



**TOWN OF
BROOKLINE, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**P.O. BOX 360 – 1 Main Street
BROOKLINE, NH 03033-0360**

Selectmen@brookline.nh.us <http://www.brookline.nh.us>

Telephone (603) 673-8855
Fax (603) 673-8136

***Facilities Study Committee 2011-2012
Police Facility Evaluation
Wednesday, August 17, 2011***

Present: Peter Cook, Chris Adams, Bill Atkinson, Brendan Denehy, Francis Gavin, Dennis LaBombard, Jay Sartell, Ann Somers

Not present: Clarence Farwell

Also present: BPD Chief Bill Quigley and Admin. Asst. Donna Matheson; Ambulance Director Wes Whittier; Dennis Mires of The Architects; Judy Cook

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Safety Complex meeting room. The minutes from August 3rd were approved as written (Brendan moved/Bill seconded, Y-all).

Jay reported that his and Chris' PD/Liability report is still in process. **Chris** has drafted a risk assessment table, and a narrative will be completed soon. Rather than repeat all the work done by earlier committees, they have chosen to focus on the most severe safety and liability issues. **Peter** noted that it is essential that we have a fallback plan to address those issues if the bond proposal does not pass. **Jay** suggested a subcommittee could explore the costs of such a plan.

Dennis Mires, principal of The Architects, was introduced. He asked our overall strategy. Peter spoke of the bonds being paid off soon and the charge by the BOS, including financial constraints. **Chief Quigley** described his proposed reductions and adjustments of use for some of the spaces in the current plan, with a hoped-for saving of around 1,000 square feet. He said the offices can be considerably smaller than currently designed. He says that officers Bob Pelletier, Doug Barnett and Joe Freda concur. He doesn't anticipate the need for a communications (dispatch) room, but if it should be required it will happen when the PD expands upstairs. Police unions are pressing for gym memberships or exercise rooms.

There was considerable discussion around traffic patterns for public use, secured use for both services, and the police administrative space. **Chris** said he would like to see a second public meeting space, and suggested that the ambulance and police services could share the current ambulance meeting spaces, locker rooms (expanded), kitchen and the second floor. He stated that he thought the combined uses could support a sense of community. **Chief Quigley** was concerned about security and health issues, including traveling through several doors to shower off body fluids in some instances. **Wes** requires his people to shower at the ambulance rather than risk taking such contamination home. Chris asked if the proposed bunkrooms were necessary; **Wes** replied that as volunteerism drops off we will need to hire an ambulance service, and 24-hour coverage will require sleeping quarters for non-resident providers. Currently there are two bunks

in one room. **Francis** asked whether separating the services was a matter of legal or technical issues. **Bill A** said we must weigh price against security – ambulance people bunking off a common hallway shared with the police (and their detainees) are not likely to feel secure or be able to sleep. **Jay** said police lockers, used daily, cannot be shared with civilians, since there are multiple weapons and other items at risk. **Wes** said that the ambulance crews separate their street wear in the bunkroom from their work clothes in the lockers. Police requirements and activities change the dynamics. Wes, Jay and Chris agree the ambulance lockers aren't big enough for police needs.

Brendan said we want good value, but should not shortchange the design. **Jay** said that planning for growth is in our charge, and we need to consider how much we can save relative to the effort involved.

Peter asked what can be common. **Dennis M** replied that police walking around with their weapons make people uncomfortable; police need to be separate and secure from the rest of the world. In many towns there are common training areas and an EOC. Toilets are typically not shared with police. With changes in volunteerism, the ambulance service likely will need bunkrooms in the future, so even if they are not built now the place where they would be built should not be used for locker rooms.

Bill A asked about construction and cost issues: plumbing provisions already in place for the addition, frame vs. block construction, the cost effects of utility runs and insulation in one or the other, bullet-resistant materials and their relative costs. **Jay** mentioned some of the safety provisions, landscaping as well as structural, built into the Hollis design to protect those inside.

Brendan observed that there are three main “boxes” to a PD. The most secure includes the sally port, arrest entry and containment spaces, with no public entry. The next level includes the offices, administrative, training, lockers, etc., for the department. The third contains the public spaces. **Jay** and **Bill Q** noted concerns with the current design, which requires that a person being released from police custody to someone waiting to provide transportation must be escorted – whether docile or otherwise - through the middle of the administrative area. **Brendan** observed that the ambulance service has only two “boxes” – a public area and a secure ambulance office/administrative/lockers/kitchen area, but no detainment area.

Francis asked about costs. **Dennis M** said the rule of thumb is \$200 per square foot for hard construction costs, which does not include a number of soft costs such as fees, inspections, furnishings, and others. Voters will be asked to vote on an overall figure. Asked whether \$1.2-1.3M was reasonable, Dennis Mires said yes. **Chris** suggested adding a 15% contingency. **Ann** noted that her insurance agent recently said that while labor may be down, materials are up. **Judy** reminded us that it was proposed for substantially less in 2003, and prices will only go up. She noted that in order to persuade voters, we must (1) make them understand the liability, (2) make them understand that we've developed a very efficient design, and (3) make them understand that if we don't act now, it will only become more expensive in the future. **Peter** suggested asking Dennis M to provide multiple scenarios.

After some discussion, **Jay moved/Chris seconded that we will work with Bill Q's changes to the current plan, to get a cost from Dennis Mires for conceptual drawings. Voted Yes unanimously.**

Dennis M asked whether we were going to use a construction management firm as had been done previously. **Ann** said that the previous committees felt that CM provided the benefit of realistic design-

based cost estimates, and having no crews of their own involved they would provide objective expert oversight in the event of construction. She said that Eckman in particular was supportive of using local contractors whenever possible, and offered a fee structure by which any cost savings would be returned to Brookline rather than absorbed by Eckman. No action was taken at this time.

Bill A and others will form a subcommittee to work with **Bill Q** on a contingency plan for the current PD.

Ann asked about storage, particularly with the proposed reductions, since it had been such a high priority and frustration with most of the PDs visited in earlier years and the Brookline PD currently has some things stored in offsite places. **Jay** said that with the second floor available, there would be plenty of space, that Hollis has storage issues as a consequence of being too frugal in their expansion provisions during the initial building project.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m. The next meeting, 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 7th, will be held at the Town Hall meeting room.

Minutes submitted by Ann Somers