

Fourth Report To Selectmen
Buildings and Facilities Committee
(September 24, 2020)

The Building and Facilities Committee filed a Preliminary Report with the Selectmen, dated September 5, 2019; a Second Report, dated October 17, 2019; and a Third Report, dated March 2, 2020. This Fourth Report addresses issues related to (1) options for the Police Department; and (2) additional matters related to the Recreation Department.

Overview

The Committee reviewed the following options for addressing the stated requirements of the Police Department:

- A. Do nothing at the present time (Scenario A, below);
- B. Make only those changes necessary for safety and security of the premises and the operation of the Department, as determined by the Police Department (Scenario B, below);
- C. Renovate the space now occupied by the Police Department and the Recreation Department to serve the requirements of the Police Department (Scenario C, below); and,
- D. Construct a new building (Scenario D, below).

The Committee has reviewed extensive data and conducted analyses of both previous studies (Mires, 2014; Harriman, 2018), as well as the most recent study (Mires, 2020), in coming to its recommendations. Based on the requirements identified by the Police Department (which are forecasted out to 2037), and the cost factors associated with the options, the Committee:

- A. has concluded that maintaining the status quo – doing nothing – is an option the Selectmen, in consultation with the Police Department, may conclude is appropriate for the short term.
- B. would recommend that changes recommended by the Police Department related to safety and security should be undertaken

as soon as reasonably possible, without regard to any other decisions concerning future actions related to the Department's stated requirements.

- C. would recommend, if and when the Selectmen decide to make an investment in reorganizing and providing more space for the Department, a renovation be undertaken of the current space occupied by the Police Department and that space occupied by the Recreation Department. This would require a relocation of the Recreation Department. The Committee has concluded that substantially all of the Police Department's stated requirements can be met by this space.
- D. would not recommend pursuing the construction of a new police building for the foreseeable future. The financial cost for this endeavor is 3-4 times greater than Scenario C, as discussed below, and brings with it other soft costs that affect the character and tax base of the town.

This Report outlines below the factors considered in Scenario A (do nothing); Scenario B (safety and security investments in the current PD); Scenario C (renovate for the Police Department the space currently occupied by the Police Department and the Recreation Department); and Scenario D (build a new Police Department). The Committee views Scenario A through C as a continuum of decisions that the Selectman can make in reference to specific requests from the Police Department, starting with doing nothing until the Police Department raises specific requests to address the short term needs for safety and security through making available more space for its long term needs. With respect to Scenario C, it is important to recognize that the space analysis, the cost advantages (relative to building new) and benchmarks against other towns of a similar nature all provide supporting data for the Committee's conclusions. Attachment A is the full report representing this analysis and these conclusions.

I. *The Police Department*

Scenario A: Do nothing

The Selectmen have the option of doing nothing at this time. The Police Department has expressed that there are no immediate needs at this time with the possible exception of some safety and security needs, some of which have existed since the expansion of the Buker building in 1999. It is incumbent upon the Police Department to identify to the Selectmen those which it believes are of an immediate need of remediation, and for the Selectmen to assess the need and respond as appropriate.

Scenario B: Safety and Security Investments

The Police Department has noted certain safety and security issues that it believes require remediation. Those noted in the report to the Committee included:

- a sprinkler system and fire safety improvements;
- bullet-proof glass and walls at specified locations; and
- relocation of the electronic equipment now housed in the room containing the water intake system and piping.

The Committee recommends that all safety and security issues requiring immediate attention should be specifically identified by the Police Department to the Selectmen, and that the Selectmen should act on its request regarding remediation of those concerns in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Scenario C: Renovate PD and Recreation Department Space for PD needs

The Police Station Subcommittee met over several months with the architect, Dennis Mires, PA; Chief Andersen and Chief Cobb of the Police Department; and Kim Hallquist, Town Administrator, to gather information, examine the data, and incorporate into their review the stated requirements of the Department. That process established the program requirements of the Department, and determined that those program requirements could be met within that space, with certain exceptions. Attachment B is a presentation that provides a summary of the Mires Report as well as a comparison of this Scenario C and Scenario D (new building).

