



**FACILITIES AND SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES\*  
MAY 2, 2022  
HYBRID MEETING**

**1. Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call**

Meeting called to order at 9:01AM by Chairperson Mary Anne Rush

**2. Roll Call**

**Present:**

Susan Alexandre, Larry Carlson, Anthony DiLuzio, Borianna Dolliver, Sheldon Drucker, Jeff Franson, Ian Kaiser, Mary Anne O'Connell Rush, Percy Stevens, and Michele Tourangeau (had to leave at 9:30)

**Absent:** Jason Corbin

**Town of Ogunquit Participant(s):**

Matt Buttrick, Town Manager  
Mandy Cummings, Town Treasurer  
Heath Ouellette, Chairperson of the Select Board and Committee Liaison  
Neal Pawlik, Interim Chief OPD

**Context Architecture Participant(s):**

Chris Logan, Associate & Project Manager

**Mary Anne reminded everyone** that we do not acknowledge chat messages or comments made on Facebook or Zoom and encouraged those that wish to participate to do by raising their hand in Zoom or attend in person at the Dunaway Center.

**3. Review and Approval of the Monday April 25, 2022, Minutes**

Minutes were not available to approve

**4. Old Business**

- a. **Schedule an Evening Information Session on Phase 2 Funding**

Brief discussion held and Thursday evening May 12, 2022, from 6PM – 8PM was decided on. Pizza and soft drinks will be provided.

**b. Discuss Effective Methods to provide Ogunquit voters with information regarding Article 53 of the June 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Town Meeting**

**Mary Anne Rush (MR)** if people are unable to attend the information session, how else can we get the information out there? I.E. – e-mail blast, mailing, social media etc.

**Larry Carlson (LC)** commented that from Parks & Recreation experience, we cannot do mailing as we are not able to use town funds. **Matt Buttrick (MB)** responded that this is generally true. An entire packet is sent out/available with information to voters. **MR** asked about e-mail blasts as well. **MB** does not feel comfortable on a specific warrant article. However, he will run it by the town attorney and the Select Board. **MR** made it clear that we are not looking to “advocate” but to provide information.

**Ian Kaiser (IK)** asked if it is possible to go out and see people in his neighborhood with a fact sheet. **MB** responded that as an individual, not using town resources, we are welcome to advocate.

**Carole Aaron (CA)** (as a member of the public) asked Mandy Cummings (MC) about the ability to use their own money to place an ad in the Sentinel or elsewhere. **MC** felt that it would not be correct to do so.

**Michele Tourangeau (MT)** asked to clarify that if we did as an individual, we could do so. **MB** said that we have the as an individual has the right to free speech. In response to **IK**, he also said that we cannot come up with a subgroup of the Committee and hold a meeting in a church or elsewhere. As an individual, we certainly can.

**LC** asked that if we are just reminding people on Facebook that this article is on the ballot and to view more information, provide the link to our town internet page – is that ok. **MB** – yes. FB posts with “factual information” is allowed.

**Heath Ouellette (HO)** (as Committee liaison) reminded all that especially within 30 days of the election, we have to be extremely cautious about

“campaigning” in the voting building, the Dunaway Center, as well as within a certain # of feet of the building

**CA** reminded all that Chris Murphy (Town Clerk) puts out a very specific packet about font size, where signs can be posted etc.

### **Public Comment**

**Barbara Ferraro (BF)** feels that this has been violated before and raised concerns about the Select Board publicly promoting this article as well as for two new positions. Feels that these are being politicized. Important the Select Board does not take a position on any of these articles.

**MB** clarified that the Select Board, just like this Committee, is allowed to express opinions. They are allowed to take positions and advocate for passage or not of an article in the Town Warrant. They could not vote for funding to advocate a position, but advocating is perfectly allowable.

**Jim Hartwell (JH)** had a question on process. Raised a concern that 40% of the Select Board is represented and has been able to speak.

**HO** responded that FS&N is a Committee of the Select Board. He is speaking as the liaison to the Committee to help clarify questions that are asked. Just like members of the public, Select Board members are allowed to participate in public meetings. Also clarified that just because someone is an elected politician, that they do not give up their freedom of speech rights. Politicians constantly, whether it is on the floor of the legislature in Augusta or in Washington, DC regularly voice their opinions.

