



Fire Station Building Review Committee

Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 29, 2017
APPROVED

Kimberley opened the meeting at 6:06 pm

Committee members in attendance: Kimberley Edelmann, Howard Kirchner, Janice Loz, Ed Raymond, Peter Wyman, Peter Ladd, Jonathan Lord

Absent: Allan Brown, David Hartman

Others present: Anthony Mento – SMP Architects, Ken Holmes – North Branch Construction, Ed Mical, Jim Bingham

1. Meeting Minutes

- A. A motion was moved and seconded to approve meeting minutes dated February 28, 2017. Motion passed unanimously.
- B. A motion was moved and seconded to approve meeting minutes dated May 17, 2017. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Energy Committee

- A. Peter Ladd, who is a member of the Energy Committee said Allan Brown solicited the Energy Committee's opinion and ideas for the Fire Station which produced a letter from the Energy Committee.

June 26, 2017

*Mr. Allan Brown
Chairman, Warner Fire Station Building Committee*

Chairman Brown,

In response to the Fire Station Building Committee's request for specific design criteria regarding energy efficiency for the new Warner Fire Station, we offer the following.

The Warner Energy Committee (EC), much like other committees and commissions in Warner, is comprised of engaged citizens with the desire to improve energy efficiency, provide programs, and shepherd projects that reduce carbon and fossil fuel use. We are not energy or building experts. We appreciate that you have invited us to provide a representative from the EC to join your Committee. Peter Ladd, our representative, along with the members of the Fire Station Build Committee (FSBC) have worked tirelessly to identify the long term needs of the fire fighters and first responders in the space layout and design of the site and structure.

Energy efficiency should be a driving factor in the design of the structure and site, not a "nice to have". This is critical for two reasons. First, reasonable initial capital costs in the name of energy efficiency will offer long term return on investment for a structure that is expected to be in service for at least 50 years. Second, the long term energy future is precarious at best, and reducing the energy use of this building can mitigate the risk associated with that future.

The State of New Hampshire Building Code is not good enough for this building or the Town of Warner. In the poll executed by the FSBC at voting day, energy efficiency was the second most important feature of the project right

after meeting the needs of the Fire Fighters. This should not be lost in the name of initial short-term and short-sighted capital cost savings. The State Building Code isn't even good enough for the State of New Hampshire. The State of New Hampshire Administrative Services, who manages the State buildings and capital project, requires energy efficiency be analyzed for any new structure or addition, and any modification with a return of 10 years or less be implemented.

The technology and products available in the building science and energy efficiency arena are rapidly changing. An expert must be engaged. Relying on a group of like-minded volunteers, the EC, to guide this aspect of the project would not be prudent. We implore the FSBC to engage an expert to evaluate all aspects of the proposed design with regard to long term energy (cost) savings. This includes but is not limited to, building envelope, renewable heating technologies for both the building and hot water, solar for electricity, sources of materials relative to their environmental impact, and the long term cost of the materials proposed with regard to life span and disposal. The Warner Select Board unanimously adopted an Energy Use Policy on September 27, 2016, while you were on the Board. It reads:

ENERGY USE POLICY

The Town of Warner is committed to sustainable operating practices, which include decreasing the Town's carbon footprint through the application of energy conservation measures, renewable energy technologies, and utilization of products from sustainable sources. It will be the policy of the Town that Town officials and employees will take this goal into consideration as part of all decision making. The Warner Board of Selectmen will review this policy at a minimum every 24 months and identify specific measures that should be taken to support this policy.

Attached are meeting minutes from our last two meetings discussing the Fire Station outlining the EC position on the correct approach with regard to energy efficiency and long term cost savings.

Thank you for requesting our input on this very important project.

