

**TOWN OF RYE
TOWN HALL SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 24, 2012
Rye Town Hall
6:30 p.m.**

Members Present: Chairman Ned Paul, Vice-Chair Curtis Boivin, Lucy Neiman, Paul Goldman, Peter Kasnet, Mel Low, Peter White, Phil Winslow, Paula Merritt, Beth Yeaton, Michael Magnant and Selectmen's Rep Jenness (arrived 6:45 p.m.)

Purpose: Create an economically sound proposal to resolve the space needs of the Town as an integral part of preservation/renovation of our historic Town Hall building.

I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Paul called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Review and acceptance of Meeting Minutes from October 10, 2012

Member Winslow noted the following corrections:

- Page 4, 6th paragraph reads: If the total driving forcing function is, Should read: **If the total driving force function is,**
- Page 12, 7th paragraph reads: Selectman Jenness explained that if Mr. Crawford moves forward of an analysis on his own of cubic feet, Should read: **Selectmen Jenness explained that if Mr. Crawford moves forward with an analysis on his own of cubic feet,**

Chairman Paul opened up to discussion of the minutes to summarize the meeting of October 10th.

Vice-Chair Boivin explained that he went through the plans of A.G. Architect and labeled everything that was a net square footage in their calculations and compared that to his overall square footage of the building. That calculation differed by 20%. The difference of 20% includes all of their circulation space and all the interior/exterior walls. His total square footage was recalculated at 11,500. He continued that at this moment forward he would like to look at an overall reduction of square footage to pass along to the architect. It could be asked what could be done with a 25% to 35% reduction in square footage. A high side and low side of total square footage could be given for the building. It could also be noted that the smaller the square footage the more pleasing the appearance of the building may be.

Member White asked why they are starting off from a document that was rejected by the Town.

Vice-Chair Boivin explained they are not going off a document that was rejected by the Town. He is basing this off the internal sizes that he was given for everything. The reduction is based on the analysis. He is going from the bases of the internal analysis that was done on all the departments.

Chairman Paul stated that he does not think it is this Committee's job to tell anyone what the building should look like or if it should be one or two buildings. It is; "What are the space needs of the Town?" Everyone should take structure out of their head. It can be documented to say what the Heritage Commission would like to see; however, it should be based on what the Town needs to effectively move forward. That is what he would like to talk about at the Deliberative Session, so it does not get "bogged" down in details, and it can be funded to move to the next step. At that point, professionals can be hired to better evaluate the details of the project. He continued there is a lot of concrete information in the minutes from the last meeting and a lot of good debate. He pointed out that there are two meetings left. He expects that by the next meeting they will have a final draft in front of everyone for final comments.

Regarding the previous meeting, Member Neiman asked what the conclusion was.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated the goal was to resolve square footage. To him one of the largest resolutions of the meeting was that they do not need to be as precise and can start to accept a percentage reduction across the board. He pointed out that in going through each department, he can get a much more conservation number easily bringing it down by 25%.

Chairman Paul stated he thinks they need to work from a "bottoms up" approach. He pointed out the department heads live their job, day in and day out. They know best the space they need. They have been interviewed twice and put under scrutiny. A "bottoms up" approach is a very simplistic approach and every square foot can be justified. He noted there was a quote from the meeting, "Basically, we are at a position of agreeing on that we need additional space no larger than the same size of the current Rye Town Hall Building". He pointed out that he did not like this; however, it was one of the best things that came out of the previous meeting.

Member Neiman asked if the other conclusion is that they would not worry about whether it was one building or two buildings.

Chairman Paul confirmed.

Member Neiman noted there was a lot of discussion about Recreation. She asked what the conclusion was on Recreation.

Chairman Paul pointed out that Recreation needs to be divided into two areas; program and administration. Administration should be included, and if the programming is included, it would only be short term inclusion as their goal is to have an off-site facility. He sees Recreation as split with only administrative needs in Town Hall.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated the issue with that was to plan a current building based on the future construction of the Recreation Department. It would be difficult not to provide them storage someplace. The more he thinks about that, the more he comes back to there are immediate storage needs for the Recreation Department. There is a building adjacent to this one, which has been said it is not a valid building. There is no evidence of that. He does not know why they do not have a company come in and take a look at the building for actual storage needs. He pointed out that he is talking about the old police station. There are hundreds of square feet of storage that no one wants to use because it is in bad shape. If there is storage capacity, he asked if it is valid to actually use it.

Speaking to Recreation Director Lee Arthur, Chairman Paul asked if that building is “maxed” out for space. He asked if there is additional room available.

Recreation Director Lee Arthur replied there is more space available. She pointed out that when they were speaking about storage at Town Hall they were speaking about administrative storage. The storage is for the functionality of administrative duties.

Chairman Paul asked about the great room. It has a large stage area to do the tasks needed to be done.