### **c. Review Draft of Final Report – Chris Logan**

**Chris Logan (CL)** provided an overview of the draft of the final report. He did not send out all of the back up in the draft due to the size of the document which will be around 250 pages. Included in this document are executive summary, scope of services, summary of existing campus and buildings assessment and a summary of the space needs report. Chris concentrated on the basis for recommendations and conclusion (section VIII). Some of the highlights:

- Recognize that both buildings are important to the town

- Importance of the Dunaway Center to the town and its residents as a community center
- Decided that options 4, 3 and 3A which retain the Dunaway as a community center would be relevant design options as we proceed into phase II
- Discussed the criteria matrix designed to evaluate each of the 6 remaining options. Value assigned from 0-6 with 3 being neutral. Based upon this, options 3 and 3A came out as most favorable followed by option 4

**MR** commented that she liked the fact that hard and soft scaped surfaces as well as sustainability was taken into consideration

**LC** stated that he liked option 4 the best, realizing that it is the most expensive option. The idea that it could easily be phased and not interfere with ongoing PD and town hall functions while work is done on the OVS site. Once that is done, the entire Dunaway would be a community center and we could talk about what we want to do with it over time

**IK** commented that he would prefer 4 as renovating OVS may pose different challenges as we do not know what we may run into. Any renovation of an old building makes him uneasy

**Sheldon Drucker (SD)** followed up on options 3 and 3A and the possibility of needing temporary space. Asked if we have any pricing on that. CL will pull together some numbers on that

**Susan Alexandre (SA)** feels comfortable with option 3

### **Public Comment**

**Peter Kahn (PK)** pointed out a couple of misspelled words, had some questions on square footage and numbers not adding up. **CL** said he would double check the numbers as they should add up. **PK** asked about the assumptions for renovation versus new construction costs and what degree of confidence we have in those numbers. **CL** obtained input from a cost estimator in Portland. **Tony DiLuzio (TD)** added that his personal confidence in these numbers is “will I pay \$4.50-\$5.00 per gallon of gas by the end of the year or am I going to pay \$2 per gallon”. It is unfair and unrealistic to ask anybody to put a guarantee on these figures at this time. It is too early to nail down those types of numbers. **SD** pointed out that we will have a better idea in phase 2; however, if we do not get the money appropriated under Article 53, nothing will happen. **PK** asked why stormwater management is mentioned as a con in option 5 and not in the

other options. **CL** because we are not doing anything to it. Pointed out that PK was fairly adamant about not extending the footprint at all under option 5. **PK**: Wanted to know about pros and cons for OVS and how they are characterized. PK had an additional comment of why option 5 has square footage deficit comment in column 1 and not under cons. **MR** responded that option #5 does not meet the square footage needs whereas all the others do. **PK** asked about the potential of an exterior plaza and what that means. **CL** responded. **PK** wanted to know the statistical significance between the options. **PK** then had questions about the document **TD** put together on the \$875,000. **TD** responded.

**JH**: confused about when public comments begins and when it ends. Had a few items: was the public included, was a survey put out? **MR** public has been included in every single meeting we have had and survey will be put out in phase 2. **JH** noticed that number went down on options and the only thing that did not go down was the \$875,000 and had some questions about it. **MR** reiterated what has been discussed at almost every meeting. We will only use what is necessary. Only the portion of the \$875k that we need will be bonded. As far as procedure and when comments are welcome, as we finish a topic, she generally opens it up to the public. **TD** addressed the “why \$875k” – it was a number that needed to be determined several months ago – last November. Using the grocery analysis, if we are short, we cannot just go back next week and buy the remainder of what we need. This number has to get us at least a year out. Additionally, people have had an option to weigh in at multiple times over the course of our meetings

**Rick Dolliver (RD)** (commenting as a member of the public). Reminded people of the Captain Thomas scenario which started out at a cost of \$17,000 and due to more engineering costs, time lapse etc., it ended up costing over \$400,000. Commended the Committee on the work that has been done

**JH**: commented about when we have our meetings; firm believer in survey and adhering to budgets

## 5. Follow-Up Items:

- a. **MB** will clarify what the Committee is allowed to do as far as providing information on Article 53
- b. **CL** to provide estimates relating to need for possible temporary services

- c. **CL** to double check the square footage numbers to make sure they all make sense
- 6. Next Meeting:** Thursday May 9, 2022, at 9AM
- 7. Adjourn.** Motion to adjourn made by Tony and seconded by Percy. Approved 9-0

Meeting was adjourned at 10:42AM

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Carlson, Committee Member

***\*Please note that every effort is made to capture the essence of the meeting in these Minutes; however, they are not an exact replication of all items discussed or comments made. If you would like an actual replay of the meeting, please click on the link below which should allow you to watch the entire May 2, 2022, meeting on Town Hall Streams (Duration: 1:41:55)***

**[https://townhallstreams.com/stream.php?location\\_id=40&id=45142](https://townhallstreams.com/stream.php?location_id=40&id=45142)**