

Fire and Ambulance Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday November 16th, 2023
10:00am – 12:00pm Select Board room - Townhouse

Members Present: Carl Mabbs-Zeno, Tony Cassady, Carol Nelson, Sarah Steinberg Heller.

Not Present: Mandy Sliver

Staff: Seth MacLean, Chief Ed Walker, Gretchen Rae

Selectboard Liaison: Bill Taylor

Visiting:

Keith Kelley CM – Harvey Construction

Jason LaCombe – SMP Architecture

Gloria Morrison – Director of the Peterborough Food Pantry

On Zoom: Marisa DiBiasco – Hoyle Tanner & Paul Leveille – Resilient Buildings Group

Energy Committee Members Present: Emily Manns & Bruce Tucker

All in attendance referenced within will be referred to by their first names.

- Meeting Minutes Review and Approval:
 - *Motion:* Bill made a motion to approve draft meeting minutes from 9/28/23, 10/19/23, 10/26/23 with revisions as discussed.
 - *Vote:* Tony Seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

- January 4th Budget Review Meeting Reschedule
 - Tabled until Mandy is available to discuss an alternative date.

- **Site Plan Updates** / Conservation Commission Update – Marisa, projected the updated Hoyle Tanner designs.
 - Site layout hasn't changed much, just fine tuning. Will be advancing a 60% plan set with construction details for Harvey to begin pricing costs.
 - Met with the Conservation Committee and held discussions of wetland buffer impacts, storm water drainage and parking areas. Will be working with landscape architects to enhance the buffer with plantings.
 - Area in front of the Community Center:
 - Option 1: Original plan of cutting out the horseshoe drive-up
 - Option 2: Entrance at existing DPW dirt drive off Elm St. Drawbacks included increased costs without a lot of improvement.
 - **Option 3:** Back to horseshoe concept with modified parking for the Fire Station Building.
Carl asked how many parking spaces are lost by returning to a modified horseshoe shape for Food Pantry parking. Approximately 7 spaces.
Carol asked about the gravel of the Food Pantry driveway. The goal is to reuse as much material already on site other than the expenses of paving brought to this project. She is concerned about safe access with a continued gravel driveway and would prefer a paved drive. Sarah disagrees that people would prefer pavement over gravel and Gloria offered the opinion that she is the only one on the Food Pantry

board who would prefer pavement over the current gravel. Carl asked Keith how difficult it would be to pave the driveway during the Community Center renovations in the future. Keith stated that the current gravel is a good base for future paving. 90-degree angle needed for joining the drive to the Fire Station Parking areas. Will be one-way traffic, highlighted by a do not enter sign with a stop sign as well.

- Carl reminded Marissa that a **painted line** needs to be added to the pedestrian walkway up and around the Fire Station Building by way of the DPW access road. Foot traffic needs to be directed away from the front of the apparatus bays along Elm St.
 - Discussion of necessary sidewalks and crosswalks on Elm St. as walking and biking traffic is considered during the planning of this area.
 - Emily Manns added to the discussion to remember that the Master Plan Steering committee is promoting increased foot traffic in town and the removal of any section of sidewalks wouldn't be looked upon favorably.
 - Ed added that placing a crosswalk too near the apparatus turning areas of the driveway isn't safe for pedestrians.

- **Architectural Updates** – Jason projected the newest floor plan design for the committee to view.
 - No significant architectural changes have been made but the full engineering team is rolling.
 - 1,000sf for training room, equipment layout for fitness room = workable but not necessarily comfortable depending on the number of people using the equipment at the same time.
 - Anticipating a 100KW PV array with some battery storage. The mezzanine area is being considered as the location for the mechanics of this system.
 - Vehicle chargers were considered for the fire equipment, but the energy needs were 3x times that of regular vehicles, so plans have been downsized anticipating vehicle charging having a sooner installation date.
 - Decon space modified to have the sprinkler system on the outside of the building, waiting for flow test reruns.
 - Added a window to the fitness room. Carl mentioned a conversation with Chief Guinard about the police being able to use this fitness room as well.
 - Tony asked about the second electrical access point. Jason answered that the primary electrical will go to the generator area on the main floor first and a second service is being planned in the mezzanine space.
 - Carl clarified after speaking with Ed that the number of bunk spaces was conceived on the premise of single occupancy but currently has 2 bunks for when there are 6-8 staff needing overnight accommodations for ambulance services.
 - Carl asked Keith if he thought with this current design that we are still on budget and the answer was “sure”. But more difficult decisions need to be made with the mechanical system changes being considered before bringing the design costs to the meeting in January.

- **Energy Model Update** – Paul joined via Zoom with the latest energy model.