Ms. Arthur explained that could be done; however, they are working on tasks every day.

Member Goldman stated that at the last meeting it seemed that the solution may include Recreation on the ground floor of the existing building. There may then be a separate building for Town Hall services. If that is the way it is going, there may not necessarily have to be something future for Recreation expansion as stated in the CIP if the current building is used. He pointed out that the Committee does not have to get “hung up” on structure and all of that. However, they may say, “Recreation is a part of all of this and they have space needs”. If this is all packaged up properly and presented to the Selectmen as a Space Needs Recommendation, it could be said this is what the Town needs for its programs and its administrative offices.

Regarding the old police station, Vice-Chair Boivin reiterated that a study of that building should be done. It should be confirmed if there is mold in the building and where it is coming from. The costs should be analyzed for the remediation of the building to provide storage in that building.

Member Goldman stated what they are trying to do is like a parallel set of work to be done. The Committee has to report on space needs and that does not have to be contingent upon whether the old police station can be used or not. If it can be, maybe that will alter the design plans “downstream”. Maybe it will make the addition on the existing building smaller. That is something that should be done for the sake of completeness. However, it should not “hang up” the Committee.

Vice-Chair Boivin explained that Recreation needs square footage and it needs to be provided for somewhere. The concern is really not if it is in a separate building or the same building.

Member Winslow stated that one of the charges of the Committee was to look at all of the municipal buildings in the Town. The old police station is one of the buildings. He asked if on their presentation they could simply state that a potential study needs to happen for feasibility of the building.

Vice-Chair Boivin commented he is not sure if there is a budget for that or if they would need an estimate. He does think that a study should be done to determine if it is usable square footage and costs associated with that.

Member Merritt expressed her concerns on the soil underneath the old police station. This was something that was not thought of years ago.

Vice-Chair Boivin commented there would need to be further review and testing for a final determination. This would all be factored into further costs as well.

Regarding the minutes of October 10th, Chairman Paul called for a further questions or comments.

Selectman Jenness noted the following corrections:

- Page 2, under c, item ii reads: What key pieces were important? Should read: **What key pieces were important?**
- Page 3, 4th paragraph reads: Recreation Director Lee Arthur stated if their offices are at Town Hall they need the space to be effect when dealing with the tangible items that Recreation needs. Should read: **Recreation Director Lee Arthur stated if their offices are at Town Hall they need the space to be effective when dealing with the tangible items that Recreation needs.**
- Page 4, 4th paragraph reads: They can come look at it from the starting point. Should read: **They can look at it from the starting point.**

Motion by Beth Yeaton to approve the minutes of October 10, 2012 as amended. Seconded by Phil Winslow. All in favor.

III. Work Session

1. Storage Analysis – Peter Crawford

Chairman Paul opened to Peter Crawford for his presentation.

Peter Crawford, 171 Brackett Road, explained that as a result one of the previous meetings he had thought there was going to be a cubic foot analysis prepared as Member Winslow had requested. This was not done so he was appointed to do the analysis. He continued that Member Yeaton was very helpful. She took him through most of the departments in Town Hall. They also went to the new Public Safety Building. He pointed out that he and Lee Arthur went through the Recreation Department, within Town Hall, and also the old police station. Ms. Arthur also took him to the Recreation area. He further explained that he took a measuring tape and measured all of the bookcases, boxes and filing cabinets. He measured everything except the furniture, tables, chairs and desks, within the offices. He calculated the numbers to come up with a cubic foot number for the things that he considered storage items. He pointed out that he tried to be as inclusive as he could. If anything, he erred on the high side.

Mr. Crawford continued onto the second page of the analysis. He pointed out this lists the numbers. He came up with 3,396 square feet. This analysis is broken out by departments. He noted that copies were sent to the Member Yeaton and Ms. Arthur.

He stated that the number of 3,396 square feet is a lot more than what he came up with last time. His last calculations were taken from the slide show by Michael Magnant regarding the current storage at Town Hall. He wrote down rough numbers for filing cabinets and boxes. If it was not in the slide presentation it did not get counted. Obviously, there were a lot that were not in the pictures and that would explain the difference. He pointed out that the Town Clerk and the Building Inspector have the two biggest storage space needs.

Mr. Crawford reviewed his cubic feet storage analysis.

He pointed out that the cubic square feet that he came up with is approximately 1100 to 1200 square feet of floor space, which is similar to the numbers of Vice-Chair Boivin of 1245sf. He pointed out that it appears that Vice-Chair Boivin has a higher number for the work area figures, which is not separately broken out as storage. He thinks that he has come up with a somewhat lower number.

Selectman Jenness stated that she is having a little trouble envisioning storage in 6ft high cabinets. Is this using a step ladder?

Mr. Crawford commented not necessarily.

Selectman Jenness noted there are a quite a few employees that would have trouble using a 6ft high storage cabinet.

