

Minutes of the Space Needs Work Group Meeting

June 25, 2012 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Training Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road, Nantucket, MA 02554

Present: Libby Gibson, Town Manager; Rick Fenuccio, Brown Lindquist Raber & Fenuccio (BLR&F); Diane O’Neil, Procurement Officer; Charlie Walters, Melissa Philbrick, John O’Connor, Patty Roggeveen, Bruce D. Miller, John Tiffany

Louise Swift joined the meeting at 4:15 pm.

Absent: Neil Paterson, Mike Forth (listened by phone)

General discussion began about the mission of the work group and the time length of a space needs plan. LG: suggested the plan would be meant for between a 10-20 year time frame and that with regard to the number of employees and space needs, those weren’t expected to change significantly from current numbers.

LG: review some suggested components of a mission statement for the work group, to include:

- downtown vs out-of-town office locations
- how much space is needed
- a review of the cost of renovated space vs new space (LG noted that some review of this has already been done by BLR&F)
- identification of what town land is/isn’t available for office space and an evaluation of such property, for municipal office space
- public outreach and education of a final plan, including the specific project(s) to be recommended/put forward and when (ie, 20 South Water St renovation)
- timeline for completion of a plan

MP: suggested that the work group needs to know more about the actual space needs of the town departments. LG said that a report done by a firm called The Maguire Group did a space needs review several years ago, but it will need to be updated.

PR: suggested that if court offices were relocated more space can be available for municipal offices at 16 Broad St. MP: expressed concern about community support for a court office project that would be funded by Nantucket taxpayers. Some discussion followed as to where the court offices might move to and whether or not state funds would be made available for any such move, including construction of a new building or rental of an existing building.

MP: suggested that it would be helpful for the work group to know what departments need to be located where and which would be best to be adjacent to each other.

JT: suggested that a recommended plan should boil down to what we know, rather than what might happen or has not happened. He added that it would be beneficial to list unknowns but not necessarily react to them in a plan.

BDM: suggested that voters are more likely to support individual projects as long as a comprehensive plan has been developed.

MP: added that there is a need for a well-developed public process for review of the plan.

JO'C: noted his perception of continued sensitivity in the community regarding the Public Safety Facility (PSF).

PR: suggested an incremental approach.

LG: noted Community Preservation funds could be used for some components of the renovation of 20 South Water St and reviewed the timeline for an application to the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) for fiscal year 2014.

PR: suggested that another funding source might revenue derived from the sale of town property\*.

RF: reviewed the 20 South Water St design feasibility study that his firm prepared and highlighted the 5 options that were developed (options A – E). He added that the firm has essentially completed its contract; and, that during the course of that work, they did some other associated work for the Town, including a review of office space options at 2 Fairgrounds Rd and 37 Washington St.

MP: asked about storage space for files and records and suggested that the work group needs to know what the Town's long-term records storage and management plan is. Some additional discussion followed about other types of storage, such as general supplies storage and electronic records management.

JO'C: commented that as the discussion progresses about space needs, other issues have tended to be raised, such as records storage.

MP: suggested that the work group should be informed as to what needs to fit inside the town buildings now, and in the future.

JT: reiterated his position that we need to base a plan on what we definitively know, now.

Discussion continued about the Options for 20 South Water St. JT: expressed his preference for Option A, adding that we can vacate the Mooney Building, we have a place for those offices to relocate to and we should focus on what needs to be done now, first.

PR: expressed her opinion that the voters may not be ready for much more than the absolute basics, which the Board of Selectmen last December felt was Option B.

MP: commented that public outreach and education needs to be very strong.

RF: reviewed the estimated costs of Option A now and Option B now vs later.

JT: re-emphasized his preference for Option A because the additional portion of B can be done later if needed, adding, the key is to build what you need now with a flexible design that easily allows future expansion if necessary.

LG: noted that the Town of Nantucket and, probably, many towns in New England tend to build only what is needed for the immediate future, not the longer-term and that has, in Nantucket, tended to result in facilities that were insufficiently sized within a short time after opening. She cited the current Nantucket Fire Station, the Nantucket Elementary School and the 20 South Water St building which was meant to temporarily house the police department (in 1980) as examples. CW: agreed that the Town has tended to undersize some of its facilities and expressed support for a comprehensive plan.

RF: reviewed some of the specifics pertaining to the Options in terms of square footage. He then suggested that a list of core principles or issues be developed and prioritized. He offered to work on a matrix of existing town office space with locations, numbers of employees, square footage, etc with DO.

Some discussion followed regarding the currently pending office moves of 37 Washington St to 2 Fairgrounds Rd; and, the Finance offices from the Mooney Building and Town Building to 37 Washington St. LS: asked if these office moves are temporary or permanent. After some discussion, PR: noted that we do not really know yet, pending the outcome of this process.

MP: suggested regular updates to the Finance Committee and a series of public forums (including a presentation of the plan, how the plan came about and outreach to get people to attend). LG: noted that similar outreach occurred for the PSF, including going to various civic and community groups.

Bruce Miller left the meeting at 5:40 pm.

The work group agreed to review the following items for the next meeting:

- the office space matrix -- to be prepared by RF & DO
- notes from the June 25<sup>th</sup> meeting – to be prepared by LG
- formalized mission and core principles – to be drafted by LG and sent around to the group for review before the next meeting

LG will get the complete BLR&F report on-line. The next meeting will be held on Monday, July 16, 2012 at 4pm in the same location as today's meeting.

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 5:45 pm.

*\*WORK GROUP: as I was doing these notes I remembered that revenue from the sale of town property can only be used for certain purposes (per Mass General Law) and if the property in question was funded through borrowing & the debt service is continuing, that has to be paid off first...there are some other restrictions as well. More on this as we proceed.*

Minutes Approved at Meeting of July 16, 2012