

Building and Facilities Committee

Minutes of 3-11-21; Zoom

Members Present: Bowers, Sherman, Beasley, Cross, Heglund, Bianchi, Cardillo, Cannon

Others present: Chief Emily Cobb, Kim Hallquist, Administrator, and members of the public

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 February 25, 2021, were reviewed by the Committee and were then approved unanimously.

2. Reports

a. Police Station Subcommittee: The Chair noted that as a Report of a Subcommittee, the Report on the Buker Building Update and Stahlman Building Analysis (attached to and made a part of these Minutes) is before the Committee for consideration without a formal motion to accept it. He noted that after the presentation, he would call upon the members of the Committee to offer comment or ask questions, followed by calling on Chief Cobb for any comments or input, and then will ask those who are in attendance whether they wish to make any comments. The Chair then asked Mr. Sherman to present the Report and suggested that questions and discussion be held until he had done so. Mr. Sherman then presented the Report, highlighting certain aspects of it.

Discussion followed. Mr. Bianchi stated that he was impressed with the thoroughness and detail shown in the Report of the Subcommittee and thanked them for the time and analysis they put into the Report. Other members agreed, and thanked Mr. Sherman for the great job he has done as Chair of the Subcommittee.

The Chair then introduced Chief Cobb and noted that he had asked her to present any specific concerns with the Report beyond the general statement she supplied to the Subcommittee which is contained in the Report. Chief Cobb said she still had a lot of concerns about having the P.D. at the Buker building, specifically mentioning safety concerns. The concerns she the raised were:

1. The sally port is near the personal cars of employees;

2. Security for the generator and the personal vehicles of employees;
3. She feels that exiting onto Seamans Road is a problem and the proposed solutions of removing parking spaces to provide appropriate sight-line distance for exiting, or installing appropriate traffic controls, is not satisfactory;
4. She doesn't feel the parking is adequate;
5. She is concerned about how the P.D. would continue to operate during any construction;
6. She worries that because some rooms are in the "basement" there may be flooding problems even though the earlier water infiltration issues have been remedied;
7. The evidence room is not large enough;
8. There is a need to store impounded vehicles and it is not practical to store such vehicles off-site due to issues related to chain of custody of evidence and she does not feel that Mr. Sherman's proposal for a change to the original "Mires proposal" to include a second bay in the sally port is viable;
8. She believes it is unsafe to walk detainees around the outside of the building to the holding cells which are in the lower level, and that it is not appropriate to bring detainees to the holding cells through the Department due to security issues.

She concluded that she "cannot get on board to recommend" the proposal for renovations to the Buker building. She doesn't see room for growth in the Buker renovations as presented.

She further noted that she had spoken with Beltronics about the communications tower, and Beltronics has told her that an additional 20-foot extension to the existing 60-foot tower at Buker is recommended, and that the Stahlman property would require an 80-foot tower.

Mr. Bianchi noted that it is his understanding that a number of police departments do indeed transport detainees through their departments to their holding cells. Chief Cobb responded that what other departments may do doesn't affect her concern that to do so here is both impractical and inadvisable. Mr. Beasley asked whether the list of concerns Chief Cobb had recited at this meeting constitutes her entire list of concerns, and that there won't be others raised. Chief Cobb responded that she doesn't believe every spot on the site should be

reserved for the Police Department – there is a “human element” to the Department that she feels should include the availability of public parking.

Mr. Sherman noted that of the issues she had raised at this meeting there were issues that had never been raised in the year and a half or so during which discussions had taken place, including the long and many deliberations at the Subcommittee in which she had fully participated. He expressed concern that she was making resolution a moving target by introducing new concerns each time other concerns are addressed. He noted that during the Subcommittee deliberations, she had provided to the Subcommittee the personnel numbers for determining parking space needs for the Department, and that the number they came up with was 12, with her full participation in that conclusion. He noted that there are 18 parking spaces on the site, which leaves an additional 6 spaces after accounting for Department personnel use.