Member Yeaton pointed out that she can reach the top of her five drawer file cabinets. She is concerned about the 6ft number.

Mr. Crawford explained the assumption could be changed. He was just making some assumptions. He tried to use round numbers.

Member Goldman stated the assumption should be based more on actual user needs and how they do things. Some people may have credenza cabinets with pullout lateral files and some may have a whole series of less than 6ft high file cabinets. It is not necessarily true that one number and one assumption will fit everyone's needs. This would impact the required square footage.

Mr. Crawford stated if someone wants to spend some more time they could go through each department and look at the numbers.

Member Goldman explained that the people who occupy the offices and do the work know what they need to be able to do their job. If everything transforms all of a sudden, to a 6ft high cabinet requirement to make the overall space a little smaller, a lot of people will be made very uncomfortable doing their job.

Mr. Crawford commented he could come up with a different assumption.

Member Neiman stated that Vice-Chair Boivin's analysis has already done the work.

Mr. Crawford asked if he could continue his presentation. He would like to go over the conclusions that have come out of his analysis.

Member Goldman stated he is very interested in what "flows out" of this. However, he would like to "raise a red flag" for going down a path on an assumption that may not be realistic.

Mr. Crawford continued to review his analysis.

Mr. Crawford reiterated that he came up with 3,369 square feet for departmental space. He pointed out that some departmental spaces do not match the needs. He reviewed his chart from the presentation.

Vice-Chair Boivin commented the two areas, from his analysis and this one, that have discrepancies are Town Clerk and Recreation. Everything else is pretty close.

Mr. Crawford also noted that Assessing is significantly higher than what the model would say for needs. He thinks the numbers of the Concerned Citizens and Vice-Chair Boivin seem higher relative to the storage needs and the people that are there.

Member Winslow pointed out the Concerned Citizens do not have an analysis regarding Recreation.

Mr. Crawford commented they were planning to move Recreation out when that was done.

Member Yeaton stated she thinks the reason the storage for her office is off is because much of the storage is not in 6ft high cabinets. Some of the storage is in bookcases that would not fit well into file cabinets. That spreads out the storage needs and there are a lot of items that do not fit the storage cabinet criteria. She thinks where this differs is in how the storage space is used. It does not lend itself well to metal filing cabinets. She reiterated this is probably where the difference comes from.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated that might be true for Recreation also where they have things that are neatly stacked versus being in a file cabinet.

Ms. Arthur stated that functionality is the problem within their space.

Mr. Crawford pointed out that he still feels his analysis is on the high side, made worse by the additional 1000sf for the circulation.

Member Neiman asked if circulation was added to his model.

Mr. Crawford confirmed. He reviewed for the Committee.

Vice-Chair Boivin pointed out the Committee needs to go in the direction of a percentage. This will address the concerns of really getting conservative. He thinks it is possible to “squeeze” everything down to 9,000sf. That is where there will be some “give and take”.

Mr. Crawford stated they were saying 8,200sf without Recreation. He would agree that including Recreation it would have a significantly higher number.

Vice-Chair Boivin pointed out that in adding Recreation to his model the numbers will be very close. The Committee is saying that Recreation is included in the Town Hall Space Needs Analysis. The proposal should say that a home is needed for the Recreation Department and it can't be neglected.

Mr. Crawford reviewed his analysis in comparison to Vice-Chair Boivin's analysis.

Speaking to Mr. Crawford, Member Winslow stated in looking at the current model versus his model the numbers are very close. He asked if he is saying that what the Town Hall currently has is satisfactory.

Mr. Crawford explained some departments are extraordinarily “squeezed”, such as, Recreation and Town Clerk. However, there are other departments that have lots of room; most of them upstairs in the great hall. Part of the plan is to reduce those offices. He pointed out that AG Architects even recognized that. He agrees that the overall total space is not terribly different from the current space. It is just distributed poorly.

Selectman Jenness asked if the projections include what will be necessary for ADA compliance.

Mr. Crawford commented that it is included as part of the circulation number.

Chairman Paul stated that in order to pass code those details are not known. That is why there has to be some flexibility. That is also why the two groups are going to come together and meet in the middle.

Mr. Crawford pointed out that the other analyses have significantly more circulation, which would get to the ADA requirements. He continued that he is a little confused on the statement that the numbers are similar. In taking 700sf for Recreation and adding it to the Concerned Citizens number of 8,200 this brings it to 8,900 sf. He pointed out that if Recreation is moved in there will need to be more circulation. The Concerned Citizens Analysis might be a “tad” low on the circulation. However, he thinks that they will be hard-pressed to see a number above 10,000sf.