It is important to recognize that Scenario C meets substantially all of the requirements as identified by the Police Department. Moreover, as identified in the Mires Report (Attachment A), the design presented is simply an example of how the Police Department can be reconfigured. There is the opportunity for changes in the flow and the placement of functions without materially affecting the cost.

The Committee also recommends that the renovation work to Whipple Hall, which the Committee understands to have been considered by the Selectmen, be undertaken simultaneously with the Police Department renovations, or within a short time thereafter. These improvements (sprinklers; sound system, HVAC, window coverings, etc.) would allow the use of Whipple Hall as needed on an infrequent basis for Police Department training when the number of personnel exceeds the space available in Scenario C. These Whipple Hall renovations are necessary to make the facility more hospitable for the many Town functions carried on in Whipple Hall, as well as accommodating the use by the Police Department for training purposes once or twice a year.

Possible addition

After examining the limited added value to do so, and the rough estimated cost to do so, the Committee concluded that proposing an addition to the Buker building (large evidence/vehicle bay; additional space for future line officer) during renovations is not recommended at this time. Should a future need arise, this possibility should be re-examined.

Scenario D: Construct a new building

The Committee ruled out the Harriman Option 6 (tear down the Buker building and construct a new police department building on the abutting McEnrue property). [Note, also: \$600,000 has recently been invested by the Town in the Buker building.] The Committee also considered the similar option of constructing a new building on a separate site. It considered the estimated construction cost established in the Harriman report (\$10M, adjusted for the cost of inflation since the Harriman Report's publication); the potential cost of a new site (\$500K to \$3.5M [Article 3, Town Warrant, March 13, 2018; Planning Board

CIP recommendation, November 12, 2019]); an approximation of site development costs, fit-up costs (Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment) based on the estimate used in establishing costs for Scenario C above; new communication and related equipment; and the other pros and cons related to that option.

The cost of new construction thus ranges from \$11M to \$15M. Compared to Scenario C, which provides for substantially all the stated requirements of the Police Department, with a cost of \$3.3M, the Committee concluded on that basis alone it was not the preferred option. In addition, there were several non-monetary reasons for having the Police Department remain in its present location, and reasons for not constructing a new building in a new location. For example:

- Opportunity loss/costs: loss of taxable property for other development; loss of downtown siting; removal from close contact with Town Green and Colby-Sawyer College; less visibility and ease of access for residents and visitors; impact on character of Town
- Land acquisition and impact on surrounding properties; relocation of communications tower from one of the highest points in Town to an area requiring an even taller tower and its impact on surrounding property owners
- Cost/use penalty for largely unoccupied Buker building; comparable cost to that of recommended renovations to renovate for other, unidentified uses; tendency to expand into empty space without identified need

The Committee recommends against the option of constructing a new building for the Police Department.

II. The Recreation Department

If the Selectmen support the recommendation for renovations to the Police Station to include the area now utilized by the Recreation Department, it will be necessary to relocate the Recreation Department. Based on the current space needs of the Recreation Department, it would require one office for the Director, a work space, and at least one room for indoor activities. There are also

storage needs. (Storage is currently located in the former sewer department building, a storage shed and a portion of a DPW storage shed at the sewer department property; in the work space occupied by the Recreation Department in the Buker building; and in the balcony of Whipple Hall.) Information relating to sq. ft. use and needs for programs, administration, and storage (see, Third Report to Selectmen) was requested of the Recreation Department but has not been provided to the Committee as of this date.

