What are the most important things to consider when thinking about Deerfield’s safety needs?

Over the past decade, several ballot initiatives for additional safety buildings have been defeated. Before moving forward with any additional proposals, the Select Board is sponsoring a review and discussion of safety service needs in Deerfield. They have enlisted New Hampshire Listens of the University of New Hampshire to facilitate a one-time community discussion of our safety needs. Please join this important conversation on November 12.

Walk-ins are welcome, but we encourage you to pre-register at http://tinyurl.com/SafetySvcs or by calling 862-0692 so we know how many people to expect. Free childcare with pre-registration.

Police, Fire & Rescue Department Open Houses

To permit us to have a well-informed discussion, the Police and Central Fire stations will be holding community open houses on Thursday, October 13th from 5 – 7pm and Saturday, October 15th from 9 – 11am. Stop by if you would like to see the current facilities for yourself.

Organized by Deerfield Select Board Safety Services Steering Committee:
Dwight Barnes, Aron DiBacco, Matt Fisher, Rebecca Hutchinson (Chair), Dick Pitman, Kevin Verville
Deerfield Safety Services – Preparing for the Future
A Community Conversation
Saturday, November 12, 2016, 9:30 – 12:00pm
Deerfield Community School Cafeteria

What are the most important things to consider when thinking about Deerfield’s safety needs?

Over the past decade, several ballot initiatives for additional safety buildings have been defeated. Before moving forward with any additional proposals, the Select Board is sponsoring a review and discussion of safety service needs in Deerfield. They have enlisted New Hampshire Listens of the University of New Hampshire to facilitate a one-time community discussion of our safety needs. Please join this important conversation on November 12.

The Select Board hopes you can join us in this important conversation, and looks forward to hearing your questions, concerns, and ideas regarding Deerfield’s safety service needs.

Walk-ins are welcome, but we encourage you to pre-register at http://tinyurl.com/SafetySvcs or by calling 603-862-0692 so we know how many people to expect. Free childcare will be provided with pre-registration.

The Fire, Rescue, and Police stations will be holding community open houses

Thursday, October 13th from 5 – 7pm
Saturday, October 15th from 9 – 11am

Stop by to see the current facilities before our discussion.

Fire Department and Rescue Department at the Fire Central Station on Church Street
Police Department at the side entrance of the GBW Building

The following information about the current status of our safety buildings was compiled from the 2015 Risk Management report conducted by PRIMEX (Deerfield’s insurance carrier), Deerfield Police, Fire, and Rescue Squad activity statistics, and information from safety services leadership.
In our November 12th conversation, we will ask the following questions

~

*What are the most important things to consider when thinking about Deerfield’s safety needs?*

~

*What priorities and ideas should be considered by decision makers?*

~

*In your view, what contributed to the failure of previous safety complex proposals?*

~

*What do we know about trends for the future?*

~

*What are the pros and cons of keeping things the same?*

~

Please bring your knowledge, experiences, concerns, and hopes about these critical issues.
Background Information

Demographics – Potential Population Growth
United States Census data indicate that the population of Deerfield grew from 1,178 in 1970 to 4,280 in 2010, 263% over the past 40 years. The Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission Population Projection is for Deerfield to grow to a population of 6,160 by 2050, or 41% over the next 40 years.

Cost
Often our first question is, “But what’s it going to cost and how will we pay for it?” Citizens who returned a Select Board survey last year asked for more information regarding the need for new safety service facilities. Because no specific building proposals are currently being developed and will not be proposed until we first discuss our current status and thoughts about future needs, potential costs are unknown.

Deerfield Police Department (DPD)
In 2015, the DPD made 173 arrests (an increase of 67% over 2014), 47 of which were for drug offenses (an increase of 13% over 2014). Calls for service, traffic accidents, and moving violation stops, citations, and warnings are not included here, as they do not have direct bearing on the limits and usefulness of the departmental facilities.

The current police station at the George B. White Building was adapted as a police station in 1991. There are two areas of concern about these facilities: the safety of those who visit and work in the building, and inefficient police operations.