Member White pointed out that the circulation on the first floor will be a greater percentage than the circulation on the second floor because of the wide expansive space of the great hall.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated this is a consideration. That is why it is a rough number. He continued there are always efficient ways to do circulation but it may not lead to the correct building in the end. He cautions the Committee in “painting” themselves into a corner in regards to the numbers. He continued that in taking his number and reducing it by 25%, it would put it at approximately 9,800. He asked if Recreation was subtracted out of that would it be at a size that he liked. He pointed out that would be a 35% reduction in the AG Architect number.

Mr. Crawford commented AG should not be used as the baseline. It should be built from the bottom up.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated a rough number, with Recreation, could start at 9,500 to 11,500. That is the goal and boundaries of the Committee.

Member Goldman clarified these are just acceptable boundaries.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated these are acceptable boundaries to give to the architect to say, “*Make this look appropriate and historically correct*”.

Mr. Crawford suggested having the architect doing three designs for 9,500, 10,500 and 11,500. He could also do designs for an option of looking at two buildings. The designs with costs could be presented to the voters as to what could be done. He pointed out that something has to be done because of the ADA requirements. Also, it is agreed that more space is needed at Town Hall. He is afraid that if one design or square foot number is done there will be a group of voters that will say it will not work.

Vice-Chair Boivin agreed. He continued this is a conservative Town and the Concerned Citizens’ numbers are conservative. Maybe that is the direction it will need to go. It may need to be smaller Town Hall offices but will be a vast improvement. He is all for it.

Member Goldman stated they have accommodated some things that are nice to have but they are not much, in terms of, doing Town business. For example, the great hall, people want that and have expressed their desire to have it. This has been included so far and now there is this “nitpick” about office space. He continued that AG is probably “way out of sight”. The Concerned Citizens of Rye is probably on the low side. It is probably somewhere within these boundary conditions. He asked why they don’t get to convergence and say, “As a Committee and as a group of citizens, we’ve exhausted this as much as we can to the point where these are the acceptable boundary conditions. Would we like it to be as small as possible? Yes; but, not to the point where people don’t have the storage space and they can’t do their jobs. However, certainly not with what AG proposed.” A warrant article will present the space needs and here are the boundary conditions that were agreed on by all.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated it makes sense.

Mr. Crawford commented that it sounds like he is disagreeing with giving a number. He asked if he is saying give it a range.

Member Goldman commented that everyone will get “some” of what they want. He is not disagreeing. He is trying to make sense of all this.

Chairman Paul commented, “Let’s do it”. He would like to come to a range at this meeting as to what is comfortable to the Citizens and the Committee.

Member Goldman stated he has listened to everything that has been said. He thinks Mr. Crawford has done a lot of really good work. He also thinks there are some differences. There is a professional architect, (Vice-Chair Boivin), involved who knows a lot about this. Speaking to Mr. Crawford, he pointed out that he has done a lot of analytical work with assumptions. The assumptions are probably no more or less valid than Vice-Chair Boivin’s are. The assumptions may be just as good or bad but Vice-Chair Boivin has the knowledge and architect experience. He pointed out that Vice-Chair Boivin has been through this analysis several times. All he is saying is, once the Committee decides the output for space needs recommendation and the boundary conditions, everyone is going to agree with that.

Member White stated the difference between the Concerned Citizens, with Recreation, and Vice-Chair Boivin’s numbers is 10,250. Taking the number of 10,250sf, plus or minus 10%, would accommodate the Concerned Citizens, on the low end, and accommodate Vice-Chair Boivin’s analysis, on the high end.

Member Goldman commented he would go with what was just said.

Vice-Chair Boivin agreed.

Mr. Crawford confirmed 9,500 to 11,500 is basically the same thing; with meeting in the middle. He is basically saying; let’s have the architect do several designs at different size ranges, then see how the Town reacts.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated the goal is to have something aesthetically pleasing. He thinks that is what is being said. The Heritage Commission and Concerned Citizens are concerned about making it too large. The Committee is concerned about making it too small inside. There has to be a coming together somewhere and that is why he thinks 10,500 is a good number. This is in-between the two numbers.

Member Goldman pointed out that when this gets to the conceptual point it could be reviewed by the departments. There is one more chance to iterate slightly downstream. This Committee does not know what they have might have overlooked.

Mr. Crawford suggested picking three numbers and doing three designs basically right at those numbers.

Member Low stated this sounds like it is getting “out of whack”.

Member Neiman pointed out that they are talking about 1,000sf difference between the numbers. That is not a lot of space.

Member Low stated the architect that did the designs had experience in dealing with town halls. To give him three different numbers is overstepping boundaries.

Member Goldman commented they could give the architect some design parameters to come up with a plan. However, there cannot be multiple sets of parameters or it will end up being lots of different projects. The Committee has tried to do a zero based bottoms up approach that has resulted in a target number with some tolerance on either side.

Chairman Paul thanked Mr. Crawford for his analysis. He has the file and it will be a part of the Committee's proposal. The suggestion of the three designs could be one of the recommendations as part of the next steps in the proposal that will be put together from this Committee. It is important for the architect to know what this Committee has done and what the recommendations are.