Mr. Cross stated that the Mires proposal with which she has expressed dissatisfaction is preliminary, as has been stated to her previously, and that it can go through many more modifications to attend to any of her concerns. Mr. Mires took the concerns as stated by Chief Andersen and used that as his guide in determining what could be done to satisfy those concerns within the footprint of the Buker building. Mr. Beasley noted that the approximately 9400 sq. ft. available at the Stahlman building (with an 1800 sq.ft. addition) is, within a few square feet, the same as is available at the Buker building. He suggested that she should treat the Buker building as a clean slate, as she is doing with the Stahlman building, and state what it is she wants.

Chief Cobb responded that she understands that the Mires proposal was designed to determine “what could fit,” but she still has concerns with the outside, the site itself. She also believes that the layout of the building itself is substantially different from that of the Stahlman building and that Buker doesn’t lend itself to a design that is adequate for Department needs. She also stated that the Stahlman site provides much better security for Department vehicles, which can be parked in back of the building; and that with the Stahlman layout the holding cells would be adjacent to and on the same floor with the dispatch public entry so that detainees could be transported from there to the holding cells

without going through the operational area of the Department, which would be on the second floor.

The Chair then opened the discussion to any members of the public in attendance. Ms. Hallquist, Town Administrator, stated that the current facility was never designed to be a police department. She noted that the Chief was not “on board” with plans to remain at Buker, and that she had inquired of Chief Cobb what it would take for her to come on board. She said Chief Cobb had responded that it was not a “secure place,” and urged the Committee to listen to the Chief for her concerns.

Mr. Cannon stated that neither the Committee nor the Subcommittee had any preconceived notion about the Department staying in the Buker building. What the Committee and the Subcommittee did was a fact- and data-based analysis. The Committee concluded that though the Department remaining at the Buker building was not perfect there were other costs and considerations that go into such an analysis and determining an appropriate course of action. It is a matter of evaluating the information.

Mr. Cardillo took exception to the characterization that the Committee had not listened to Chief Cobb. He stated that the Committee and the Subcommittee had indeed listened to Chief Cobb’s concerns, and, as a general matter, took into account any and all concerns raised by employees of the Town, not just the Police Department. He stated that the Committee listens to all points of view and did not come into this analysis with any preconceived notions.

Mr. Bianchi stated that throughout this process of analysis and evaluation the Committee has never heard from either Chief Andersen or Chief Cobb why the Department cannot function effectively in the space they currently occupy. Mr. Sherman noted that a review of the minutes of the Planning Board shows that this whole process started in 2014 when Chief Andersen requested only that dispatch be enlarged. From that date on, until this Committee worked directly with Chief Andersen to establish exactly what his concerns were, there was no written statement of what exactly was the problem with the space currently occupied by the Department. Now, for the first time, Chief Cobb was raising a new issue, that of security for vehicles on the site. Mr. Beasley and Mr. Cross concurred, and Mr. Cross stated that he was very frustrated that with each

attempt to resolve a concern a new one was raised or fault found in the solutions to others, with the result that it was just the spinning of wheels. Mr. Beasley stated that of the issues raised by Chief Cobb all but two have had solutions already proposed. Chief Cobb then noted that she felt the Department should have the ability to have indoor car-washing available for the officers.

The Chair then asked what action the Committee wished to take. Mr. Cardillo inquired of the Subcommittee whether any of the concerns Chief Cobb had raised at this meeting would affect its recommendation – did the Subcommittee feel that if it had further conversations with Chief Cobb about these issues would they change their recommendation. The members of the Subcommittee agreed that although there could always be more discussion about what could be done at Buker to alleviate the Chief’s concerns, that process would not alter the ultimate conclusion of the Subcommittee that the purchase of the Stahlman building should not be pursued.

