

Building and Facilities Committee
Minutes of 8-11-20; Whipple Hall

Members Present: Bowers, Beasley, Bianchi, Cross, Sherman; Absent:
Cannon, Cardillo, Hogle

Also present Kim Hallquist, Administrator

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

1. *Approval of Minutes*

The minutes of the previous meeting of July 29, 2020 were reviewed by the Committee and were then approved by unanimous consent.

2. *Update on Right to Know Law*

Deferred to a later meeting.

3. *Presentation by Subcommittee*

The Chair called on Phil Sherman, Chair of the Subcommittee, who noted that the Report as presented at the prior meeting had some minor changes, which were outlined in the cover email from Dennis Mires when it was sent out to the Committee.

The Chair informed the Committee that John Cannon and Joe Cardillo had notified him that they were not able to attend this meeting. Joe Cardillo asked the Chair to pass on his comments. Mr. Cardillo stated that he thought the Subcommittee did an outstanding job, and that the Report lays out what can and cannot be accomplished more clearly than in some prior reports and studies. He also stated that the rationale behind earlier Selectmen's decisions to have the Police Station located and expanded at its current location still holds true today – its proximity to the college and to the interstate exits, and its central location in Town. He does feel that the Committee, going forward, should keep under consideration the possible purchase of the abutting property for the possibilities it would add to any final solution.

The Chair then called on Peter Bianchi, who agreed that it was a thorough Report, but was concerned that the population number for New London referred to in the Report was incorrect, noting that the last Town Report stated the population to be 4,397, not 4900; and that the lower figure included Colby Sawyer College students of probably around 1,000, while the current number of students was less. [Colin Beasley offered that he believed the number of students last year was closer to 700.] He was also concerned that the reference to full time

equivalent positions at the Police Department was not clear as to the actual total. After some discussion, Dennis Mires agreed that he would make clear the reference source for population figures used in Town comparisons, and would further clarify the number of positions for New London.

The Chair stated that he had a few questions to pursue, mainly for clarification purposes. First, he noted that Kim Hallquist had suggested a more complete statement of the experience, background and knowledge Dennis Mires, Architects brought to the process, and the formal standards, regulations, etc. considered during the analysis. He thought this was a valid suggestion, so he had turned to the Harriman Report to see how they had handled it. As best he could tell, in reviewing the Harriman Report, there is no clear statement of that nature in the Report. Therefore, he thought it would be of value to address this issue so it is reflected in the Minutes.

In addition to the information which the Chair noted is contained in the Report, he inquired of Mr. Mires about his experience and knowledge related to the design of police stations, and the rules and regulations that apply. His questions are set forth on Attachment A, with Mr. Mires' answers (concisely stated) set forth after each question.

Based on the information in the Report, and his responses to the questions asked, Mr. Mires made clear that he is familiar with the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) Law Enforcement Agency Standards, which for the most part deal with process and procedure, while there is a standard dealing with holding cells; that he had knowledge and background and, in his word with other police departments and safety services in other towns, he acquired additional knowledge and experience related to the construction and program needs of police departments, and of the rules, regulations and standards that apply; that he reviewed the laws, codes, and regulations applicable to this project; that he utilized experienced police department planning as part of the team; that he had revised the prior reports related to the Buker building which had been supplied to him, specifically including the Harriman Report, and the chart in that Report specifying work that Harriman felt should be done; that he reviewed the work referred to in that chart which has been completed, based upon information supplied by Bob Harrington, Director, New London Dept. of Public Works and by North Branch Construction; that work noted in the Harriman chart which is deemed necessary or important but which has not yet been completed, is contained in the proposal submitted, or will be included in the final proposal where appropriate; that he is familiar with Space Needs Assessments

(SNA) referred to in the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) in their *Police Facilities Planning Guidelines* (also referred to in the Harriman Report), and is familiar with those *Guidelines*, and that he performed that SNA in devising the Program set forth in his Report; that he is familiar with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) *Critical Facility Design Considerations*, and that the current Police Facility was in compliance with those recommendations when it was constructed; that he is familiar with the *Americans with Disabilities Act (ACA)*, and considered those requirements in his advice and proposal, including provision for an elevator in that proposal; and that he is familiar with the rules and regulations related to life safety issues, including the need for a sprinkler system, as they pertain to police department design and construction. He further noted that no one had made him aware of any other rules, regulations, standards, or laws which might be applicable.

Finally, he stated that he had applied the knowledge, experience and background all as noted above, and the information he had reviewed related to the Buker building and its needs, to his advice to the Subcommittee, and in his design proposals for the New London Police Department.