Mr. Crawford stated that AG did one design and that was the problem.

Member Low explained it was a preliminary step. If the money was approved at the Deliberative Session and the vote, then he would come back to do a plan.

Mr. Crawford stated he did a schematic design. The warrant article then said "shall we proceed and spend \$130,000 for design development". That means the schematic design was agreed to and it was moving to the next stage. He pointed out that Mr. Azzi was saying the same thing and he is an architect.

Chairman Paul thanked Mr. Crawford for his comments.

Member Merritt stated that her understanding is that the Committee needs to set up a warrant article.

Chairman Paul denied. He stated he asked this at the first meeting. The Committee will provide the proposal to the Selectmen and they will make up the warrant article based on the recommendations. He further explained that he does not want a square footage number put in the warrant article.

Member Merritt stated the Committee needs to get to the proposal that has nothing to do with the 10,500 number. Her understanding is they need to give a proposal for an amount of money so this can move further.

Chairman Paul denied.

Member Yeaton explained the Committee's charge was to come up with a square footage number to move forward with.

Chairman Paul agreed.

Member Yeaton stated the Committee could recommend an increase in working space to a total of 10,500 square feet, plus or minus 10%. It would then be turned over to the Selectmen for them to come up with a number to go forward to the design process. She thinks they do have to put in a square footage number. She likes the idea of a range because it does not "nail it down" to a particular number. She also likes the average, plus or minus the 10%. It should also be explained why it should be on the current property and how the final proposal was determined. That is as far as the Committee needs to go.

Selectman Jenness stated the things that this Committee has reached a consensus on, is important for the Selectmen to hear. She does agree with the range.

Chairman Paul commented it would be too easy for someone to agree or disagree with a specific number.

Member White asked if the Selectmen accepted the report, wouldn't it make sense that it be part of the warrant article?

Selectman Jenness stated she does not know what the warrant article will say until the Selectmen review the report.

Member Neiman noted that part of the Committee's objective is to get agreement and support from the Concerned Citizens. She asked if they reached an agreement with the Concerned Citizens on this approach; the number of 10,500, plus or minus 10%.

Mr. Crawford stated he would like to see very basic sketches.

Chairman Paul asked Mr. Crawford to answer "yes or no". He pointed out there is only one week to do this.

Mr. Crawford commented he does not necessarily speak for the Concerned Citizens. They have not reviewed the numbers that he presented to the Committee within the last few weeks. He continued that from his perspective he thinks a design needs to be done at 9,500sf.

Chairman Paul explained that is not within the scope of their meeting.

Speaking to Mr. Crawford, Member Goldman stated he has had a lot of "air time". The Committee has listened to everything. The Committee has the responsibility and accountability to come up with something. They are now at the point of asking for closure. He continued that at the previous meeting, he asked when it comes to the Deliberative Session, that everyone operate as a team; with no hidden agendas and no big surprises at the Session because something is not liked, that was done here when everyone was a part of it. He is asking the same thing again tonight. He is getting really impatient. The Committee is trying to get this work done.

Member Neiman stated her concern is a statement that was made that, "*The Boivin Space Needs projection remains excessive on these documents*". The end statement; "*Accommodating an 11,500 square foot Town Hall WOULD CAUSE ANY ADDITION TO DOMINATE THE BUILDING*". She pointed out that this is not going to get anywhere if this kind of information gets out into the public.

Mr. Crawford stated this is a public meeting. There can be no guarantee what is going to go out to the public or not.

Chairman Paul explained they are asking for his input. He asked if he is satisfied with what they are coming up with.

Mr. Crawford stated he thinks they need to be focused on the voters. This is a room of only 20 people. There are 4,980 other people.

Mae Bradshaw, 106 Harbor Road, representing the Heritage Commission, stated she would just like to reiterate what it was that she said at the last meeting on their behalf. There is a certain size that works as an addition to this building. An add-on that is as big or almost as big, wouldn't work. It will not work and will not be acceptable. She continued for Mr. Crawford or anyone to commit to Member Goldman's request, that this be supported 100% in what is concluded, is difficult to say tonight. She does appreciate why this would be wanted. Having everyone's support, as this moves forward, is an ideal. On behalf of the Heritage Commission, she does not support a building that is going to be too big. If the architect concludes that it needs to be two buildings, it would be very likely that it would be supported or a much

smaller 9,500 square foot building. She thinks that to ask anyone in the room if they are going with the Committee at the Deliberative Session and “waving the same flag” is tough. That is not something that can be committed to now. The proposal needs to be reviewed and the response of the Selectmen is needed before asking people to commit.