Mr. Bianchi stated that these issues had been discussed thoroughly and extensively, and that nothing new that would affect the actions of the Committee had been raised and it was time to make a decision and move on. After discussion, it was moved by Mr. Bianchi, seconded by Mr. Cardillo, and, by roll call vote of the members, unanimously

VOTED: To adopt the Report of the Police Station Subcommittee and forward it to the Selectmen as the recommendation of the Committee.

b. Report on Priorities

Colin Beasley requested that his discussion on priorities be postponed until the next meeting, March 18, 2021.

c. Other Reports

Whipple Subcommittee: Mr. Sherman reported that the Subcommittee has met and will meet again this coming week. Mr. Mires has been gathering data and information which will be discussed.

Transfer Station land: Mr. Cardillo reported that Ms. Hallquist was doing great work in discussing with the State the possibility of the State land earlier

discussed by this Committee being made available to the Town, if not by outright purchase then possibly by a long-term lease that would provide what is needed or the transfer station.

3. *Old Business*

None

4. *Other items to come before the Committee*

None.

5. *Action Items*

Previous (from 1-21-28)

A. Colin Beasley to prepare a draft statement of the priorities discussions so far, for the Committee meeting on February 18, 2021. **Reported on February 25, 2021; continuation to March 4, 2021. Continued to March 11 due to March 4 meeting cancelled.**

(from 2-25-21)

B. The Chair to prepare a memo to the Selectmen regarding the suggested charter, for review by the Committee. **Done, and memo with Charter forwarded to the Selectmen.**

New

C. The Chair to prepare a memo to the Selectmen forwarding the Report of the Police Station Subcommittee as the Committee's recommendation.

The next meeting is by Zoom, on Thursday, March 18, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Bowers, Chair

ATTACHMENT

New London Police Department

**Building and Facilities Committee - Subcommittee on
New London Police Department**

**Buker Building Update and Stahlman Building
Analysis**

Revision 0
March 9, 2021

Table of Contents

1)	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	10
2)	<u>PURPOSE OF THIS EXERCISE</u>	10
3)	<u>SITE ISSUES</u>	11
a)	<u>Parking</u>	11
b)	<u>Street access</u>	11
c)	<u>Shared driveway</u>	12
d)	<u>Communications tower</u>	12
f)	<u>Summary</u>	13
4)	<u>SPACE ISSUES</u>	14
a)	<u>Buker</u>	14
b)	<u>Stahlman</u>	15
c)	<u>Summary</u>	15
5)	<u>WORK PROCESS AND FLOW ISSUES</u>	15
a)	<u>Buker</u>	15
b)	<u>Stahlman</u>	16
6)	<u>OTHER ISSUES</u>	17
a)	<u>Codes and standards</u>	17
b)	<u>Buker</u>	17
c)	<u>Stahlman</u>	18
d)	<u>Other</u>	18
7)	<u>COST</u>	18