The Committee reviewed several options for the space needs of the Recreation Department. There may be other options the Selectmen have in mind. To assist the Selectmen in this process, the Committee notes the following options it has considered:

A. SAU space

This, in conjunction with the option of partnering with the Outing Club, set forth below, is the Committee's preferred course to pursue, subject to its continued availability and the negotiation of terms with the SAU. The Committee met with SAU (Kearsarge Regional School District) Superintendent Feneberg and concluded that the space available at the SAU fulfilled the current functions of the Rec. Dept. more adequately than its offices at the Buker building. It also provides access to the SAU gym and playing fields and is in close proximity to a significant segment of the population it serves at the elementary school. This option would require:

- negotiation with SAU and the KRSD Board to determine the reconfiguration of the space available;
- the identification of costs associated with modifying the space, including a separate entrance door and means of access to the bathroom facilities in the hallway;
- lease terms, most notably cost, as well as negotiations with the SAU and Outing Club as to shared use of the facilities (gym) and fields; and other matters which may arise in pursuing this option.

The Recreation Department has been asked to provide data on the number of Town residents utilizing the programs, and the number of non-residents

utilizing the programs. This data has not been provided as of the date of this Report. This is believed by the Committee to be pertinent to any discussions with the SAU about use of its space, since use of the programs by other Town residents would support a request to the KRSD Board for use of space in the SAU building.

The Committee is prepared to pursue the details of this option with the SAU, if the Selectmen agree it is the proper course of action.

B. Outing Club

- Outsource function to Outing Club.

This is an option for possible consideration by the Selectmen, but is not one considered by the Committee.

- Partnership with Outing Club to share space at their proposed new facility.

The Committee met with Ben Drummond, President, and other members of the Outing Club on March 12, 2020. The Outing Club is open to this option, but is only in the beginning stages of formulating plans for a new facility and executing fundraising. Thus, this option would likely not be available at the time of renovations to the Buker building. It is in part for this reason that the Committee believes that a two-step process is necessary: first relocate the Recreation Department to the SAU building, and second, move the function to the new Outing Club facility, if that is then available; or, if the Outing Club facility is not available, pursue another alternative.

C. New building/site

The Committee does not believe this is an option that should be pursued. Given the options above, the anticipated cost compared to the space required would not seem to justify this option.

D. McEnrue property

The Committee discussed the possible purchase (if it is available for purchase) and renovation of the McEnrue property abutting Buker to meet Recreation Department needs. It was not unanimous in its conclusions. The advantage would appear to be Town ownership of that property for initial use by

the Recreation Department and then relocating the Recreation Department at some future date, making that property available for other Town uses. The disadvantages include that it would remove one more residence from the downtown area, detracting from its residential atmosphere; would require a fairly substantial investment to renovate it to meet Recreation Department needs, including handicapped accessibility; and the location is not conducive to the types of activities contemplated by the programs offered (other than proximity to Whipple Hall for such activities as are now offered there), nor the parking and vehicle traffic that would ensue on Seamans Road.

III. Other

The Committee had to postpone its originally scheduled meeting (on March 19, 2020) with DPW Director Bob Harrington, and that remains on its list of agenda items. It continues to discuss the issue of a Town building inspector; and will at future meetings discuss the concept of a building facilities manager. To date, a records retention policy recommended by the Committee in its First Report has not been adopted. When this has been formalized and actions taken pursuant to it, the Committee may revisit the various expressions of concern regarding records storage space which have been raised in this process.

Respectfully submitted,
For the Committee
Robert Bowers, Chair

Attachment A

Subcommittee Report

memo

To: Buildings and Facilities Committee

From: New London Police Department Subcommittee

Date: August 18, 2020

Re: New London Police Department Subcommittee

Attached please find a report prepared by Dennis Mires, P.A., setting forth a plan for renovation of the existing police department and recreation department space within the existing Buker and Whipple Hall structure.

The report is the result of work performed by Dennis Mires, hired by the Select Board based on the recommendation of the Buildings and Facilities Committee; the subcommittee worked in concert with Mr. Mires over several months in the data collection, analysis and presentation, For reference purposes, it is important to re-emphasize, in addition to Mr, Mires' qualification as represented in his response to the town issued RFP, Mr Mires further qualified:

- His familiarity with the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) Law Enforcement Agency Standards;
 - His knowledge and background with other police departments and safety services in other towns where he has developed further 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 reviewed 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 that had already been completed in the building, based upon information supplied by Bob Harrington, Director, New London Dept. of Public Works and by North Branch Construction;
 - 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;
- 2
- 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.