Chairman Paul pointed out that at the Deliberative Session all they will be asking for is money to be able to further the study. There is no building right now. If anyone has in their mind a building that is too large because the space needs are that big, that is an incorrect conclusion. He reiterated they are only requesting money to further define the study to find an appropriate solution for the space needs. He commented that if the space needs warrant an addition that is too big, he thinks a separate building is probably a good solution.

Member Yeaton stated the Committee was charged with coming up with the square footage for the space needs of Town Hall. If a number of 10,500, plus or minus 10%, is all that the Committee is looking for and asking. She asked if this sounds like a reasonable number.

Speaking to Ms. Bradshaw, Member Goldman stated he could not agree more. Regarding the aesthetics and historic position of the building, he agrees with all of that. He pointed out that the Committee has worked really hard to get to the space requirements. It is down to a number, plus or minus 10%. Mr. Crawford has stood here with minor details time after time. It is now time for him to put his commitment on the line that when it comes to a conclusion, that he was a part of, that he is going to say, “Yes”. Member Goldman continued that he is not talking about an addition or whether it is one or two buildings. The Committee cannot do that. The Committee is asking, has Mr. Crawford supported the process and is he going to say “Yes or No”? At the Deliberative Session if questions come up it can be said that the process that has been followed got to the space needs requirements. A professional with design and architectural credentials, will need to get the Town through the next step, which will be what the warrant article is about.

Chairman Paul stated that he would like everyone to be able to leave feeling like their voice was heard. He would like everyone to rally around this point. If someone can't rally around 10,500 then they should be very concise so there can be one voice at the Deliberative Session to get support. He continued that if this does not get support someone is going to get hurt because it is not ADA compliant and everyone will pay for it. The other thing that could happen is the building could burn down because of its condition.

Vice-Chair Boivin proposed that they respect the Heritage Commission's research and include that within the report. There is a recommended gross square footage coming from the inside. There is also a good consensus of the Town that there should be a historic looking building. He reiterated that they are making “broad strokes” with a pen and should give a range with a recommendation of style.

Town Administrator Michael Magnant stated the Selectmen are looking for some strategies to gain the citizen's support. Speaking to Vice-Chair Boivin, he asked if from an architect's point of view, would be unreasonable for a client to see multiple designs? Maybe one of the recommendations that the Committee would want to make to the Selectmen is that there be multiple designs that people can review.

Vice-Chair Boivin explained the design should be a public process and should include several meetings that get feedback. Typically, there will be one design style throughout the process. Once in awhile, a couple of different schematics will be prepared. Those would be very different designs. It is very unlikely that a design would be done on 9,500, 10,500 and 11,500 square feet. That is an unlikely scenario for an architect to follow.

2. Creation of the proposal rough draft

- **Space Needs Committee recommendation**
 - **A reduction in square footage needs from the AG Report recommendation of 15,090 square feet to a range between 8,288 and 10,478 square feet**

- **Space Needs Committee supporting documentation**
 - **Town Hall survey of neighboring towns**
 - **Space Needs Committee binder**
 - **Town Hall alternative space options:**
 - **Pros and Cons**
 - **Financial Evaluation**
 - **Secondary space needs review with department heads head managers**
 - **Review of AG Architects recommendation**
 - **Review of Article 27**
 - **Review of Rye Town Hall courtroom usage**
 - **Review of required town record keeping**
 - **Inspection of RTH and RSB**
 - **Rey Concerned Citizens Reports**

Chairman Paul reviewed his notes for the final proposal. He asked Vice-Chair Boivin to address the 10,500 square foot number for the final report.

Vice-Chair Boivin agreed. He will be as conservative as possible while making it work.

There was further discussion and review of the supporting documentation for the final report.

3. Public Input

Victor Azzi, 1100 Old Ocean Boulevard, spoke to the charge of the Committee. He also stated that the number of 10,500, plus or minus 10%, was a number that he was at a few weeks ago. He is feeling very comfortable with that number. He thinks they will be able to accomplish what is needed for the Town, in terms of, moving forward with that as a number. He thinks that whatever is presented at the Deliberative Session for a warrant article will have to have more information than that. The voters will want to know what the vision is that the 10,500 square feet will add to the Town. To give a range of numbers is not responsive enough to the charge that was given to the Committee. It is necessary; however, it is not sufficient. He reiterated that there needs to be a vision of where this additional space will be created.

Member Goldman agreed. He understands what is necessary and what is efficient. He thinks they ought to respond to exactly what the charge of the Selectmen is and its completeness to the best of the Committee's ability. One of the fundamental drivers is coming to convergence on what the actual space needs are; whether it is two buildings or an addition. He continued that when it gets down to filling in the rest of it that makes it efficient, he was not getting an agreement on a necessary point, which is part of what team building is all about.

Vice-Chair Boivin stated the conclusion on the "where" is the current Town Hall site. The "how" is where the Heritage Commission should come in with the constraints and characteristics that are being sought. He summarized the report should be this site, this style and this amount of square footage, give or take.

