

PSC Building Committee Meeting

January 28, 2019 6pm Minutes (submitted by David W., slightly edited by John Z.; Rev. #1.)

Present: Steve Holt, Laurie Sanders, Phil Dowling, David White, Steve Gagne, John Zimmerman, Art Pichette, Chris Brooks, Peter Montague

1. Call to order: 6pm. Minutes review by Steve Holt. Vote to accept minutes: unanimous. (11/5/18)
2. Proposal for the development of a flyer. To be typed/layout and submitted.
3. Discussion about members and prospective member interested in taking part in the process.
4. Chief Norris provides notes as to needs for the fire dept. The second bullet: lack of ADA compliance. Concern over the drain in the boiler room and direct leach into the ground. Discussion about how to short term mitigate. Discussion about overall cost estimate to bring the building up to the code.
5. PD needs: Two offices with a reception counter that is ADA compliance and , a private interview area with video record capability. Evidence storage, weapon storage, IT and security that will adequately protect the assets of the town.
6. Discussion about current day to day and a 50 yr. building. Can things be cut out of the larger current project? Discussion about how the project was already reduced twice from the recommended project under the "needs assessment".
7. Phil reviews a conversation with C &B: to limit the building further will cost more in the future. The highway dept. is willing to assist in site work. The delay in construction is estimated to increase the cost +5%/yr.
8. Phil: Propose to FinCom to put design monies into the FY20 so a solid number can be developed. He defined how that can be done under a debit exclusion.

OPM costs can be reduced by the town doing some of the work. Hiring a designer to finalize the plans will cost approximately \$240,000. This will allow the project to move forward with a solid number to send out to bid. Lastly, move to town meeting with a number from a GC.
9. Art: Emphasizes this is a complicated building and the cost might not be reduced from the original request.

Laurie: Comparison projects might be valuable for the public and how close the project will come in price wise. Steve will work on this.

Steve G: Questions spending \$240,000 for design based on the vote that just failed.

Art: Asks Pete for input.

10. Pete: You are asking for the same project and that is hard to push forward. So maybe re-think the entire project.

Steve H: Explained what has already been cut.

Pete: For instances, Ambulance service. Is it needed? Reduce the size (of the Fire Department) fleet. What is needed?

Phil: Discussion about knocking a bay off the building to save. It overall does not help the project on a large enough reduction.

Laurie: It is about due diligence and defining absolute need.

11. Art: Points out how the town residents vote. Delay will cost more.

John: Reducing the footprint again may not help. It is about finding the dollar amount that people are willing to vote for.

12. Laurie: Even if the money is spent (on a plan set that can – is ready to – go out for bid), the plans are good if even turned down (Discussion about design funding).

Chris Norris: If the town moves forward, can the design factor in add-ons to see what will ultimately be funded?

Phil/Laurie: Yes

13. Phil: Reviews the conceptual site plan.

Pete: Emphasizes to reduce the *cost* and not necessarily the *size* of the building. States he can not see supporting a \$240,000 cost for design.

Phil: We are looking to define *hard numbers* to provide to the town.

Pete: Discusses *true cost* as a tax issue, i.e., ancillary costs of a new building and up keep.

14. Steve G: Are we backing off education to the town (outreach)?

Art: No, we need to do *both*. Again, the longer we wait the more this will cost.

Laurie: Suggests a pie chart to see how *little* this expenditure is and where the tax dollars are actually going.

15. Steve G: Are we moving forward on a vote for the project or are we moving toward just the design money?

Continued discussion with no defined answer to Steve's question.

Next meeting: Feb 11th at 6pm.

Motion to adjourn, seconded; passed, unanimous, at 7:45pm.