The attached is not a recommendation, but rather is a report that provides further clarity on what functions requested by the police department can be accommodated within the walls of the existing police department and recreation department space, and at what cost.

The subcommittee, consisting of Philip Sherman, Chair, Richard Cross and Colin Beasley, recognizes and appreciates the input and contributions of Chief Emily Cobb and Town Administrator Kimberly Hallquist.

(Mires Report previously submitted to Selectmen)

Attachment B

New London Police Department
Scenario Comparisons

Buildings & Facilities Committee Town of New London

Final Draft

September, 2020

PD Scenario Comparison

		2020 Mires Report – Renovate Buker	2018 Harriman Report: New Building (Option #6: 10/15/18 add.)	Notes
1	Program Elements Provided (Net / Gr SF)	6795 / 9351	10,194 / 13,252	• 2020 Program reflects current / future NLPD's identified needs less 677 SF (See Rows 5&6).
2	Cost for Program Elements Provided	\$3.3M	\$10.1M	• Costs assume decision in March, 2021 • Harriman 2018 Cost adjusted 4% compounded over 3 yrs.
3	Cost / Gr. Sq. Ft	\$352.90	\$762.15	• All inclusive
4	Tax Rate Impact	\$83.32 yr for 20 years	• \$241.84 / yr for 20 years	• Example Provided: \$400k Assessed Value & 20 yr Bond at 3.5%
5	Program Elements / Costs Not Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated Breakroom: Assume 200 GSF • Supervisory Expansion: Assume 125 GSF • Larger Training Room: Provided In Whipple • Evidence Vehicle Garage: Assume 352 GSF (AKA 2nd Sally Port) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Acquisition • Cost Penalty associated with Buker Building Vacancy (up to 85% Unoccupied based on current occupancy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition under Mires Study would impact parking and costs, needing additional analysis: Evidence Vehicle Garage size needs assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But – Other solutions exist • Land acquisition & occupancy penalty would increase New Building option; Tax revenue impact analysis required.
6	Total (Would be) Program	7472 / 10,311	10,194 / 13252	• 2020 Program reflects all current / future NLPD's identified needs
7	Dependencies	Relocation of Recreation Department	Depending on Location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential loss of meadow, or • Potential loss of residential street front & relocation of Recreation Dept. 	• Impacts would need to be factored into costs
8	Other Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to town, interstate and College • What do we want New London's "Town" character to be? 		

PD Scenario Comparison Additional Data

	PD Analysis 2020	Harriman Report Stand Alone PD (Build New)	Notes
Other Cost Items Included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved sound separation between offices, meeting, and public spaces • Modify duct work - reduces sound transfer between spaces • Exterior security: Reduce window areas in certain locations, provide bullet resistant walls and windows on the exposed facades on the upper level • Upgrade Electrical service, 3 phase • New access security system inside • Modify security camera system to reflect new configuration • Modify Electrical & Data infrastructure for new configuration • Budget construction extra time to manage work / keep PD in operation • Domestic water service off sprinkler service: consolidates water works and eliminate service in basement of Whipple • Provide sprinkler system throughout upper level • Provide floor drain in Sally port and oil/gas separator to site storm drain system for washing of PD vehicles • Beltronics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Communications Tower • New Radio Antennas • New Connections to Dispatch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included • Not Required • Included • Included • Included • Included • Not Required • Included • Not Required • Included • Unknown 	

* Note: While outside the scope of the study, in the subcommittee's review of the use of Whipple Hall, it became clear that its utility as a location for community use is compromised due to the lack of air conditioning and appropriate audio / visual equipment. **The AC / HVAC and AV needs of that space should be evaluated; further, a sprinkler system also should be assessed in order to protect both the NLPD and Whipple Hall Functions.**