There was further discussion on the preparation for the final report.

Sam Winebaum, Cable Road, spoke to the range of numbers and the separation of departments with two buildings.

Alex Herlihy, Rye Historic Society, stated there may be someone that goes to the Deliberative Session who has not been a part of this process and will not be a part of it until that time. What is now being submitted is just part of the process. There will be input at the Selectmen's Meetings and there will be opportunities up until the Deliberative Session.

Member Winslow stated what is provided to the Selectmen is critical. The way it is worded in a warrant article will be most critical to get the acceptance by the majority of the voters.

Ms. Bradshaw stated the "sale" of this will also be important.

Chairman Paul agreed that communication is the key.

Member Yeaton thanked Mr. Crawford for his work that he did on the cubic footage. She may not agree with the conclusions; however, she appreciates the amount of time and work that was put into the analysis.

Chairman Paul agreed. He called for the help of the Members in writing the report.

There was discussion on writing the final report.

- **Next Town Hall Space Needs Committee Meeting will be held on October 31, 2012**

IV. Adjournment

Motion by Beth Yeaton to adjourn at 8:44 p.m. Seconded by Mel Low. All in favor.

- **A complete copy of Peter Crawford's Presentation, dated October 23, 2012, may be viewed at the Rye Town Hall, Town Clerk's Office.**

Respectfully Submitted;
Dyana F. Ledger

Preliminary Rye Town Hall Storage Analysis
(PAC 10/13/12)

Depth, Width and Height are in inches. PS indicates Public Safety Building, OPS Old Police Station

	Locn.	Quantity	Depth	Width	Height	Cubic feet
Miscellaneous						
Ladies room paper supplies		1	25	48	46	31.94
Boiler room rack	Boiler	1	24	72	84	84.00
Wood storage rack	Courtrm	1	12	28	38	7.39
Map rack	Courtrm	1	13	26	39	7.63
Mailing machine cabinet	Kitchen	1	19	49	29	15.62
Shelves	Kitchen	1	12	38	25	6.60
Shelves	Kitchen	1	12	32	38	8.44
Equiv. large file boxes paper	Kitchen	14	25	13	11	28.96
Total misc.						190.59
Conservation Commission						
4 drawer filing cabinets		3	25	15	52	33.85
Small filing boxes	PS	14	15	13	10	15.80
Total conservation commission						49.65
Town Clerk						
4 shelf bookcases		2	12	32	54	24.00
4 shelf bookcases		1	12	20	54	7.50
5 shelf metal racks		2	15	72	72	90.00
3 shelf bookcase		2	12	36	52	26.00
5 shelf fireproof cabinet		1	19	36	70	27.71
7 shelf built-in unit	Courtrm	1	25	34	84	41.32
4 shelf metal rack	PS	1	25	48	72	50.00
4 drawer filing cabinet		2	29	15	52	26.18
4 drawer filing cabinet		1	31	18	52	16.79
2 drawer filing cabinet		3	25	15	28	18.23
5 drawer lateral filing cabinet		1	19	42	69	31.86
4 drawer lateral filing cabinet		1	17	36	52	18.42
3 shelf antique safe		1	29	39	49	32.07
21 slot cardboard form file		1	12	28	19	3.69
10 drawer filing cabinet		1	28	13	56	11.80
4 shelf bookcase		1	9	24	46	5.75
12x28 drawers		8	30	28	12	46.67
30x33 3 shelf credenza		1	31	32	36	20.67
Storage cubbies		3	30	15	19	14.84
Storage cubbies		1	30	50	19	16.49
Shelf built-in unit		1	12	22	76	11.61
License plates	Boiler	9	13	7	12	5.69
Folder/stuffer/sealer		1	18	36	31	11.63
Election materials		1	33	25	84	40.10
Misc. election equipment		1	17	48	19	8.97
Town hall lobby shelves		1	36	36	46	34.50
Total Town Clerk						642.49
Planning						
4 drawer lateral filing cabinet	Hall	1	18	36	52	19.50
Small file storage box	Hall	1	17	12	10	1.18
Misc., small stg. box equiv.	Hall	2	17	12	10	2.36