*Respectfully,
Warner Energy Committee*

Energy Committee Meeting Minutes, Wednesday, May 10, 2017

Present; Darren Blood, Peter Ladd, Bill Balsam, Susan Hemingway

- 1. Solar Array Update: A pre-construction meeting is scheduled for 5/11/17 with logger/land clearer and clerk of the works among those to be present. Clearing is expected to begin this week. Note that the EC requests they consider leaving a buffer of trees between the solar site and wood bank.*
- 2. Per selectboard minutes, the 35,000 CDFA grant was approved and accepted, as was a \$15,000 grant.*
- 3. River protection nomination. No updates.*
- 4. Fire station update. Next Wednesday, 5/17/17, 6-7 pm, a meeting is scheduled for consultation with the architects. The EC continues to advocate for an energy efficient building and systems. We remind the Selectboard to note the energy policy they passed last year which states that town projects shall make energy efficiency a high priority. Suggestions tonight included inquiring about consultation services from the Jordan Institute, the Northern Forest Center, etc. to increase the committee's understanding of mechanical systems and current building science re energy efficiency.*
- 5. Wood Bank. There is an inventory of wood needing to be processed. Darren and Peter will speak with Varick about locating new piles.*
- 6. Erin at CAP will be reminded that she can call Peter/Darren directly if clients prefer to not go thru town hall. This may avoid some mis-communication and delay, too.*
- 7. Economic development committee. It is not known whether they met with the selectboard yet. Once they have, the EC would like to discuss energy implications in relation to development/ business growth.*
- 8. Master plan. For next meeting we will have a discussion about suggested edits of the Energy Committee chapter introduction and sections 9-11 and 9-12.*
- 9. What's next? Some ideas; electric vehicle charging stations, greener transportation; i.e. Park and ride south of town, bus stop, community energy cooperative.*
- 10. Next Meeting. June 14. 7 PM, Warner Town Hall, selectboard office.*

Warner Energy Committee – June 14, 2017

Present: Clyde Carson, Darren Blood, Bill Balsam, Sue Hemingway

1. Solar Array Update

The site has been logged and stumped. Further prep work will be done by town crew and will involve some boulder removal, fill, and grading. This work is expected to be done next week, with solar vendor beginning the installation around the first week of July.

July 9 is the 1 year anniversary of the precinct array which is expected to produce significantly above projections. Clyde reports that Yankee Cable Network plans to do a feature. We expect to receive \$43,000 from rural development.

2. Fire station update

The EC representative to the building committee reports that Allan Brown, Chair, requests specific input from EC about the design, structure, mechanicals. EC appreciates and recognizes the significance of the request. We do not have expert qualifications within our committee and continue to recommend the Selectboard and building committee do due diligence to ensure the project meets high energy standards for design, construction, material, and mechanical systems by engaging an energy expert who can look at the entire system.

The community survey results conducted in March 2016 show residents rated energy efficiency as #2 priority after #1; meeting the needs of the fire department. The energy policy adopted by Selectboard reflects this commitment.

EC recommends an energy expert/consultant be engaged ASAP at this point in the design process to perform energy modeling, analyze cost benefits of structure, advise on emerging technology, etc., so that we build the most efficient structure feasible.

This recommendation was also briefly documented in the EC May 2017 minutes, which will be sent to Allan Brown. The EC will also draft a more specific letter to be sent by the end of next week. Darren will assist Clyde to develop questions to present at next Selectboard meeting. He suggests Clyde also use the questions posed to firms at initial interview.

3. Wood Bank: *No report.*

4. River Protection Nomination

EC suggests the protected status is unnecessary, has had issues with the process. A committee meeting is scheduled for this Friday night, 6/16 to prep for public hearing scheduled for July.

5. Master Plan *We began to edit the introduction, last 2 sections, and summary. Darren will circulate his draft for comment and edits. Clyde will gather data to include in the update.*

6. Study With UNH

Clyde reports he has had preliminary discussion with Roy Morrison and Neil Nevins about a study with UNH and CDFR to look at residential and small business solar, microgrid, storage. More information will come.

7. Business and Economic Development Committee: *No discussion this month.*

Next meeting July 7/12/17.

