

Building and Facilities Committee

Minutes of 12-3-20; Zoom

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

Also present: Kim Hallquist, Administrator

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. The roll was called, and each member present stated that no one else was in the room with that member.

*1. Approval of Minutes*

The minutes of the previous meeting of November 19, 2020, were reviewed by the Committee and were then approved unanimously.

*2. Discussion of DPW Presentation/Report; Transfer Station*

Transfer Station

The Chair noted that the members had received the Transfer Station Study, and had reviewed it. (Incorporated by reference, and available at the Town website.)

Discussion ensued, and questions were raised, including: the stated need for a new recycling building, and its recommended size; bale storage, including the possibility of removing the cottage that is on the site and replacing it with a larger building for that and other purposes; whether the clothes recycling bin has been removed and will no longer be used; and the data regarding tonnage of recyclables and the population projections. Mr. Sherman noted that the Study assumed it was a good idea to bring the brush and metal recycling operation to the transfer station site, but it didn't enlarge upon that conclusion. Mr. Harrington noted it would be more efficient to have all services at one site, and that there were other issues related to having a person on site at the stump dump during operation. These concerns would be alleviated by having all operations at the transfer station. He also noted that the "public" wants even more recycling, and more open hours at the stump dump. There is not room in the current configuration to add another trailer for cardboard recycling,

Mr. Beasley suggested that the discussion should be related to an overarching plan and a determination of the "breaking point" of current operations that should be addressed.

With regard to Option 1, Kim Hallquist noted that discussions with the State had not been pursued. There was general discussion that this might not come to fruition, but should be pursued by the Selectmen in order to ascertain if that option is available.

With regard to Option 2, Peter Bianchi noted that there did not appear to be sufficient land at the transfer station to include the brush and metals recycling operation. Bob Harrington estimated that the actual portion of the stump dump property used for those purposes was about three acres. (Study diagram [C-2] states that the transfer station site is 4.8 acres, with probable wetlands.) He also noted that incorporating the amount of traffic and the vehicle size (often pickup and larger trucks, and vehicles with trailers) utilizing the stump dump would exacerbate the traffic issues. Phil Sherman suggested that there were two distinct parts to the discussion, the transfer station/recycling operation, and the brush metal recycling operation, and they should be examined individually.

The idea of single source recycling was raised for consideration and rejected. John Cannon raised the question of whether acquiring the State land proposed would actually provide enough additional space for brush and metals to be moved to that site, although it would provide additional space for more storage and better traffic flow. Bob Harrington informed the Committee that although there is currently not a lot of revenue from recycling, one of its main values is not incurring costs related to contracting for those materials to be taken to a landfill. He also noted that the glass is recycled by New London and is a good and cost-effective means of disposing of glass. He stated that one of the biggest problems at present is tractor trailer movement within the site, and extra room for trailers needed for materials.

The Committee was divided on the issue of transferring the brush and metal (including “white” metal) recycling to the transfer station site if space allowed. Mr. Harrington was in favor of doing so if possible in order to consolidate the system, to avoid the necessity of person being assigned to the current stump dump (which splits a “team of two” for other DPW work), and because there is no running water at the stump dump and this is an issue which has been raised by the State.

There was discussion of the proposed costs, and what that cost would be in present dollars, and it was concluded that this subject needed to be addressed in a comparative way with other proposed building and facilities projects in Town. This will be addressed at the Committee's next meeting, on December 10, 2020.

The Committee also discussed the option for a proposed new site at a new location, and the possibility of regionalization with other close-by towns. The consensus, including that of Bob Harrington, was that the option of regionalization was not worth pursuing. The option of a new site should not be pursued at the present, but was not ruled out.

Both Option 1 (acquire State owned property) and Option 2 (totally restructure the recycling operation on the existing site owned by the Town) would likely necessitate wetlands remediation. Overall, the Committee felt that the recycling and trash disposal needs could be met at the current Transfer Station site. There was also consensus that Options 1 and 2 need further discussion and would be taken up in the context of reviewing priorities at the meeting of December 10, 2020.

### DPW Site

Peter Bianchi inquired as to whether more space on the DPW site was needed, and Bob Harrington responded that at the present there was not a need for more space. The proposed salt shed could be constructed on the site in available space. Peter Bianchi also inquired as to inside space available for storing the roller and equipment attachments, currently kept outside. Bob Harrington stated that if the transfer station situation were resolved in a way that allowed recyclable storage there, it would free up space currently used for that purpose at the DPW site, and inside storage of those items could be accomplished. He also stated that the sewer department spare pump needed to be housed in a heated building, and that the large garages for trucks, etc., were not heated. As to the sewer building property, he suggested that a three bay, low-cost garage, with one heated bay, would allow for heated storage of the pump and other uses.

Bob Harrington briefly discussed the need for a bunk room and showers, and the issue of meeting space; but stated that the resolution of the transfer

station question, to include removing recyclables from the DPW site, takes priority over those concerns.

### 3. *Old Business*

The Chair noted that the Committee had not assigned to a subcommittee the review process for work proposed at Whipple Hall. He then assigned this task to the existing Police Station Subcommittee. He reported that Rip Cross had visited the SAU space, and would provide North Branch with the necessary information to give a quote on required work there. He also reported that he had presented to the Selectmen at its meeting on November 30, 2020, the Committee's request for funding of a professional to advise on the appropriate actions for Whipple Hall renovations and P.D. safety improvements. This meeting related to whether that request should be included in the proposed 2022 budget. The Selectmen decided not to add the amount requested to the 2022 budget, but would use funds from the current budget, if the request is approved. The request, along with the other requests made in the Memoranda of November 13, and November 24, 2020, will be taken up by the Selectmen at its meeting on December 7, 2020, at 6:00 p.m., by Zoom. He reminded the Committee that he would be making a presentation to the Citizens Advisory Committee on Saturday morning, December 5, at 7:30 a.m. Colin Beasley will assist by presenting the slides he has earlier prepared regarding the Subcommittee and Committee analysis and comparisons.

The Chair then reported that he had been informed by Kim Hallquist, Town Administrator, that she, Bob Harrington, Bob Brown, and Peter Hogle had met on the issue of possibly acquiring the land abutting the DPW. They have concluded that it would be wise to pursue this possible purchase, and will be making that recommendation to the Selectmen, possibly at its meeting on Monday, December 7, 2020.

After discussion, it was moved, seconded, and voted by roll call, one opposed,

VOTED: To support the Town Administrator to investigate and gather the facts related to a possible purchase of the land described by the Administrator which abuts the DPW property.

The Chair inquired regarding the Committee's wishes for future meetings and suggested they should include: Priorities re buildings/facilities; P.D. input re Stahlman building; P.D. input re seeking resolution of outstanding differences; Rec. Commission/Outing Club joint meeting; Rec. Dept. relocation; Admin. Issues re additional space, safety and security, use of Syd Crook room for offices; and overall plan for future building/facilities management, review, action. The Committee decided not to request input at this time from the Solid Waste Committee regarding its rationale and analysis related to its request for the Transfer Station. After discussion, it was decided to discuss priorities at the next meeting, December 10, 2020.

4. *Other items to come before the Committee*

Peter Bianchi reported that the Fiscal Panel appointed by the Selectmen to look at fiscal issues had met and was meeting biweekly. It will formulate guidelines and policies for the Selectmen's consideration related to fiscal issues.

5. *Action Items.*

- a. Chair to request that possible acquisition of State land, as set forth in the Transfer Station Study be pursued by the Selectmen in order to ascertain if that option is available.

The next meeting is by Zoom, on Thursday, December 10, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Bowers, Chair