The Chair then inquired of Mr. Mires if he believed he had completed the requirements of his contract, other than the review by and presentation to the Selectmen, noting that the final determination of that issue is for the Selectmen to decide, as his contract is with them. Mr. Mires stated that he believed that was correct, and he would meet with the Selectmen as and when requested. Phil Sherman asked if Mr. Mires could include in his Report CAD (Computer Assisted Design) rather than the sketches currently contained in the Report, and Mr. Mires stated that he would do so.

The Chair then inquired of Kim Hallquist whether there were any issues she felt needed to be addressed, who responded that there were not.

Phil Sherman wrapped up the Subcommittee's presentation, again noting that the Subcommittee's task was to fill in the information not included in the Harriman Report, specifically that which related to a redesign of the existing space, to include the Police Department space and the Recreation Department space, and the full use of the basement of Whipple Hall.

The Chair again thanked the Subcommittee, Chief Cobb (*in absentia*), Kim Hallquist, and Dennis Mires for the work which has been done.

4. *Discussion of Mires contract and next steps*

Mr. Mires took leave of the meeting, and there ensued general discussion of the next steps for the Committee. It was agreed that the Subcommittee, or members, would devise a chart listing the economic costs for the Harriman recommendation for a new police station, and for the current Mires design for use of the existing space. This will be available to the Committee at its next meeting. There was also general discussion about non-economic factors related to the location of the police station; and the process for reviewing possible solutions for relocating the Recreation Department.

5. *Other items to come before the Committee*

None.

6. *Action Items.*

None

The next meeting is at Whipple Hall, on Tuesday, August 18, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Bowers, Chair

ATTACHMENT A

Questions addressed to Dennis Mires, Architect at the BFC meeting on August 11, 2020, and his answers.

1. You have stated in your response to the Town's Request for Proposals (RFP) that you have experience with the Sunapee Safety Complex, Brookline Police Dept., Campton Police Dept., Amherst Police Dept., and Manchester Police Dept. Communication Center, as well as the Wilton Fire Dept., the Wilton Emergency Services Building, and the Nashua Public Health Dept.

Did you and your firm have at that time knowledge and experience, and acquire additional knowledge and experience while working on those projects, related to the construction and program needs of police departments, and the rules, regulations and standards that apply to that work?

Yes.

2. Did you apply that knowledge, experience, and background to your review and the advice given related to the New London police department, and to the design proposals you presented?

Yes.

3. Your contract requires that you “review laws, codes, and regulations applicable to [your] services.” (AIA contract Sec. 1.1.1.) Did you do that?

Yes.

Did your advice and design proposal take that review into account?

Yes.

4. The RFP sets forth a Scope of Work for the Proposal, and your Response includes a statement of Fees for each section of that Scope of Work. Paragraph 4. of that Scope of Work requires that you “utilize[e] experienced police department planning as part of the architectural team.”

Did you do so?

Yes.

5. Under your contract you were required to review existing reports related to the Buker building, which includes the Harriman Report, and the work completed to date referenced in that report.

Did you review the chart in the Harriman Report specifying work Harriman stated should be done?

Yes.

Did you review the synopsis of that work which I believe was available to you through the Subcommittee, showing what Bob Harrington, the New London DPW Director, indicated had been completed?

Yes.

Did you take that into account in your advice and in your proposal?

Yes.

Would it be your intention that any of that work which is deemed necessary or important which has not been completed would be taken care of in the final work done, if the proposal is pursued?

Yes.

6. The Harriman Report notes in its Program Summary, Section 3, that a Space Needs Assessment (SNA) is an “accepted step in design and construction of

police facilities by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) as listed in their *Police Facilities Planning Guidelines*.”

Are you familiar with these Guidelines?

Yes.

Did you include your experience with and knowledge of these Guidelines in your advice and in your proposal?

Yes.

Is the Space Needs Assessment in your Report the SNA process referred to in those Guidelines?

Yes.

7. The Harriman Report refers to structural improvements to meet “critical facilities design standards.”

Are you familiar with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) *Critical Facility Design Considerations*?

Yes. The Police Station conformed to the recommendations in that document at the time the addition was added (in 2000); and any issues related to the renovations would be addressed as needed in the final design process.

8. The Harriman Report refers to the *Americans with Disabilities Act* (ADA) and the need for an elevator.

Are you familiar with the ADA?

Yes.

Did you consider ADA requirements in your advice and in your proposal?

Yes.

9. The Harriman Report also refers to life safety issues such as a sprinkler system.

Are you familiar with the rules and regulations relating to life safety issues as they pertain to police department design and construction?

Yes.

Did you take into consideration your knowledge and background as to life safety issues in your advice and in your proposal?

Yes.

10. Were there any other standards, rules, regulations, or laws brought to your attention by anyone that are relevant to your advice and proposal?

No.

11. With regard to your contract, have you fulfilled, to the best of your knowledge, all requirements at to the Scope of Work with the exception of such meetings and review with the Selectmen as they may require?

Yes.