- B. Peter Ladd said the Energy Committee recognizes that this Committee has been working very hard and they feel the energy efficiency and the systems of the building should be of the highest level. The Energy Committee are not technical experts, they are merely advocating.
- C. John asked Anthony to reiterate what his firm tries to do with energy efficiency. Anthony said his firm agrees with the Energy Committee's concerns, he thinks their recommendation is wise to have an independent third party to provide additional insight and to focus solely on the aspect of efficiencies and how the systems work holistically. Anthony said it was not asked of his firm to provide that service early on, it was necessary that we were capable and fluent in the different energy solutions and his firm is. Anthony said he mentioned during his interview his firm designed and participated in the construction of the second LEED gold building in the state, the McClain Audubon Center in Concord, NH in 2008/2009. He said SMP has certified LEED representatives that work for them and since that time every project they built may not be

LEED certified or achieve a gold or platinum, but we utilize lessons learned from that design in all of their buildings now. He said there isn't a single project that goes out that doesn't surpass the International Energy Code by some significant factor. Not just for building envelope, but mechanical systems, energy across the board, energy efficiency is part of what we do. Anthony said he felt confident at the time he was hired that he didn't need an independent consultant on our team because he was conscientious of the cost. SMP did carry energy modeling through their mechanical engineer, and their own staff to do the energy analysis and can provide you with data, background and feedback. Anthony said this is different from what the Energy Committee is recommending. SMP thinks it is a wise decision to have an individual like that on board, it will benefit the building and the knowledge and understanding of how it will perform. It also may help to communicate the reasoning and the pay back to the general public when we return to the voters with a cost. Anthony said SMP is planning to give some of that, but not to the extent the Energy Committee speaks of.

- D. Kimberley asked what the cost would be to bring in an energy expert. Peter Ladd wasn't sure what the cost would be. Kimberley asked if there is that expertise in town? Jim said what comes to his mind, is how do we use this consultant, one way is to have one on board at this stage working with SMP, which would have been a certain fee. There's the possibility of having this work done in stages and having the expert review and critique with recommendations, this may cost less.
- E. Peter Ladd said the concern over the budget is a big issue. It will need to be explained to the voters why spending more now will save in the long run.
- F. Kimberley, talking to Ken Holmes, said she remembered Ken speaking about this issue during the Construction Manager process. Ken said his firm evaluates various systems based on cost and experience with maintenance, they do not do modeling or return on investment analysis, he can provide data. North Branch are not in the position to say what type of savings will be achieved over a number of years doing this versus that.
- G. Janice asked how useful would it be for the Committee to have someone answer their energy questions as they go through the process and also have someone evaluate it once at that point.
- H. Peter Wyman asked Anthony when he designs the building, to what level is it being designed, because if Anthony is designing to the upper level and the budget is on the upper side of \$2.5 million, then decisions will need to be made on energy costs or cut back somewhere else. That's when you would have to run the scenario's by, it may meet the budget and you won't need to pay for someone to tell you that you have to go cheaper, where in reality you may be able to afford the highest. Kimberley stopped the conversation at this point because she wants Allan at the meeting, they will discuss this again. Anthony said it's more then achieving a rating or meeting a goal, it's a holistic look at all the systems and how they play together. He said the Energy Committee is looking for the return on investment. Anthony had asked Allan to ask the Energy Committee to recommend some goals, something specific like we want this building to be 20% better than the states energy goals are, that's something tangible that he can work toward. Anthony said the state uses 2009 International Energy Code, his firm uses the 2015. He said his firm is building a \$8,000,000 building in Claremont, the energy code from the state says the walls need to be R19, the walls in this building are R45, the windows have a U value that are twice what the energy code is, the roof system is an R52, it needed to be an R30. The envelope is excessive to what the Energy Code calls for. That will occur in your building because that's what we do, and your going to pay for that no matter what because we don't build a building that is bare minimum. Ed Raymond said this building will be close to LEED certified, it just won't have the paperwork behind it. Anthony said correct, that said, we haven't had the conversation about the mechanical systems, his engineer will meet with the Committee to discuss different systems and costs.
- I. Jim was wondering if the Energy Committee could reach out and see about getting rates for someone to come in as an acting consultant on energy efficiencies or a review consultant. Kimberley asked Peter Ladd to take that as an action item. Peter Ladd said the Energy Committee could put a short list together. John said he would prefer and expert versus a vendor trying to sell a product.