8) CONCLUSIONS 20

1) Introduction

- a) The origination of the need for new or renovated space for the New London Police Department (NLPD) appears to have begun in October 2014, with the former chief raising the need for additional space for dispatch, and other needs he felt existed. In November of 2015, the Planning Board Capital Improvement Plan committee issued their 2016 CIP report stating that the dispatch center should be expanded, and in the future, a new station should be provided. The discussions concluding in the need for a new station are not clear in the record, as a 2014 study by architect Dennis Mires, and statements by the former chief, appear to draw the opposite conclusion. After a failed 2018 warrant request to purchase land, Harriman was retained to study the needs of the NLPD, concluding in a 12/7/18 report that these needs could not be met within the existing building. In early 2020, Dennis Mires was again retained to study what could, in fact, be provided within the existing building, resulting in a report dated 8/24/20.
- b) Since the issuance of the Mires report, additional issues and thoughts have been identified by the Building and Facilities Committee (BFC) and by the NLPD. Other conclusions in the Mires report have been questioned. Further, the NLPD has generated a proposal to purchase an existing building at 74 Pleasant Street, known as the Stahlman Building, and to renovate it for NLPD use.
- c) At their meeting on 12/7/20 the Selectmen requested the BFC to investigate the potential for the Stahlman building to serve NLPD use. The BFC assigned the review of the Buker issues and the review of the Stahlman proposal, to the NLPD subcommittee, consisting of Richard Cross, Colin Beasley, and Philip Sherman, chair of the subcommittee. This subcommittee was assisted in their work by NLPD Chief Emily Cobb, whose assistance is appreciated.
- d) The subcommittee divided the analysis into two phases:
 - i) The first phase, lasting through early March 2021, consisted of a first pass at the issues. This phase was completed without an outside architect, and this preliminary report serves to set forth the findings and recommendations of that work, for presentation to the BFC and the Selectmen. Phase 1 addresses site, space, work process and flow, and other issues, followed by a cost comparison (where costs are available), and conclusions.
 - ii) The second phase, lasting until the end of April 2021, will proceed if approved by the Selectmen, and is intended to develop these options for presentation to the town meeting in the summer of 2021 if the Selectmen choose to proceed with either option. This phase is expected to require the services of an architect.

2) Purpose of this exercise

- a) The purpose of this exercise is to update the Buker analysis and review the Stahlman proposal, setting forth the factual basis, and, in the opinion of the subcommittee, offering conclusions as to the best approach. Where agreement on a specific issue was not reached with Chief Cobb, the open issue is identified in this report.
- b) The efforts of this subcommittee are not to be interpreted as a due diligence review of the potential purchase of the Stahlman building. If the Stahlman approach proceeds, this review is required to be performed by others.

3) Site issues

a) Parking

- i) The required NLPD normal daily parking count is 12 spaces, as identified in the Mires report and confirmed again during this exercise. If necessary, the public parking in the front lot could be assigned as well. Additional parking for up to 30 vehicles is required for various training functions.
- ii) The Mires sketch indicates 18 spaces on the Whipple/Buker site, leaving an excess of six spaces for visitors or other public use. Additionally, there are four public spaces on Seamans Road, next to Buker. Some spaces within the site would be reserved for NLPD purposes, reducing those available for public parking. Parking for training functions would be partially off-site, as it is today.
- iii) The Stahlman site plan indicates that 43 spaces currently exist. The preliminary approach is that the rear lot, consisting of 22 spaces, would be reserved for NLPD. At least four spaces will be removed from the rear lot due to the proposed addition, leaving about 18 spaces. Additional spaces in the rear lot may be lost due to required traffic aisles. The front lot, with 21 spaces would be available for visitors and the public. Spaces may be lost if separate access routes for NLPD and the public are provided.

b) Street access

- i) Street access, from the Buker rear lot, is to Seamans Road, where sight distances can be limited as a function of car parking, as identified in the Mires report. Improvements could be made by removing parking or installing a traffic control device. The front lot is striped to provide entry from Main Street and egress to Seamans Road. Sight distances for this lot are reasonable.

(1) There has been some discussion about making Seamans Road a one-way street near Buker. The subcommittee concludes that this approach is probably not viable and warrants no further discussion.

