COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMITTEE
AUGUST 1, 2010 – MILFORD TOWN HALL

Members Present: Gil Archambault, Mark Fougere, Lorraine Marchildon, Merv Newton, Bill Parker, Jim Rumson, Eric Schelberg, Peg Seward, Rod Watkins, Leighton White, and Mike Castagna of Castagna Consulting Group, LLC.

Members Absent: Kathy Bauer, Janet Langdell, and Liz Michaud. (K. Bauer entered the meeting later.)

M. Castagna reported that after the last meeting B. Parker provided him with pertinent information on the sites under consideration, and he spoke to E. Schelberg as well. He also visited each site and walked thru the buildings to be able to come to a conclusion as to which site is the most suitable for an ambulance facility. Copies of the Preliminary Site Analysis for New Location prepared by Castagna Consulting Group, LLC were distributed.

Lot No. 25-112 is the largest lot, and it is the only single lot that could accommodate an approximately 10,000 sq. ft. facility. All other lots would have to be combined with one or two contiguous lots to have enough square footage. Even though the lot borders a contaminated site, the EPA report states that any contamination is outside the boundaries of the property with the monitoring wells being on the railroad side of the property. Therefore, it does not appear that contamination is a major factor. There is currently a wooden storage building on the lot that is not suitable for rehabbing as well as a smaller wood framed shed, and these structures would have to be razed.

M. Castagna reiterated his previous statement that the most economical arrangement is for an ambulance facility and a fire station to be together as there are many possibilities for shared quarters. Stand-alone facilities have redundancy, and future expansions down the road are more costly. However, this committee is solely charged in making a recommendation to the BOS as to a stand-alone site for an ambulance facility that would best serve the community.

Lot No. 25-76 is the site of an old train station. Even though the building appears to have historical significance, it is not on the historical register. There is a wood framed structure on the site, but it would be cost prohibitive to retrofit the structure. The lot itself is long and narrow and would have to be combined with a contiguous lot to provide enough room for an ambulance facility. Even then it would be difficult for vehicles to enter and exit any building and provide adequate parking. In this instance the adjoining site is not on the market

Lot No. 25-74 is the site of a two-story wood structure with a CMU and steel infill addition between two wood structures. A retrofit of this property could work but would not be efficient or ideal. The entire structure would have to be gutted leaving only the four walls and the roof. The structure would have to be brought up to code and made energy efficient. This site would also need to be combined with an adjacent site to fit an ambulance facility.

Lot No. 25-69 contains a residential apartment building located next to the police station and a town-owned vacant lot. The two combined lots would add up to about 1/3 of an acre, and the house would have to be razed. However, the combined lots do not allow for future

expansion. That location would allow shared parking with the police station site and an adjoining town parking lot as well as shared use of the police dept. community room.

Lot No. 25-125 is a long narrow lot of less than half an acre with a residential wood structure used as a business. Even though it would be difficult to fit a 10,000 sq. ft. ambulance facility plus parking on the site, it would be doable. However, there would be problems with access as there is an adjacent commercial business as well as the SHARE office in the rear. It is a heavily trafficked street with a nursing home and funeral home across the street, and a traffic light on the next corner. Also a traffic control device would be needed at the ambulance facility site, and the access road would need a complete makeover.

M. Castagna went on to say there are pros and cons for each site. A determination has to be made as to the size of the facility and placement on the most suitable site. There are acquisition costs, but these could be mitigated through a long-term land lease.

R. Watkins asked how much more a two-story building would cost vs. a one-story building. M. Castagna said a two-story facility would require an elevator along with bathrooms on both floors, and the heating and electrical systems would be zoned differently, with the additional cost in the neighborhood of $300,000 to $500,000. Lot No. 25-69 would require a facility with two stories.

At 6:55 p.m. Kathy Bauer entered the CFC meeting.

Discussion ensued on the feasibility of rehabbing the largest structure vs. new construction, and which sites could accommodate a one-story building. It was noted that most of the sites are relatively flat, and there would be demolition costs involved. The availability of some of the sites was also discussed – how willing an owner is to sell or whether a sale is contingent on selling all the lots.

In response to a query regarding a community room for the ambulance facility, E. Schelberg said such a room could double as a safe haven in the event of an emergency as the facility would be equipped with a generator. It was his feeling that the entire structure should be deemed an “essential” building and able to withstand seismic activity.

M. Castagna pointed out that with the insulated concrete form system (ICF), the HVAC system is half the size of a conventional system, with the walls rated at R50 and the ceiling at R70. The figure of $240/square foot for a single level building is a good starting point, with the goal being to make it less. The use of durable synthetic materials also helps to reduce the cost of construction.

M. Castagna will review the EPA web site to find the results of the monitoring wells near the railroad tracks. He will also outline the parameters of Phase II and what has to be done prior to September 20th.

R. Watkins made the motion, seconded by M. Fougere, that M. Castagna be present at the meeting with the Board of Selectmen on Monday, August 8th, at 5:40 p.m.; said motion adopted.

The committee members reviewed and continued the evaluation process of the options under consideration utilizing the report prepared by M. Castagna. The evaluations were as follows:

Option 1 – Sites 25-74 & 25-73	total – 729
Option 2 – Site 25-76 `	total – 687
Option 4 – Sites 25-69, 25-70, & 25-71	total – 693
Option 5 – Site 25-112	total – 832
Option 6 – Site 25-125	total – 693

(Option 3, Sites 25-76 & 25-75, was not considered, as one of the parcels is not available.)

Therefore, the CFC will recommend Option 5, Site 25-112, to the Board of Selectmen.

M. Newton volunteered to prepare a “Report of the Review of Sites” to present to the Selectmen next Monday along with the summary sheet of the findings.

M. Fougere made the motion, seconded by R. Watkins, that the minutes of the meeting of July 25, 2011, be approved; said motion adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.