- J. Anthony said if there is an energy consultant, he likes the idea that person would come on board a little later on to review what has been done because frankly, the Selectman and the Committee have hired his firm to fulfill a goal and design within a time frame and back 2.5 months ago the Committee was provided with a full schedule which is starting on July 12th and will roll with it and make decisions. There will be a window of opportunity to do this, we won't be doing this in September because he won't have drawings to North Branch on time to bid it, to have a number for the budget season.
- K. Peter Wyman said if Anthony designs to a higher standard, and then budget cuts are needed, that's when a consultant will be needed and becomes invaluable. He doesn't feel the consultant is needed at this time, and we may not need the cost for a consultant if the town can afford this. Peter Ladd said that could also work in reverse, at some point we need to go to the town, educate the voters and say if we spend a little more, the reason why, and how much will be saved by spending more now. Janice said she is absolutely against spending more, the \$2.5 million figure has been put out there.
- L. Kimberley said the reason for choosing SMP Architect and North Branch was for their expertise in energy and had links to the Jordan Institute. Over kill needs to be avoided. Janice feels not everything can be a priority, there will be things the Committee will have to say no to, it's essential to get what the town needs at cost.

2. House Situated on Fire Station Site

- A. Kimberley reported the house sold for \$337,000, the Town Administrator will work with the winning bidder on the time line for moving the house off the property.

3. FEMA Grant

- A. Emergency Management Director, Ed Mical, reported at this point according to the state the only thing that can be done is the test borings. He met with the Architectural Historian today who took pictures and has completed some of the background information and will be submitting a report to the state historic resource department for their review. Ed's hope is the middle of next month he will have more information. Jim said he can contact the key agency which is the NH Division of Historical Resources, they will get this report first, Jim said he can make some phone calls to NHDHR and explain the urgency to move the process on.
- B. Ed Raymond asked if there is a chance of an historical event where the building can't be moved? Ed Mical said yes, there is a possibility. Jim said Goffstown experienced the same thing where adjustments had to be made to receive the grant. If this property shows some historical significance, it will be the grant that is in jeopardy, not the building of the fire station. Kimberley said the worst case scenario is a delay in schedule and we don't get the FEMA grant that results in about \$100,000.

4. Status on Contracts

- A. SMP Architect Contract: Jim reported the Selectmen have accepted and signed the contract.
- B. North Branch Construction Contract: Jim said he was reading through the agreement and general conditions and had some questions and is reading through the contract one more time. The town decided to have a more active role where other towns choose to hire an architect that manages everything. The more active role carries more responsibility. Jim created some questions with the hopes of being able to go through the questions this evening with Ken Holmes.

There are 4 separate documents:

- North Branch Construction Proposal
- Standard Form Agreement between owner and Construction Manager
 - General Conditions of the Contract for Construction
- Guaranteed Maximum Price Amendment

Jim said as the owners we need to know what they are responsible for.

- C. Ken Holmes said for the record we are utilizing the American Institute of Architects Contracts, these are not North Branches Contracts, these are fill in the blanks. He said the reason North Branch uses AIA Contracts is because 99% of their projects use AIA Contracts because it's a family of contracts that AIA has put together for decades that are meant to work together. Ken went through the process.