- ii) Stahlman street access is currently via a single drive to Pleasant Street. Sight distances are poor, due to landscaping and snow, which could be corrected with relative ease.
- c) Shared driveway
 - i) The Buker rear lot shares its driveway with the adjacent structure, and conflicts have been problematic over the years, as identified in the Mires report. This could be corrected either by enforcement of the present easement, purchase of the adjacent lot, or by minor adjustments of the lot line, and providing two physically separated driveways within the space currently occupied by the drive and walkway. Reworking of the Buker accessible route and the current parallel parking in the drive aisle would be required. The front lot shares NLPD parking with public spaces, but this has not been identified as a problem.
 - ii) Stahlman currently has a single drive that might serve both NLPD and public purposes. If this is deemed to be a problem, a second entrance to the public lot could be created (not included in the Stahlman cost estimate), at the loss of some parking in front of the building. The provision of a single drive aisle to the rear lot, and potential conflicts with emergency response traffic leaving the site, is thought to be manageable, either by orienting traffic patterns to provide sufficient sight distances, or by providing traffic control or warning devices.
- d) Communications tower
 - i) The Buker communications tower is currently at capacity. If equipment is relocated from the attic of Whipple hall to the tower, the tower needs to be increased in height by 20 feet, which will require a structural analysis. Relocating the equipment currently in the attic is driven by the fact that the first floor and attic of Whipple/Buker is not currently sprinklered, and the equipment in the attic is not secure. Both issues will be addressed, potentially eliminating the need to relocate equipment, with the resulting tower work. As no engineering documentation on the installation of the tower has been located, the subcommittee agrees that a detailed record search should be performed. Based on any documentation that might be located, or starting without documentation, a structural analysis should be completed to justify the additional weight of equipment installed since the original tower installation. Further, the subcommittee agrees that appropriate security fencing should be provided for the existing tower. Both costs have been included in the Mires cost estimate.
 - ii) Stahlman would require a new tower with appropriate security, and an engineering analysis is required to determine the height. The subcommittee has carried the Mires cost in the Stahlman estimate below.
- e) Other site issues

i) Buker

- (1) The Mires report, appendix E, #3-4, indicates that parking on the Sallyport ramp should not occur. Parking adjacent to the ramp will be formalized and used for NLPD purposes.
- (2) The relocation of the recreation department out of Buker also relocates related pedestrian and drop-off traffic away from the building.

ii) Stahlman

- (1) Traffic congestion at both the Gould Road and the Main Street intersections with Pleasant Street, and conflicts with bus and parental traffic, require further review.
- (2) Pedestrian traffic in the area, including school children, requires further review.

f) Summary

i) Parking and drive issues

	Buker	Stahlman	Comparison
NLPD parking	12 required, 12 provided. 30 required for periodic training	12 required, 18 provided	Both sites provide sufficient daily PD parking. Buker uses off-site parking for periodic training
Visitor parking	6 provided on site, plus 4 on Seamans Road	Up to 21 provided	Reasonable visitor's parking is provided at both sites
Accessible parking	Two provided, one required	One provided, two required	Sufficient parking is available at both sites to comply with accessible parking requirements
Street access	Improvements required	Improvements required	Options are available at both sites permitting sufficient sight distances for safe street access

Shared driveway	Shared with neighbor, solution available.	PD and public share one drive, solution available.	Options are available at both sites, except the front Buker lot, permitting dedicated drives for PD purposes
-----------------	---	--	--

- ii) Communications equipment within the Whipple Hall attic likely could remain in place, given sprinklers in the entire building and securing all or part of the attic. If this is not warranted, the existing tower requires an increase in height. An engineering analysis should be conducted, and security fencing provided, for the existing tower. A new tower is proposed for Stahlman, requiring an engineering analysis to determine the height.

4) Space issues

a) Buker

- i) Several space issues internal to the building were identified in the Mires report, categorized as “What we don’t get”. These included a dedicated breakroom, space for supervisory expansion, a rectangular shaped lobby, space to store a vehicle used as evidence, and a 30-person training room. Most functions were allocated the space (or more) identified on the program requirements; however, some functions received less square footage than that requested, as identified in the program tabulation. It is important to note that the Mires Report delivered a proposal with a significant proviso, that being that proposal was preliminary, and changes could be made without materially affecting the structure or the costs.

