Town Manager Russ Dean said the town is working with Lavallee Brensinger, who came out of the Public Safety RFP process at the top. This firm is already working with Police and Fire. The bulk of the work will be done in 2022, with the idea that they'll have something prepared for the 2023 warrant. Mr. Corson asked whether there should be a recommendation for an interim amount of money in the 2022 budget to allow for the continuation of the project. Mr. Dean said they should be within that \$100,000. Mr. Weeks said that during the interview process, the firms all seemed to think that the \$100,000 was sufficient.

Mr. Weeks asked if they wanted to make any schedule recommendations for the feasibility study. Mr. Corson said he'd like to determine what role the FAC will have in that process, and whether Mr. Weeks or Mr. Leighton will continue to act as a liaison. Mr. Dean said that the people that have been involved will stay involved. There is one rep from the Facilities Committee, and that individual can report back to the full committee.

3. CIP 2022

Mr. Lennon presented his revision of the FCA CIP item. He said he was trying to create a convincing argument of why this is a different product from what has been done before. They've already done an assessment; this is a "study," which is different. The

database tool is designed to be used on an ongoing basis by DPW and the Town Manager, but they should add “and other clients.” They need to demonstrate why this \$45,000 is a good investment for everyone in town, not just an assessment that will end up on a shelf.

Mr. Leighton said that regarding the budget number, he got an informed estimate which took into account the square footage under study. They should put the information about how they got the figure into the CIP proposal.

Mr. Leighton asked if they could further revise the information after they submit the CIP, and Mr. Dean said they can present changes to Mr. Sharples until the final draft is presented at the CIP meeting August 26th.

Mr. Lennon asked if there would be a second year of this funding. Mr. Weeks said it wouldn't be funded at \$45,000 a year. Mr. Leighton said the town has the resources to update this database year over year. Every 5 to 10 years they should be bringing in another firm to review it. There may be a yearly cost depending on what platform they choose, such as a hosting fee.

MOTION: Mr. Lennon moved to approve the revisions to the CIP draft. Mr. Corson seconded. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Weeks said they should consider which CIP items they want to weigh in on, and how they would present their feedback to the Planning Board.

Mr. Weeks discussed the CIP item for the DPW to conduct more design and study on their facilities, at a cost of \$75,000. This is a continuation of what the committee previously discussed with Jennifer Perry about their facilities. Mr. Lennon said they haven't gotten answers to their questions from Public Works. Based on this lack of information, last year they recommended to the Select Board that they not fund anything. Should the Committee recommend not funding anything again? Should we instead be thinking about an operational analysis of the Public Works department that leads into a feasibility study, following the same process we've established with the Public Safety project?

Mr. Weeks said this is just a CIP blurb; he's not sure if there's more of a scope breakdown on what they'll get for the \$75,000. Mr. Dean said the CIP is a planning document, not a funding document. The CIP is adopted and the document is transitioned to the BRC for the real work on the financial end. He suggested coming up with questions for Public Works to answer. Mr. Lennon said if it's a planning document where the numbers don't have any relevance or impact, there's no point in having numbers there. They should try to get the right number.

Mr. Corson asked what happened to the Public Works Master Plan and the planning portion of this. Mr. Leighton said there's identification that the fuel island is in poor condition, and in FY 23 they'll be asking to replace that. In 2024/25, there's the new Public Works facility. Even if the FAC doesn't support the new building, they should still look at it as part of a site plan.

Mr. Corson said they should ask about the condition of the fuel island, what is the long term master planning of the area, and which is the priority. Mr. Lennon said the

project description is saying we've got a concept about what we want to do, and they want an architect and an engineer to lay it out. He thinks they're getting ahead of themselves. Mr. Weeks said they should ask "how does this fit into the plan that was developed in 2019 for the new garage and maintenance facility?" Mr. Leighton suggested asking "has there been a third-party review of the existing fuel island?"

Mr. Lennon said he had six questions that were in the document he already sent. Are those valid questions to ask for this project? They're avoiding the question of whether or not they should be put into a process similar to the Public Safety center, with independent guidance. This project will compete with the Public Safety Center and possibly the Community Center, so he doesn't want to take another step without getting a better handle on it. One year or two years more is not so critical that they have to spend money now on this, without an operational analysis and a feasibility study. Mr. Leighton said the write-up mentions that they'd done a programming exercise. Mr. Lennon said we don't know what the architect looked at. We shouldn't buy into what the Department says they need without bringing in an independent perspective, for a building that will be a major anchor in the town's funding. Mr. Corson said this was about the replacement of an existing garage, so how did they get from there to where we are today?

Mr. Leighton suggested they have another meeting about the CIP. They discussed the timeline of the CIP process with Mr. Dean, who said that even if they were to miss the August 26th Planning Board meeting, it doesn't preclude them from getting questions out to the Departments. Mr. Leighton said they should send a note to the Planning Board saying they have questions and haven't had time to put together recommendations yet, except for regarding the FCA.

The Committee discussed the debt service projections with Mr. Dean. Mr. Lennon suggested the Public Works garage might fit better into 2024/2025. Mr. Dean said there's nothing on the books to come online in 2022. Mr. Lennon asked if Public Safety and Public Works would go forward in the same year, and Mr. Dean said it may be best to phase those projects.

Mr. Weeks said the committee members should send their questions to Mr. Lennon and they will review them at the next meeting.

4. Review Committee Calendar
 - a. The next meeting will be Tuesday, August 24 at 4 PM.

5. Adjournment

MOTION: Mr. Lennon moved to adjourn. Mr. Corson seconded. In a roll call vote, all were in favor and the meeting adjourned at 5:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joanna Bartell
Recording Secretary