Closet shelves	2	12	38	57	30.08	
Large file box equivalents	6	25	13	11	12.41	
Storage shelves	3	12	72	43	64.50	
Wooden storage rack	1	12	28	38	7.39	
Wooden file boxes	1	17	27	32	8.50	
Total planning					145.93	
Building department						
4 drawer filing cabinets	14	28	15	54	183.75	
3 drawer filing cabinets	1	17	15	41	6.05	
5 drawer filing cabinets	13	28	13	59	161.57	
2 drawer filing cabinets	3	28	15	28	20.42	
Wooden storage rack	1	24	120	25	41.67	
Wooden storage rack	1	24	48	25	16.67	
Wooden plan rack	1	25	30	64	27.78	
Misc. equiv. large filing boxes	11	25	13	11	22.76	
Closet shelves	1	12	116	64	51.56	
Misc. shelves	1	18	81	39	32.91	
Bldg. shelves	1	12	72	32	16.00	
4 drawer filing cabinets	1	28	15	54	13.13	
4 drawer filing cabinet, legal	1	30	21	52	18.96	
2 drawer filing cabinets	2	25	15	28	12.15	
6 shelf bookcases	2	12	30	60	25.00	
Metal rack	PS	1	25	48	50.00	
4 drawer filing cabinets	PS	4	28	15	54	52.50
Total building dept.					752.85	
Assessors office						
Equiv. large filing boxes	6	25	13	11	12.41	
5 drawer lateral filing cabinet	2	19	42	69	63.73	
4 drawer filing cabinets	4	28	15	54	52.50	
2 drawer filing cabinets	4	28	15	28	27.22	
Supply cabinet	1	18	36	42	15.75	
Total assessors office					171.61	
Trust funds						
2 drawer filing cabinets	2	28	15	28	13.61	
Total trust funds					13.61	
Selectmen's Office						
2 drawer filing cabinets	5	28	15	28	34.03	
4 drawer filing cabinets	8	28	15	54	105.00	
Cabinet on stage	1	32	78	86	124.22	
Wooden bookcase	1	12	29	40	8.06	
Misc. equiv. small filing boxes	12	15	13	10	13.54	
Shelves on wall	1	13	60	51	23.02	
Stand for fax machine	1	16	20	29	5.37	
Small filing boxes	PS	39	15	13	44.01	
Large filing boxes	PS	4	25	13	8.28	
Total Selectmen's Office					365.52	
Town Administrator						
5 shelf bookcase	1	13	36	66	17.88	
2 drawer lateral filing cabinet	1	22	36	29	13.29	
2 drawer filing cabinet	1	28	15	28	6.81	
Small filing boxes	2	15	13	10	2.26	

Total Town Administrator						40.23
Finance						
Envelopes, equiv large filing boxes		4	25	13	11	8.28
Small filing boxes	Attic	177	15	13	10	199.74
4 drawer filing cabinet		1	28	15	54	13.13
Maps, small filing box equiv.		12	15	13	10	13.54
Shelves	Treas.	1	12	108	72	54.00
Misc., equiv. small filing boxes	Treas.	6	15	13	10	6.77
4 drawer filing cabinets		2	28	15	54	26.25
5 drawer lateral filing cabinets		2	19	42	67	61.88
2 drawer filing cabinet		1	28	15	28	6.81
Shelves		1	12	85	12	7.08
Shelves		1	12	89	45	27.81
Shelves over desk		1	12	49	24	8.17
Total Finance						433.45
Treasurer						
2 drawer filing cabinet		1	28	15	28	6.81
Bookcase		1	12	23	35	5.59
Total Treasurer						12.40
Sewer						
4 drawer filing cabinets		4	28	15	54	52.50
5 shelf metal bookcase		1	12	36	68	17.00
Maps		1	17	22	39	8.44
Binders		1	11	88	12	6.72
Small filing boxes	PS	7	15	13	10	7.90
Total Sewer						92.56
Recreation						
Small filing boxes	Sewer	10	15	13	10	11.28
Drafting table	Attic	1	24	42	53	30.92
Small filing boxes	Attic	4	15	13	10	4.51
Totes, 50 gal.	Stage	2	36	20	20	16.67
Totes, 73 qt.		11	23	14	16	32.80
Misc., small filing box equiv.		4	15	13	10	4.51
Totes, 73 qt.	Stage	12	23	14	16	35.78
Equiv. 73 qt. totes	Geoth.	18	23	14	16	53.67
Current records, small filing boxes		20	15	13	10	22.57
Unassembled bench		1	9	48	26	6.50
Rec offices, small filing box equiv.		4	15	13	10	4.51
Rec offices, 73 qt. tote equiv.		2	23	14	16	5.96
4 drawer filing cabinet		1	28	15	54	13.13
Misc. equiv. small filing boxes		8	15	13	10	9.03
Bagged items		16	10	9	15	12.50
Cabinet in closet		1	24	30	24	10.00
Shelves, left closet		1	10	57	57	18.80
Shelves, right closet		1	22	46	70	41.00
4 drawer lateral filing cabinets		2	18	42	50	43.75
Small filing boxes	PS	12	15	13	10	13.54
Large totes	OPS	2	19	42	20	18.47
Totes, 73 qt.	OPS	12	23	14	16	35.78
Boxes	OPS	5	21	16	13	12.64
Totes, 73 qt.	Recarea	4	23	14	16	11.93

Jerseys s/b @ TH due to mice, 73qt	Recarea	5	23	14	16	14.91
						485.15
Grand total						3396.05