- ii) To that end, a revised, highly preliminary, sketch of the Buker renovations (attached) has been generated that address many of these issues. These comments are based on this preliminary revised approach, which addresses the following:

- (1) A dedicated breakroom is provided within the existing structure.
- (2) Space for office expansion is provided within the existing structure.
- (3) The lobby is not rectangular but is larger than the size that was requested.
- (4) Space for an evidence vehicle is provided within the existing structure.
- (5) The Corporal/Sergeants office is larger.
- (6) A second bathroom is provided on the upper floor.
- (7) Further, a Whipple Hall meeting room not identified in the Mires report, which is similar to the existing meeting room, is provided.
- (8) The large conference function is satisfied using the training room that is provided.

- (9) The 30-person meeting function is satisfied using an upgraded Whipple Hall, as identified in the Mires report.
- iii) Appendix E of the Mires report was reviewed, and all space issues identified there have been addressed either in the Mires report, or in the revised sketch except:
 - (1) #21-1, fitness center needs to be 10 feet wider. Both Mires and the revised sketch provide a fitness center about the same size as currently exists. The specific size of the room, based on the layout of the required equipment and number of occupants, requires further review.

b) Stahlman

- i) NLPD had obtained the pro bono services of architect Frank Anzalone prior to the beginning of this exercise, and his preliminary drawings were referenced. Highly approximate square footages were backed out of the Anzalone sketches and added to a spreadsheet from the Mires report, attached. This spreadsheet compares existing, desired (program), and provided room sizes for Mires, Revised, and Stahlman approaches.
- ii) The existing building is about 7,600 sf on two floors. A proposed 1,800 sf addition brings the total area to about 9,400 sf, which is approximately the same area that is available in Buker.
- iii) Spaces identified by Frank Anzalone essentially accounted for those identified in the Buker program, although areas were not aligned for all spaces. As there is significant slack in the Anzalone sketches, the subcommittee is confident that all required spaces will fit in the building with the proposed addition, and in fact a smaller addition might suffice.

c) Summary

- i) To house the spaces identified in the Buker program tabulation, Stahlman will require an addition, currently expected to be about 1,800 sf, but potentially smaller.

5) Work process and flow issues

a) Buker

- i) Several work process and flow issues internal to the building were identified in the Mires report, categorized as “What we don’t get”. These included file transfer between dispatch and the processing/booking area, and proximity of the dispatch center to the process/booking area, to assist an officer in distress.

ii) These issues are addressed as follows:

- (1) The file transfer need between dispatch and booking/processing should be dealt with electronically, as identified in the Mires report.
- (2) In the revised sketch, the stair has been reworked to reduce the distance and resulting travel time between dispatch and the booking/processing area.

iii) Chief Cobb also felt that the Mires approach resulted in a congested layout that did not permit the free flow of people. The revised sketch provides a more straightforward circulation path, that may be more efficient in terms of use and flow.

iv) Appendix E of the Mires report was reviewed, and all work process and flow issues identified there have been addressed either in the Mires report, or the revised sketch except:

- (1) #3-1, soft interview room should have an exterior door. Chief Cobb agrees that having the soft interview room off the lobby satisfies the intent of this issue.
- (2) #19-2, office area not on the same floor as processing. This is deemed acceptable in the Stahlman design and should therefore be deemed acceptable for Buker.
- (3) #22-1, use of the training room as an emergency animal shelter. The subcommittee agrees that this use should be relocated out of NLPD.
- (4) #24-7, building is unsafe. The subcommittee concludes that this is an overall redundant statement, addressed by other issues.

b) Stahlman

i) The Anzalone approach locates dispatch, process/booking/cells, soft interview, sallyport and miscellaneous spaces on the first floor. Offices, training, patrol, break room, lockers and fitness are located on the second floor. Chief Cobb feels that the file storage might better be on the second floor.

ii) Some issues were discussed, and found acceptable in the Anzalone approach, including:

- (1) A two-story building is acceptable.
- (2) A remote hard interview room is acceptable, provided an exterior entrance is located nearby.
- (3) A chief's office remote from the building entry is acceptable, although the location of the administrative assistant requires further review.
- (4) A patrol area remote from the processing/booking and on an upper floor relative to vehicle locations is acceptable.
- (5) The location of dispatch on the same floor, but not adjacent to, processing/booking and cells is acceptable.

iii) Chief Cobb feels that Stahlman seems to provide a better flow through the building.