- Mostly minor tweaks to previous versions with one major change with electric demand costs. The previous model was based on \$9.22 per KWH for demand charges but with increased updated information, the demand charge is \$19.20.
- Options A (ground source heat pumps), B (water source heat pumps with gas boiler and cooling tower), C (water source heat pumps with electric boiler and cooling tower) & D (water source heat pumps with biomass boiler and cooling tower) data for the building envelope and filtration systems are staying the same.
- Daylight Dimming was removed from the model because this is not an option if the clear exterior material is exchanged for non-see-through material in the tower & apparatus areas, allowing daylight to enter the building in these areas as previously proposed.
- Wood pellet burning offers thermal renewal credits, unique to New Hampshire. Public Utilities paying you to produce green power. (Utility Incentive)
- The smaller solar array will produce 110,000 KWH per year, about half the electric need will be produced onsite. If the larger array was installed, nearly 100% of the electric need of this building could be produced.
- Graphs and charts provided for each option.
- The Energy Committee had questions and Paul answered via previous emails. (actual demand figures, battery storage needs are still being researched)
- Tony asked about each option comparing mechanical systems and how similar are the comparison parameters. i.e. flooring insulation depth, wall material, window types, etc.
 - The committee asked Paul to equalize the data across all 4 options.
 - Jason asked that for reporting purposes, we should only review Options A & D with operating and construction costs.
- Sarah shared her concern of continued research being done on option A, Ground Source heat pumps if this committee has already decided to pursue option D, water source heat pumps.
 - Tony answered that the water source system was chosen because it could most easily be converted to ground source if funding can be secured at some point in this process. And Carol further explained that option A is the least expensive to run but most expensive to construct.
- Jason said that any battery storage could be built into the design in the mezzanine area. Paul said that the batteries allow not only back-up power but also set-up to reduce the energy demand costs, depending on the day's need.
 - Jason confirmed that the batteries will be broken out as a separate cost by Harvey as part of the project proposal in January which will be an a-la-cart style format.
- Seth shared that he had a conversation with Steve Walker after receiving more information from Keith on the earlier geothermal installation cost estimates. Steve and Keith do not need to fit in a meeting to discuss the details of the estimates.
- Jason feels comfortable with the fast-approaching January deadline because his team is moving forward with option D only and staying mindful that option A is continued within the energy modelling process but only for possible "future" system upgrades.


- **Other Topics:** Group comments
 - Bill expressed concern with the decision-making hierarchy on the building's mechanical system details and not having a solid hold on costs being driven up by continued work on systems already known not to be within the budget cap. Is the building committee yielding their appointed responsibilities to this project to others not on this committee?
 - Carl noted that the Building Committee hasn't lost any oversight of the project and no final decisions have been made.
 - Emily offered that the Energy Committee is not interested in creating delays in the process and fully supports this building project. The goal of their committee is to help the building committee find the best energy plan for this community for many years to come. Upfront time is required to analyze the many options and configurations including life-cycle costs against construction costs but not meant to hold-up progress or tight timelines.
 - Bill asked if the tax incentives / rebates being discussed are truly viable for this project planning process to be realistically considered.
 - Emily answered that the cash back is 30% of eligible projects with a very high probability of being awarded funding rebates.
 - Bill then asked if local solar contractors will be considered for this project. Emily reminded the group that Revision Solar is "local", originating from New Hampshire and that our Peterborough contractor, South Pack Solar, is swamped with work. Bill didn't want to exclude Greg Blake (owner South Pack Solar) as more solar array options are considered.
 - Ed asked Emily what the definition is of "definite" when it comes to being awarded cash back funding. He pointed out that 1/6th of the entire building project takes the energy consumption systems into consideration so the level of "definite or guarantees" is important.
 - Bruce said that the grant progress isn't competitive rather if the project meets the qualifications, then funding is made available.
 - Tony suggested that this discussion continue in January when the committee is tasked with making firm project decisions while keeping within the budget cap parameters. Jason confirmed this line of thinking.
 - Sarah voiced continued concern of this conversation derailing the focus of the January meetings. Carl seconded this concern.
 - Jason and the group agreed that convening a preliminary work session before this project goes in front of the Budget Committee and The Select Board in January is necessary and as soon in January when the initial costs estimates are ready from Harvey. It was discussed if this preliminary meeting should be public or non-public to work out continued sticky points and budget issues.
 - Tina Kriebel made a comment on the importance of communication and having the messaging details hashed out and agreed upon before going into a public meeting. The committee will need to look like a cohesive group and have a solid handle on budget issues where hard decisions have had to be made. The committee must narrate the story of the project and not let public opinions invade the conversation and change the storyline.
 - Sarah, Bill and Carol all expressed thoughts on a public vs. nonpublic work session.

- Seth pointed out that this committee is ultimately tasked with making the hard decisions with focus on keeping at the 12.1 million budget cap and not having the external pressure from special interest groups may help the committee stay focused.
 - Keith explained for the January work session, Harvey will be presenting a set of schematic documents with an additional portion for the solar and battery estimates. That is when the budget gets discussed and based on what the quotes are, the committee can then start to decide what stays and what gets exchanged to stay within the budget.
 - Seth offered a clarifier about the intent of the early January meeting and before the presentation to the Budget Committee and the Select Board: *From my perspective, we need to finish that meeting knowing if we can get there or we can't. We can confidently say we can get there; we know there will be tough decisions to make along the way, but we will have a project on budget to bring to Town Meeting in May 2024. OR no we can't, we are too far off the budget, and we need to take more time before taking the project to the voters.*
- **Last Public Session Debrief:** Group comments already addressed earlier in this meeting.
 - Museum space – Carl shared that he isn't aware that there's anyone coming forward to direct alternative funding options for the museum space project costs.
 - Mechanical systems
 - Entrance to the PCC
 - The Peterborough Rotary has asked Seth to come speak about the building project as a next community outreach event.
 - Carl is updating the info brochure for handouts.
 - Carl has spoken with the Fire staff and there's no concern about driving fire trucks onto or off of Elm St on or off Union St.
 - Carol reminded the group that a conversation with the State DOT needs to happen for a streetlight at the Elm St. and Rt. 101 interchange for fire traffic. Seth intends to reach out to them when we are closer to a 60% design.
- A January work session meeting to be scheduled once Mandy can be consulted for a date.

Meeting Adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gretchen Rae, Business Manager DPW

BUILDING COMMITTEE Co-CHAIR: Carl Mabbs-Zeno


Signature