

Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting  
Thursday, September 9, 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, and Mark Leighton. Amanda Kelly was present remotely via Zoom. Melissa Roy, the Assistant Town Manager, was also present.

Members Absent: Select Board Rep Daryl Browne

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Weeks at 4 PM. Mr. Weeks started the meeting by taking a roll call attendance.

1. Approval of Minutes

a. 7/19/2021

Corrections: Mr. Lennon said on page 3, "should they instead be thinking about operational analysis?" should be "we," the Committee, not the DPW. "They've established" should be "we've established," because Public Works didn't establish anything. He wanted to substitute "project description" for "blurb." "They've got a concept", it should say "The DPW has a concept." "They don't know what the architect looked at," should be "we don't know." "They shouldn't buy into" should be "We shouldn't buy into."

Mr. Corson asked if the minutes were a paraphrase of the meeting or literal, as he was concerned that they might be changing something that was said verbatim. Ms. Roy said they're a paraphrase.

b. 7/24/2021

Corrections: Mr. Lennon said that "Geophysical Survey" should be "Geotechnical Evaluation." The Planning Board should hear the kind of questions "they're" asking should be "we're" asking, and when "we" get the answers can share the information with the BRC. "They" should also sit down, should be "we" should also sit down and "we" can get answers to "our" questions. "Who" they sent the Raynes Farm letter to, should be "whom." "We" want to reference. In the line "Mr. Weeks will send a letter about DPW Garage," add "and the Town Offices Geotechnical Evaluation." "Their support" of the Raynes Farm project should be "our support." Regarding the fuel island, should "we" allow the DPW to allow, or do "we" recommend. Where it reads "they shouldn't replace it," "it" should be "the fuel island".

**MOTION:** Mr. Corson made a motion to accept the minutes of 7/19/2021 and 7/24/2021 as amended. Mr. Lennon seconded. Ms. Kelly abstained, as she was not present at the meetings. Mr. Weeks said he would vote no, as there was enough ambiguity in the corrections that he would like to see a final draft. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 3-1-1.

## 2. Old Business

### a. Milestone Review

Mr. Leighton said he attended the Planning Board meeting on the CIP on August 26, but he was 15-20 minutes late. At that meeting, Dave Sharples read the letter to the Planning Board from the FAC prior to him getting there. The Planning Board said they appreciated the FAC's work but there were no direct questions. The Planning Board voted to accept the CIP as presented.

### b. FAC Meeting schedule discussion

Mr. Weeks said regarding the Facilities Condition Assessment, the action items were to confirm the proposed operation with the DPW, finalize the request for proposal with Town Manager, present it to the BRC and Select Board, and add it as a CIP item. They've added it as a CIP item, but he has not yet spoken with Jen Perry. Mr. Leighton said he didn't think the FCA RFP would go out until it was approved. Mr. Corson said it is supposed to go out the week of September 13. The delivery date for the final review would be in December. Mr. Leighton said they should speak with Ms. Roy or Mr. Sharples about whether it can go out prior to approval. Mr. Lennon asked what Mr. Weeks meant by "operation," and Mr. Weeks said the assessment system and its annual maintenance. Ms. Roy said Ms. Perry is on vacation until next week.

Mr. Weeks said regarding presenting the proposal to the BRC and Select Board, the date listed is by Sept 30, but he needs to talk to the DPW first. Mr. Lennon said we were going to reach out to the BRC before submitting it. Mr. Corson said we talked about presenting it to a small group before going in front of the full BRC. Mr. Lennon said the goal of meeting with a small group was to ensure that this proposal would meet with a somewhat positive response. Mr. Corson said there's a certain lack of transparency if it's not presented to the whole group [BRC]. Mr. Lennon said we happen to be discussing it with a few members of the BRC, it's not a quorum of either group. It's not a substitute for making a public presentation.