6) Other issues

a) Codes and standards

- i) The subcommittee reviewed the fact that no legal or model standards for space planning of police stations are known, which was the conclusion reached in the Mires study. While Harriman cited national standards as justification for their conclusions, no such standards could be produced upon request, nor has research identified any that can be referenced in any NLPD design. Moreover, the Chief is not aware of any NLPD space and design standards. The subcommittee believes this should no longer be addressed as an issue in any going forward NLPD discussions.
- ii) FEMA documents make some general statements about environmental hazards, such as flood, earthquake, and wind.
- iii) Some building code requirements will apply to Stahlman, due to the proposed change of use, resulting in a change in code classification, that will not apply to Buker. It is not clear whether the cost estimates provided for a Stahlman project accounts for these building code requirements.
- iv) Code requirements are accounted for in the respective projects, except as noted below.

b) Buker

- i) At Buker, car washing is currently done by NLPD officers, outside during the summer. The desire is to wash vehicles inside the building during cold weather. The subcommittee concludes that car washing should be performed at another site, perhaps the fire department or DPW.
- ii) Three issues were identified as critical, including sprinklers in the remainder of Whipple Hall and Buker, protection of the existing communications equipment from the risk of leakage at the sprinkler riser, and bulletproofing.
 - (1) The Whipple Hall subcommittee is addressing the installation of sprinklers in the first floor and attics of Whipple Hall and Buker. This subcommittee supports this, to increase life safety, property protection and operational continuity.
 - (2) The reasonable risk of damage from the sprinkler riser is deemed to be spray from a small leak. The equipment can be protected by means of an easily moveable shield between the riser and the equipment. Chief Cobb is pursuing the installation of this relatively low-cost shield through ordinary town channels.
 - (3) The subcommittee and Chief Cobb reviewed the extent of bulletproofing provided at police stations in Sunapee, Brookline, and Tilton. Each protected the building from its lobby, and Brookline added protection at a wall along a parking lot. As

the Buker exterior walls are brick, exterior issues involve only windows. The subcommittee recommends that bulletproof walls, windows, and doors be installed between the PD lobby and the building interior, and that the exterior window on Seamans Road into dispatch also be protected. The cost for this work has not yet been obtained.

c) Stahlman

- i) The Stahlman property deed was reviewed and no apparent restrictions apply. This would need to be confirmed by a formal due diligence effort by others.
- ii) The subcommittee confirmed that the town is not required to abide by zoning requirements.
- iii) The subcommittee confirmed that all wetlands shown on the site are regulated only through local zoning.
- iv) The subcommittee confirmed with DPW that there is no prohibition on car washing facilities relative to the sewer, but that a sand/oil separator will be required.
- v) Papers in the town building file indicate some type of oil spill in 2014, and the resolution of this should be confirmed by others as part of a due diligence review.
- vi) Gravity, wind, and seismic upgrades that may be required are not included in the cost estimate.

d) Other

- i) Communications and building wiring are budgeted in both buildings.
- ii) Soundproofing of dispatch relative to noise from processing/booking and cells and other areas can be accounted for as a design issue in both buildings.

7) Cost

- a) A preliminary cost estimate of the proposed work was generated during the Mires exercise in 2020. This estimate has been escalated due to inflation to the current date.
- b) A preliminary cost estimate of the proposed Stahlman work was generated by Milestone Engineering and Construction, 2/22/21. This cost, with additional costs not included in the contractor's estimate, are identified below.