3

Town Comparisons

Town	Population/ Seasonal	Police Station Sq. Footage	# Police Uniforms	# Police Uniforms/ 1,000 population	GSF/Uniform	Building and Town Characteristics
Brookline	5,298	6,356	9FT 1FTE	1.89	560	- No Fitness - Shared Training w/ EMS
*Moultonborough	2,077	8,500	10FT 1FTE	2.74	773	- Shared with Fire - Fitness - Training - Lockers - Seasonal Impacts
New London	4,490	9,351	9FT 1FTE	2.23	935	Includes: - Fitness - Training - Dispatch - 1 Car Sally Port - College - Hospital - Park & Ride, @89/11 Crossroads - Seasonal Impacts
North Hampton	4,453	10,000	12FT	2.70	833	- No Fitness - No Training - Beaches - RT 1 - Seasonal Impacts
Sunapee	3,432	7,220	5FT 2FTE	2.04	1,031	- Includes Fitness - 2 car Sally Port - Training shared with fire - Seasonal Impacts

<p>Legend:</p> <p>FT= Full Time FTE = Full Time Equivalent (accounting for part time officers) GSF = Gross Square Footage EMS = Emergency Medical Services</p>	<p>* Moultonborough is older data since we have not yet been able to update however building remains same Population figures are from the State using US census data</p>
--	---

6

Mires / Harriman Program Comparison

		Harriman (10/15/18 Add. - Through 2037)	PD Subcommittee A.2.1	Difference	Difference
	Shared Building Prog. w/ Whipple	460	0	- 460	Partially provided through shared Break Room; otherwise, not provided
1	Administration	1048	1053	+ 5	Kitchenette in breakroom
2	Records	480	202	- 278	Significantly reduced w/ Scanned records; other active files in offices
3	Communications	476	448	- 28	
4	Patrol	2632	1867	- 765	No roll call room; storage, processing and holding more than existed
5	Training	1128	619	- 509	30 person training room not included; use Whipple
6	Investigations	344	120	- 224	Staff Officer under Admin / Hard interview elsewhere
7	Property & Evidence	912	428	- 484	Evidence vehicle space not programmed within footprint
8	Legal Prosecutor	140	0	- 140	Done by staff / accommodated elsewhere
9	Common Facilities	2174	1610	- 564	Smaller breakroom / Smaller fitness / Toilet rooms not counted twice
10	Other General	200	46	- 154	Support accounted for in program spaces
11	Facility Support	200	402	+ 202	
	Totals	10194	6795	- 3399	

7

Program Detail By Function

Category	Function	Existing	Prog. Req.	A.2.1
		Square Feet		
1	Admin.			
	Administrator	120	140	140
	Chief	145	200	272
	Lt. / Det.	160	166	253
	Conference Rm	0	400	388
2	Records	311	148	202
3	Comm.	289	450	448
4	Patrol			
	Sgt / CPL	112	112	112
	Patrol Work Sp	411	192	276
	Booking	394	400	412
	Adult Holding	94	94	94
	Juvenile Holding	47	47	47
	Juvenile Ante	61	61	61
	Hard Interview	82	82	82
	Trap	38	38	38
	Secure Vestibule	108	108	108
	Sallyport	587	587	457
	Sallyport Storage	0	0	130
	Misc. Adjustment	69	221	45
5	Training	864	500	563
	Armory	43	80	56

Category	Function	Existing	Prog. Req.	A.2.1
		Square Feet		
6	Investigations			
	Hard Interview Rm	0	80	96
7	Prop. & Evid.	237	372	428
8	Legal Pros.	0	0	0
9	Common Fac.			
	Vestibule	83	83	83
	Lobby	226	250	326
	Soft Interview Rm	80	80	120
	IT	107	120	120
	Break	150	120	Use Conf.
	Men's Locker	143	320	332
	Women's Locker	123	200	218
	Fitness	385	450	371
	Staff Toilet	0	56	64
	Misc Adjustment	92	164	
10	Other Gen	71	140	46
11	Facility Spt			
	Mechanical	104	104	104
	Electrical	114	114	114
	Janitor	25	50	69
	Utility	36	36	120
	Total	5911	6765	6795

8