

**Long Range Facilities Planning Committee
Answers to Info Session Questions
May 12, 2015**

<p>Q: CONSIDERING THAT THE CONTACT ON THE PSF FLYER HAS NOT EVEN SEEN PLANS FOR THE BUILDING, I AM CONCERNED THAT THIS HAS NOT BEEN THOROUGHLY THOUGHT OUT AS FAR AS PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES.</p> <p>A: Expert opinion based on square footage costs; consistent with other actuals.</p>
<p>Q: HOW WAS THE FIGURE OF 7.1M ATTAINED? ARE THERE ACTUAL PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN DRAWN UP FOR BOTH THE SENIOR CENTER AND THE PSF?</p> <p>A: Expert opinion based on square footage costs. Artist's rendition of Senior Center; nothing else yet because to incur the planning costs before a vote would be premature. These costs are included in the requested amounts.</p>
<p>Q: HAVE ALL THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS BEEN DONE FOR THE LAND, TO RULE OUT MAJOR POTENTIAL PROBLEMS WITH GROUNDBREAKING, DRAINAGE, WATER SOURCES ETC?</p> <p>A: Not all geological surveys have been completed. The well will be a "public water supply" and will need extensive testing and assessment before it can be permitted. We do not anticipate any surprises, but that's why there is a construction contingency built into the overall budget. These studies will be amongst the first activities initiated once funding is approved.</p>
<p>Q: WHAT IS THE ACTUAL PRICE TAG FOR EACH OF THESE OVER RIDE BALLOT QUESTIONS? THE REPORT STATES 7.5M IN 2016 DOLLARS BEFORE GRANTS, STATE FUNDING AND OTHER COST SAVING DEFERRAL STRATEGIES. HAVE THESE FACTORS BEEN INITIATED? HOW MUCH MONEY IN SAVINGS ARE WE LOOKING AT? AND WILL THOSE MONIES AND STRATEGIES BE ACCOMPLISHED IN 2016?</p> <p>A: These are <u>not</u> override questions. They are <u>debt exclusion</u> questions. Overrides are permanent tax increases; debt exclusions are increases that last only for the life of the debt. The "price tags" are: \$7.5M for Phase 1 (Sr. Ctr. and PSB); \$400K for fire truck; \$250K for ambulance. The \$500K grant for the Senior Center has been obtained; other savings will result from nonuse of the replaced buildings, collocation of Town offices, avoidance of the deferred maintenance costs that we would incur to keep the current buildings operational, and so on (e.g., no lease of Breezy Hill, no heating of FS #1).</p>
<p>Q: HAVING SPOKEN WITH OTHER TOWNS THAT HAVE BUILT SIMILAR BUILDINGS, \$7.1M SEEMS AN UNREALISTIC FIGURE GIVEN THE AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDED AMMENITIES IN THE REPORT. AGAIN HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT THIS FIGURE?</p> <p>A: Our experts and other outside consultants gave their opinions based on square footage cost, which are consistent with other actuals. And while we will need some furnishings and fit-ups, we have most of the furnishings and fixtures already because our Police and Fire Departments are operational.</p>
<p>Q: IT APPEARS THAT YOU ARE ASKING FOR A BLANK CHECK ON EACH ITEM SINCE THERE ARE NO DOLLAR FIGURES IN ANY OF THE QUESTIONS OR WORDING INDICATING THAT THE AMOUNT WILL BE WHAT IS VOTED ON AT TOWN MEETING!</p> <p>A: The warrant will state the dollar figures and other communications will be sent to voters before the meeting describing the debt exclusion requests and amounts.</p>

**Long Range Facilities Planning Committee
Answers to Info Session Questions
May 12, 2015**

Q:	THE REPORT STATES THAT THE AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX INCREASE WOULD BE LESS THAN \$300. DOES THAT INCREASE INCLUDE THE AMBULANCE AND FIRE TRUCK PURCHASE? IF NOT WHAT WOULD THAT INCREASE BE?
A:	The LRFPC report speaks only to the building of the Senior Center and the Public Safety Building. It does not address any other debt exclusion questions or purchase questions, such as the ambulance and fire truck. But average tax increase will still be less than \$300 if we go for a 40-year borrow on the buildings, even with the ambulance and fire truck. It will be more if we go for a shorter borrowing period.
Q:	WHAT ABOUT ALL THE MONEY IT WILL TAKE TO MAN, EQUIP, MAINTAIN, FURNISH AND PAY FOR HEAT/COOL EXPENSES IN THESE LARGER BUILDINGS? I SUBMIT THAT IT WILL PROBABLY BE THE SAME OR MORE, WE WILL NOT BE SAVING ANYTHING.
A:	It may be more but offsetting savings will come from higher efficiencies, no lease of Breezy Hill, and no heating of FS#1. The purpose of these buildings is not to save on operating expenses - their purpose is to safely and legally house our public safety employees and our seniors, avoiding the potential liabilities the Town now risks due to the current condition of its buildings.
Q:	WHAT IS THE 10 YEAR PLAN AS FAR AS INCREASES IN MANPOWER & RESOURCES TO UTILIZE AND MAINTAIN THESE BUILDINGS APPROPRIATELY?
A:	The BOS is working on this. This plan was not within the scope of the LRFPC charge. It is a goal in the design and construction of these buildings to use low maintenance exteriors (masonry or other), pitched roofs and quality construction so that maintenance is not a burden.
Q:	WILL THE PUBLIC HAVE 24 HR ACCESS TO THE PSF? IF SO WHAT COSTS ARE ASSOCIATED WITH MAKING THAT POSSIBLE?
A:	The BOS is working on the rules under which access to both the PSB and the Senior Center will be available to the general public. Any increase in costs would be to heat the premises and provide utilities to the premises after hours - minimal.
Q:	WILL DISPATCH REMAIN REGIONALIZED?
A:	Yes.
Q:	DO YOU PROJECT AN OVERRIDE TO ACCOMMODATE THE SCHOOL BUDGET THIS YEAR?
A:	No.
Q:	WHAT IS THE CONTINGENCY DOLLAR FIGURE BUILT INTO THAT NUMBER?
A:	The contingency dollar amount built into the \$7.5M construction amount is \$400K.
Q:	WHY NOT REGIONALIZE THE SENIOR CENTER? MORE PEOPLE, LESS MONEY, MORE SOCIALIZING.
A:	Hubbardston tried to regionalize with Westminster for a senior center some years ago but there was insufficient local support.
Q:	WOULD IT BE MORE COST EFFECTIVE TO MAKE THE TWO BUILDINGS ONE FOOTPRINT, WITH SEPARATE ENTRANCES?
A:	No because the needs are different and that is not recommended by our experts.

