

## OPM Steering Committee

October 1, 2020 at 6 p.m. via Zoom

OPM Steering Committee Present: Jim Ayres, Daniel Bonham, Kim Boas, Jason Connell, Brenda Lessard, Jean O'Neil, Denise Wickland

Absent: Paul Wetzel

Others: Kevin Chrobak (architect – Juster Pope Frazier), Rob Todisco (P3), William Sayre (Select Board), Alex Kassell (Fire Department), Charlene Nardi (Town Administrator)

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

The Committee moved (W.K.B / B.L.) and voted unanimously to approve the September 17, 2020 minutes.

Survey, structural, systems and hazmat reports were shared with the Committee. Rob Todisco briefly summarized each of them as follows:

**Hazmat:** 250 samples were taken from the floor up to and including the roof. Asbestos, lead and PCBs were found. Asbestos was found in the window caulking and glaze, and in the paper underneath all the hardwood floors which would be expensive to remove. Most asbestos is encased with the only possible friable items (items that can flake off and enter the air) being the electrical panel and interior / exterior insulation boiler components. The only thing not tested is the exterior foundation facing. Estimated cost of mitigation is \$350,000 to \$500,000 for removal. Abatement would need to happen if the building was removed. Mitigation would need to happen if any of the identified items were disturbed.

**Structural:** Generally good condition, steel and wood trusses in good condition, buildup of plastic in ceiling should be replaced with lighter material. If the building is reused for any of the public safety functions, then the building would require significant bracing upgrades. Buildings that house essential / emergency services / response functions have higher thresholds (category 4) for bracing in case of a seismic event because they will be responding to such an event. Reuse for other use such as offices or the senior center requires less bracing although there will still be some needed. Idea is to not change any of the bearing walls and to not touch more than 10% of the bracing frame – “sistering some joists, take down ceiling without touching the asbestos paper under the floor – reinforcing and tying the floor to walls”.

**Overview of Mechanical Systems:** Basically, the same as the Collier's report done in 2015. Most mechanical systems need updating / replacement such as the fire alarm, fire suppression, power service, total replacement of lights, electric panels need to be enclosed, boiler needs upgrades, hot water boiler needs replacement, outside air ventilators may be upgraded or will need replacement and cooling system needs to be added.

The floor plans are at a place that cost estimates can be applied. The footprint is stable just the details inside may change.

Discussed the James building and the value of keeping it versus the value of removing it. If removed, the project has more options to meet wetland mitigation (less wetland mitigation needed?) and design storm water management system, gives more green space, and an opportunity for park to honor HEJ.

Discussed the need to get informal feedback from the Conservation Commission and DEP to determine if the proposal for a constructed wetland in the south west corner of the site would be an acceptable consideration for them. Developing formal plans to submit to the Conservation Commission would be about \$15,000. The Committee doesn't wish to waste that money if DEP and Conservation Commission wouldn't entertain such a proposal for mitigation in that location. Charlene will contact Commission Chair Marci Caplis.

Kevin Chrobak shared the schematic designs:

**Proposal A** – Keep James and build a new PSC on same site (no emergency functions in James): New building would be set at elevation of 523 feet, parking lot and entrance were changed to minimize impervious area, separate vestibule entry areas, direct access to apparatus bay for FD members, brought storage down from the attic area, uses painted fiber board to eliminate need for filed sub-bids. Painting would be required in about 15 years. Floor plan changes were outlined; however, it was noted that changes can still be made within the footprint.

**Proposal B** – Use James ground level for fire and police functions and build an apparatus bay only – elevation of bay building at 523 feet. Area used in James is about 2,600 feet, need to add the sallyport to the James. Would require 4 east-west braces, and 2 north-south braces, need to change the existing grade down from 528 to 523 feet (lower it to allow addition of sally port). Noted this plan is awkward for the operations of the fire department because their apparatus bay is on the other side of the building and not attached. No other configuration is possible because police offices need to be near the sally port. It is good to have someone in the apparatus bay area daily which means a special trip from the fire dept. office to the bay building. Not conducive to efficient operations of either department.

Shared a quick test fit of the Senior Center and Town Offices in the James building which proves that it can be done if that was the route the town decided to take.

**Proposal C** – Removal of the James and a new PSC building – need to see the costs of removal as part of the project. Stated that the cost of the James removal could be up to a million dollars. Committee members would like to see a scenario where the PSC was built in the area where the current school is. Committee would like to see the schematic design of two buildings assuming the removal of the James – 1. Still in the east south corner (how does this affect the space and wetlands / storm water issues 2. Placed where the James building is now. The footprint / size would be generally the same to keep cost in the ballpark of just under 4 million.

Feedback / comments by attendees on the three proposals and reports:

- Concerned with bays stacked – eliminated drive through, but understand cost is a factor
- Overwhelmingly everyone felt that from an operations and cost standpoint the reuse of the James for emergency departments does not make sense and proposal B is not a feasible option.  
– for the cost and work necessary

- Cost to reinforce the James building for fire and police is high and then you don't get the most efficient setup for the department operations for the next 50 years – still feel like we are making do at an expensive cost
- Still like the idea of keeping and reusing the James building for other office use functions but understands that cost will be a dominating factor.
- If HEJ is removed, would like the new building sited so that a new town office / senior center building could be added to that site in the future because the current building is not adequate – town shouldn't be shortsighted in the decision process
- Reports and layouts have been very helpful
- Police and fire folks will still be able to make tweaks on the floor plan and even more detail when the town is in the design phase and the final location proposal has been determined and funded.
- Concern that reuse of the James building is cost prohibitive for every scenario – want to see the cost estimates for each scenario side by side
- Demo is \$500,000 and mitigation of hazard materials (must take place before demolition) is estimated \$350,000 to \$500,000 = estimate of \$1,000,000.
- Side by side comparison of removing the James to keeping the James – need to show those upgrades that would absolutely be needed to keep the building. Town needs to understand keeping it means a commitment to invest in it and that comes at a cost.

Committee felt focusing on Proposal A and C should be the focus. Discussed a limited demolition of the James if the exact location wasn't going to be used – for purposes of a park.

Other comments:

- Truly appreciate the amount of work that has been done over the last 3 months
- Kudos to the architect team and to the OPM Steering Committee and OPM for all the work being done
- Concerns with the light cupola – leaks, insulation, energy issues
- Need to make sure there is plan to handle possible flooding in that area
- Make sure we include appropriate stakeholders at appropriate phases. Noted would like to include Nick Dines in the design phase
- Need to determine if it is feasible for fire trucks to enter and exit the site in the general locations of where the driveway is now.

Next meeting is October 15 at 6 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.