	Buker	Stahlman	
Purchase cost	\$0	\$1,100,000	
Closing and due diligence	\$0	\$10,000 *	
Contractor's estimate	\$3,432,000	\$3,336,000	Buker w/one year 4% inflation
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	Included	\$112,000	Buker value carried to Stahlman
Beltronics estimate	Included	\$175,000*	Buker value carried to Stahlman
Revised changes to the layout	\$150,000*	\$0	Buker cells/booking, move stair
Code required structural upgrades		TBD**	
Soft costs	\$50,000*	\$10,000*	e.g., temporary facilities, moving
Demolish Buker, rework Whipple lobby	\$0	\$250,000*	
Incremental life cycle costs for additional town building	\$0	\$385,400*	e.g., heat, repairs, and maintenance. Use NLFD as surrogate. Capital repairs not included. Present value, 25 years, 3% interest, 2% inflation, \$17,500 /yr.
Reduce Buker Life cycle cost for demolition		-545073*	Reduce 45% of current \$55K cost, Present value, 25 years, 3% interest, 2% inflation, \$24,750
Lost tax revenue, present value	\$0	\$271,000*	Present value, 25 years, 3% interest, 2% inflation, \$12,300/yr. (2018)
Renovate SAU for Rec Dept	\$225,000	\$0	
Rec dept SAU life cycle cost	\$123,000*		Present value, 25 years, 3% interest, 2% inflation, \$5,600 /yr.*use Academy sf cost x 1400 sf
Total	\$3,980,000	\$5,104,327	Difference is \$1,124,327
Incremental tax rate impact	\$84/yr. for 20 yrs.	\$108/yr. for 20 yrs.	On \$400,000 house, grand list \$1265204773, 20 yr. 3% int

*Planning estimate.

**Needs evaluation; costs could be material.

- c) While many of the cost elements represented in the Stahlman Building alternative are planning assumptions, the Subcommittee believes they are good assumptions, if not conservatively low. Moreover, the Subcommittee believes that two elements identified in the Stahlman Building alternative (structural upgrades and Buker Building disposition) have the potential to be more material than that represented in the cost table of Section 7. It should be noted that when the cost planning assumptions identified by an asterisk in that cost table are brought to zero (a completely unrealistic scenario), the Buker Building alternative still costs \$568k less than the Stahlman Building. The Buker Building is less financially burdensome in any sensitivity analysis of the cost planning assumptions.

8) Conclusions

- a) Chief Cobb has reviewed the site, space, and work process issues at Buker, and has offered the following:

Over the past year or so, I have not seen a plan to renovate Buker in the existing footprint, considering the inside and outside of the building, that would adequately address the needs of the police department and communications center.

Respectfully, I believe the Stahlman building is a worthy option to continue investigating.

- b) The committee exhaustively reviewed site, space, and process/workflow issues for both Buker and Stahlman. The subcommittee has provided a revised sketch that provides all identified needs except for a large meeting room. The large conference function is accommodated in the proposed training room, and large training functions are accommodated in an upgraded Whipple Hall. The subcommittee finds that space needs can be accommodated at Stahlman only with the construction of an addition. The above report clarifies that the subcommittee has addressed all of the issues raised by Chief Cobb and former Chief Anderson.
- c) Given the fact that there is no identified need for Buker if vacated by NLPD, the town would be burdened with additional costs associated with a vacant building and the community impact of abandoning a public building. The subcommittee has factored into the Stahlman alternative costs associated with the Buker building demolition. The subcommittee believes demolition is the appropriate planning assumption to avoid the ongoing costs of maintaining a vacant building, the community impact of a public building vacancy and / or the implication of town departments filling the building with an ineffective use, and the associated physical, and perhaps personnel, costs to do so.

- d) Given that no identified issues have been found that cannot be resolved at Buker, and the fact that preliminary estimates indicate the Stahlman alternative would cost \$1.1 million more than that to renovate Buker, the subcommittee finds no reason that the purchase of the Stahlman building should be investigated further.