**Long Range Facilities Planning Committee
Answers to Info Session Questions
May 12, 2015**

<p>Q: WHAT ABOUT TRAFFIC CONCERNS ESPECIALLY IN THE SUMMER SO CLOSE TO THE REC FIELDS?</p> <p>A: Traffic increases are projected to be minimal. Moving the Seniors out of the Slade Building will reduce traffic and traffic conflicts that exist during morning and afternoons at the Center School and Slade Building. Traffic into and out of the Fire/Police Facility is usually during the business day and during the week, not the weekends or evenings, when the rec fields experience peak usage. The Fire Department currently passes by the rec fields to get from Breezy Hill to FS# 1, that trip will be eliminated with a single station location.</p>
<p>Q: WILL THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDINGS BLEND IN WITH EXISTING STRUCTURES IN THAT PART OF TOWN?</p> <p>A: The buildings will be designed to be aesthetically appealing and consistent with the Town's rural character. We hope you will participate on the committees that will recommend designs to the BOS.</p>
<p>Q: THERE WAS MENTION OF A COMMAND POST/EMERGENCY OP CENTER, WHY NOT USE THE REGIONAL FACILITY FOR THAT?</p> <p>A: We will plan to use the Public safety Building as an emergency response center in the event of local emergencies such as a large ice storm or tornado. The regional dispatch will be part of our emergency response team but we must have space locally to run emergency response operations. The Training/Meeting Room will be equipped to act as an Emergency Operations Center, with computer, communications and power outlets located strategically throughout the room for just this purpose</p>
<p>Q: WHY COULDN'T THE AMBULANCE BE PURCHASED OUT OF THE HOLDEN TRUST FUND FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES?</p> <p>A: It can if there are funds left in the trust fund.</p>
<p>Q: WILL THESE BUILDINGS STILL BE APPROPRIATE FOR THE 40 YEARS IT'S GOING TO TAKE TO PAY THEM OFF?</p> <p>A: In general, yes - that is how they are being designed. They will probably need modification in the years to come, as laws change and population changes (for example, the requirement of a secure lockup once the Town's population hits 5K). Keep in mind that the payoff term might be less than 40 years, depending on what is decided by the BOS.</p>
<p>Q: BOTH FACILITIES SHOULD BE SEPARATE VOTES, THIS SEEMS LIKE A DELIBERATE STRONG ARM TACTIC.</p> <p>A: The LRFPC sees separate votes as a strong-arm tactic. The need for both buildings in the Town was identified by the Committee, and by the experts, as identical in terms of (a) the departmental needs and (b) the building conditions and therefore does not see this as an "either/or" scenario. In addition, the construction of both simultaneously saves money - probably \$2M, according to our experts - and is necessary to achieve Phases 2 and 3 by 2017.</p>

**Long Range Facilities Planning Committee
Answers to Info Session Questions
May 12, 2015**

Q:	I AM CONCERNED THAT THIS WILL BECOME "THE BIG DIG" OF HUBBARDSTON. WHAT ASSURANCES DO YOU HAVE THAT THIS WILL NOT BE THE CASE?
A:	This type of municipal building construction is well understood and experts have been involved in the site assessment. The construction budget includes funds for a project manager to ensure that proper budgeting, construction controls, and schedules are met.
Q:	WHEN DO YOU FORSEE PHASES 2 & 3 COMING TO FRUITION?
A:	After the two buildings are built - probably 2017.
Q:	IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE NEED BETTER TOWN OFFICES MORE THAT WE NEED A SENIOR CENTER
A:	That is not what the experts have told us, or what the Town survey revealed, as described in the LRFPC report. And better Town offices are Phase 2.

**Long Range Facilities Planning Committee
Answers to Info Session Questions
May 12, 2015**

	<p>I REQUEST THE TOWN MESSAGE BOARD BE UTILIZED TO ADVERTISE THE ELECTORAL BALLOT/DEBT EXCLUSION QUESTIONS.</p>
<p>Answer:</p>	<p>That sounds reasonable.</p>
	<p>TO REQUEST AN OVER RIDE FOR 2 LARGE BUILDINGS AND TWO EXPENSIVE PIECES OF EQUIPMENT IN ONE FISCAL YEAR SEEMS INAPPROPRIATE AND FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE. WHAT IS FINCOM'S TAKE ON THESE SUBMISSIONS?</p>
<p>Answer:</p>	<p>These are not overrides. They are debt exclusions. There is an important difference, discussed above. FinCom recommends the \$7.5M debt exclusion and took no action on the other two.</p>