- D. Ken explained the base Construction Management Contract lays out how North Branch is compensated, and lays out the services. The General Conditions covers all the legal aspects. The Guaranteed Maximum Price Amendment is essentially at the time that North Branch provides all the information, the drawings, the design, they go out to bid, all of those are attached to the amendment, a series of exhibits. This is not presented until about January 2018. Ken said that document is not signed by the town. Anthony said the AIA who develops these contracts all are tied together, his architect contract ties directly to Ken's contracts. John confirmed the reason it's an amendment is because we are not signing now, we sign it when North Branch is done with their work with the dollar figure and what's included. Ken said yes, the reason for the term amendment is because it's an amendment to the base contract that is being signed now.
- E. Anthony said in January 2018 there will be a clear sense on what the cost will be as well as an outlined schedule. He said he has developed into their schedule through design, points along the way where he will get estimates on the developed drawings at that time. This will help keep an eye on the budget. Ken said the first estimate happens as soon as design development is done.
- F. Jim asked Ken what goes into the Guaranteed Maximum Price. Ken said his Guaranteed Maximum Price is to build per the contract documents. That is not your project budget, that is the construction cost to build per the contract documents. Ken said he can assist the town in putting together that budget, but, the overall amount needed at Town Meeting will encompass the Guaranteed Maximum Price (hard costs), the design cost, minor expenses, may have furnishings and moving costs etc. And lastly, Ken said we will strongly recommend an owners contingency as well. Ken continued to educate the Committee regarding the contracts.
- G. Jim asked Ken to go over roles and responsibilities during the construction and pre-construction phase. Jim asked for a general overview because he wants the Committee to understand the level of responsibility and ownership that has been taken on by the town. Ken said the level of responsibility is up to you, he said he has done CM projects where the owner does nothing and leaves it to the designer and the CM.
- H. Kimberley asked what happens when we need to make decisions quickly, how do we do that as a Committee. Ken said during the construction phase a member of the Committee will have to be assigned to be the person. During construction there will be either a weekly or bi-weekly meeting and a representative of the owner (town) must be there. Ken said if everyone does their job there will be very few decisions that will need to be made on the spot. Peter Wyman recommended having more than 1 representative so there is a check and balance.
- I. Jim said the time of pre-construction, when we are looking at cost options, that is where the Committee will have the biggest influence on both construction and the cost of construction. Anthony said he manages that, he will provide agenda's and he will likely do the meeting minutes as well, he wants to take control of it because there are things that are important to the design. Anthony will also deal with the pre-construction schedule.

5. Time Line

- A. Anthony said anything pre-construction is him, once he turns the drawings over on January 3, 2018, it will be then blended for a while with Anthony and North Branch. Once construction starts, it's all North Branch. Anthony will provide oversight on the construction as well with field reports.
- B. Jim said he read that the CM will submit a work schedule and then a submittal schedule. Jim asked what is the difference. Ken said the work schedule is the actual time line of the construction, and the submittal schedule is we are responsible for submitting to the design team all of the components that go into the building. North Branch produces a submittal schedule at the start of the job which is shared with the design team and they confirm that our schedule has all the submittal's on it that they anticipate seeing and reviewing. It's a series of checks and balances.

- C. Jim said the monthly reports North Branch provides will also include application for payment? Ken said you will receive either a weekly or bi-weekly meeting minutes from the job site meetings and then on a monthly basis you will receive a requisition which will be reviewed by Anthony's team and receive a recommendation for approval with an updated construction schedule. Lien releases will be involved as well, another check and balance to confirm everyone is getting paid.

6. Water/Sewer

- A. Anthony wrote an email to Allan Brown recommending to gather any additional information on water/sewer for the team civil engineer. Anthony said a survey was done on the property and water and sewer was not indicated. This information should be available at the Water District. It will cost more not knowing where everything is underground. Jim said he will follow-up.

7. Sub-Committee's

- A. House removal is being handled by Jim.
- B. Grants and financing is being researched by Jonathan Lord.
- C. Public information and marketing, Kimberley likes the video idea, a website, a sign advertising at the site. Kimberley asked do we want a sub-committee for marketing or the whole committee brainstorm at the next meeting. A sub-committee will be formed.

8. Other Business

- A. Howard confirmed that test borings can be completed on the property and he asked the status of such. Anthony said he will be contacting the Geotechnical Engineer, he will schedule the date and then this Committee or the town needs to notify the abutters. Ed Mical asked if there will be an issue with trees and Anthony said no.

9. Next Meeting

Next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 12, 2017

Recorder of the minutes: Mary Whalen