Ms. Roy said the BRC has subcommittees, so the FAC could put in a request to have a subcommittee review the proposal. Mr. Lennon said Mr. Kelly is the Chair and Water/Sewer Subcommittee Chair, and Corey Stevens is the DPW Subcommittee Chair, so those were the two individuals he had thought they would speak with. Mr. Corson said they could invite those members to a Facilities Advisory Committee meeting to discuss it. Mr. Lennon said there's a distinction between a discussion and a meeting. Inviting the BRC to come to an FAC meeting is unlikely to work. They're not avoiding transparency by having this discussion. They will still go publicly to the BRC and say essentially the same things to them. He would like to have some sense of what the initial reaction might be from some influential members of the BRC prior to the public meeting. He asked Ms. Roy if she could ask legal counsel whether an informal meeting would be acceptable. Ms. Roy said yes, and also suggested sending an email

from the FAC to Bob Kelly asking how he [Mr. Kelly] would like it done. Ms. Kelly said that the FAC is so small that more than two people would be a quorum, so if more than two people want to participate in the conversation then it's null and void. Mr. Lennon said he's comfortable with only two people talking to Mr. Kelly or Mr. Stevens. Sending an email to Mr. Kelly is a less effective way to make a first outreach to a co-equal Committee.

**MOTION:** Mr. Lennon made a motion that Ms. Roy to ask the town's lawyer whether the proposed informal meeting is acceptable. Mr. Corson seconded. Mr. Weeks said he doesn't believe Ms. Kelly can vote since she's remote. Ms. Roy said the Town Manager said remote attendees can vote. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Weeks asked Mr. Lennon to also reach out to a member of the BRC via email to propose what the FAC would like to do and how the BRC would like to handle that.

Mr. Weeks asked about the timeline for the item "BRC receives the CIP and the Town budget requests." Ms. Roy said in late October. Mr. Corson said the subcommittee meetings are public, so anyone could go to those and, if allowed by the subcommittee, may comment.

Ms. Roy said she asked the DPW to send someone to the 9/23 FAC meeting to answer questions. Mr. Lennon asked if the DPW would provide written answers, and Ms. Roy said she doesn't think so, because she asked them to come and have a conversation.

c. Public Safety Complex Study Update

Ms. Roy said Mr. Sharples and the Chiefs have been working on the information from Lavallee Brensinger. The scope of work was originally in the \$95,000-100,000 area, but the town wanted more of a cushion, so the firm has gotten it down to around \$80,000 which Mr. Sharples and the Chiefs need to review. Mr. Leighton asked if they could be provided a copy of that scope once it's finalized. Ms. Roy said the current draft includes \$52,000 for team leadership, programming, planning and conceptual design, \$4,800 for MEP/FP engineering, \$4,000 for structural engineering, \$4,500 for civil engineering, \$7,000 for FD and PD operational review and planning input, and \$6,500 for conceptual cost budget prep, for a total of \$78,800, plus an \$1,000 expense allowance, which would bring it to \$79,800. The project scope is that it will compare three options, engage the public, and select a preferred alternative for the town Public Safety services.

d. CIP 2022

Mr. Weeks said this was covered previously.

e. Facility Conditions Assessment

Mr. Weeks said we have to sharpen up the sales pitch. He'd like a 5 minute dry run of the presentation for the BRC and Select Board at the next meeting. Mr. Corson offered to create a draft. The Committee discussed what to

include. Ms. Kelly said she could contribute to the visual aspect of a presentation. Mr. Lennon suggested having a discussion with EXTV about getting information out to the public. Mr. Leighton suggested giving a tour of the facilities and explaining the proposal to get people more involved.

f. Raynes Farm

Mr. Weeks said he sent the letter of recommendation on Raynes Farm to the Select Board, and Mr. Papakonstantis responded. He said that Kristin Murphy told him the LCHIP people were coming to tour the property soon, so they're still working through the grant process.

g. DPW Project List

i. This item was not discussed.

h. Library Update

i. This item was not discussed.

i. ADA Study

Ms. Kelly asked Ms. Roy to follow up with Mr. Sharples about getting into the DACTrak system for seeing the specifics on the ADA study. This plays into the FCA discussion, so it's getting timely. Mr. Lennon asked Ms. Kelly to send him more information on the connection between FCA and ADA. Mr. Corson said the connection is that they're trying to capture disparate studies which have implications to our overall budget and trying to track them in a single location.

j. Committee Interactions

i. This item was not discussed.

k. Alternate Members

i. This item was not discussed.

3. Adjournment

**MOTION:** Mr. Corson moved to adjourn. Mr. Lennon seconded. All were in favor and the meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Joanna Bartell  
Recording Secretary