

Pepperell Building Committee

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 6, 2022

1.0 Call to order

The meeting was called to Order by Catherine Lundeen at 4:05 pm via ‘Go to Meeting.’

2.0 Attendees

2.1 Present

Catherine Lundeen, Brian Borneman, Taya Dixon Mullane, David Querze, David Scott, David Stairs, Andrew MacLean, Joe LoBuono

Project Team: Bryan Fors (vertex), Rebecca Hopkins (techtion)

Public: Kelli, Tony Beattie, Gil Morel, Jason, William Schlosstein, Harvey and Judy Serreze, KS, John and Joan Ladik, Rob Rand, Shaun Shattuck, David, Chuck W, Harvey Serreze, M. Quinton Cutler, John Coburn, Caroline Ahdab, Mike D, Sandra Hartnett, Betty, Gertrude, Kelli, Gina, Mark Mathews, Bentley Herget, Elaine Marco, April, PK, Martin Cadek, Matt Chapman, Alam

2.2 Absent

Lea Gavrilov

3.0 Action Items

Intro by A. MacLean. Presentation by R. Hopkins & Bryn Fors & A. MacLean on the project.
Opened to questions:

1. Question: John Ladik 16 Joan Street - why was affordability not a goal?
 - a. A. MacLean – cost was always a goal since the beginning, and will be through the project. The SB did not assign a project budget, but affordability is an objective.
2. Question: John and Joan Ladik 16 Joan Street – Concerned that the style of the building is not in traditional New England form or shape.
 - a. Comment acknowledge by Building Committee.
3. Question: Caroline Ahdab and Dave Lavender, 19 Deerfield Drive - How many more years are left paying for NMRHS?
 - a. Refinancing underway – A. MacLean - believe it is extended out 20 years.
4. Matt Chapman - do other towns of our size have firing ranges, and could it be omitted to maintain overall project affordability
 - a. D. Scott – yes, most do. Also recommend an interior firing range to minimize potential noise issues with proposed housing development near Jersey Street.

5. [Caroline Ahdab & Dave Lavender](#), 19 Deerfield Drive - Is the location near a water protection resource district? If so, how far is it from the proposed complex and what will the project do to protect our drinking water?
 - a. R. Hopkins – Referred to the slide with the site plan; wellhead protection area marked. Working with Civil Engineer and town representatives. Also within an aquifer protection area and ACEC – all items require different permitting requirements and site design thru a stormwater management plan.
6. Sandra Hartnett, 1 Willow Street - if the final cost is 40 million, are you planning to finance it for 40 years? Isn't 30 to 40 years of debt financing unfair to the younger people in town?
 - a. A. MacLean - Term of financing will be based on final cost. Can finance up to 40 years but comes with higher interest rate. Could finance for as little as 20 years. Will seek best interest rate when we know the total project cost. Benefits for next two generations.
7. [Tony Beattie, 36 Oak Hill Street](#) - are you able to comment on the carbon footprint of this project, with Climate Change in mind.
 - a. R. Hopkins – public safety buildings can have an impact on the environment; and the project will be looking at sustainability, and will talk about more specifics as the design progresses including items such as: high performance building envelopes, indoor environment, life cycle cost analysis, zero energy, energy consumption and potential energy production, fully electric, net zero, and right sizing for the town.
8. [Harvey Serreze](#) 93 Elm St - What would happen to the existing school building that houses the police department?
 - a. Committee discussed this, but have not determined future plans. Considering disposing of the property into private hands, possibly downtown business, etc. Will be looking for the community for guidance.
9. Rob Rand 77 A Streey – what is well protection zone number on the site?
 - a. Zone 3 – located at corner of the parcel.
10. Matthew Chapman 38 Bayberry Street - why wasn't the field behind the current police station considered?
 - a. Protection on property for long term use of recreation, and also wetlands are present.
11. Alan (no last name provided) - What controls are in place to stop runaway costs...as happened with Lowell HS?
 - a. R. Hopkins – all of the numbers reviewed tonight include contingencies, are escalated into the mid-point of construction, will considering bidding elements as alternates; project team is in contact with contractors so understand availability of materials and costs. Will also have a third party estimate to compare to the architects estimate during different phases of design.
12. [Jason \(no last name provided\)](#) Can part of Peter Fitz be repurposed?
 - a. R. Hopkins – looked at repurposing all or part of the Peter Fitz. Many issues including code concerns, building would need to be substantially reconstructed to support structure due to change of use, layouts resulted in sub-optimal layouts for the program, and difficult to provide all access points off of the site.
13. Sandra Hartnett 1 willow Street - Could you explain what is on the Town Meeting Warrant in regards to this project

- a. A. MacLean - Town received ARPA funding. The SB can allocate funds. The Building Committee asked for funding for the next phase of the project. Select Board noted Town Meeting agreed to Phase 1 of the project and that we would come back in about a year of the progress and asking for additional funding for phases 2 and 3. Phase 2 is final design and bidding. Could ask for the total of phases 2 and 3 (construction), but due to fluctuations on the market would come in for Phase 2. SB asked for Town Meeting to endorse the ARPA funds to endorse Phase 2 of detailed design. Town Meeting on May 9th

8.0 Adjournment

B. Borneman motioned to adjourn. Seconded J. LoBuono, and unanimously approved by the committee. Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.