In the area of safety, PRIMEX stated that our police facilities lack:
- … a secure entry to facility that is separate from the public entry.
- … a safe processing area for prisoners. Currently prisoners are handcuffed to a bench in a public area. Often prisoners have behavioral outbursts which can create an unsafe situation for themselves, police officers, and whoever is nearby.
- … self-contained restroom/sanitation facilities; Currently prisoners must use the same facilities as the general public.
- … adequate smoke & fire detection systems. … any type of fire suppression system (sprinklers, etc.); Vital Records and evidence are at high risk in the case of fire.
- … any type of video surveillance/monitoring/recording; Video monitoring discourages criminal activity; Video recording may be used to assist in prosecution and also can protect employees with allegations of abuse or harassment toward arrestees.

Barriers to effective operations include the lack of:
- … adequate evidence/property storage and management; Drugs and weapons need extra security; Video cameras should cover this area 24/7.
- … adequate sound proofing; Current station lacks adequate construction to maintain privacy. Personnel discussions and interviews with arrestees and/or witnesses cannot be adequately private because all walls are hollow and many do not go floor-to-ceiling.
- … adequate file storage space.
Of particular urgency is the lack of facilities needed to keep juvenile and adult detainees separated by sight and sound as required by law.

Recommendations from the PRIMEX report included construction of separate entrance for prisoners away from general public and a larger booking room separated from other police areas, as well as creating separate facilities for juvenile detainees.

In his note to the committee that wrote this guide, Police Chief Duquette reiterated the risk Deerfield has relative to the legal requirement to keep juvenile detainees separate from adult detainees. He noted that officers have adopted different methods of dealing with this situation when it comes up, including dealing with juvenile at the scene to avoid bringing them back to the station, trying to locate a probation office, and transporting them to Rockingham County Jail, often when they are working alone.

He also described the frustrations of working in the current cramped space. This has impact on effectiveness as well as morale: though they wish to keep an organized station, there is not enough space for everything. This makes it difficult to maintain the professionalism they aspire to and also impacts their ability to recruit and retain qualified new officers. He closed with an invitation to the residents of Deerfield to visit the station so they can see the situation for themselves.

**Deerfield Fire Department (DFD)**

The DFD made between 90 and 131 calls a year from 2010 to 2015, averaging 113.5 calls per year. As of August, there were 90 calls in 2016.

The current fire department stations are located at the center of town and in south Deerfield. The PRIMEX report evaluated the central station on Church Street. As with the police station, there are two areas of concern about these facilities: the safety of those who visit and work in the building, and inefficient fire department operations.

In the area of safety, the fire facilities lack:

- … adequate communicable disease/sanitation facilities, including separate areas for disinfecting equipment and personnel.
- … interior diesel emissions management systems; Current facility also has no air purification system. Space and other restrictions in the current facility may make installation of any system difficult at best.
- … any type of fire suppression system beyond equipment stored inside the facility; The overcrowded conditions would make firefighting within the building very dangerous.
- … adequate turnout gear storage and laundry areas; The increasing number of firefighters with cancer and job-related health issues demand attention be given to exposure to carcinogens on the job and in fire stations. Gear and equipment should be stored in a ventilated room and there should be separate laundry areas for turnout gear.
- … overhead door safety sensors. These protect against entrapment between the floor and edge of the door, and have been required since 1982.
- ... adequate SCBA (air tank) fill station. Because the station lacks the equipment to contain these high pressure tanks when they are refilled, they are held by a person who has no protection against potential shrapnel if a tank should rupture.

Barriers to job effectiveness include the lack of:

- … space to work in an effective manner, including exiting the buildings quickly when called to a fire.
• ... enough space between the trucks to open a “till” and still be able to walk between the trucks without difficulty.
• ... space for up-to-date equipment, which is generally larger and more maneuverable than most of our current equipment. More space for larger equipment such as larger doors, higher ceilings and more apparatus space (with higher ceilings) will be needed should we need to purchase new equipment. This is also a current issue when other towns provide aid coverage. Typically a neighboring town will “man” the station while our firefighters are at a fire scene. Our station’s ceilings are too low to park their trucks so they leave them outside running.
• ...designated office space. The Chief has extensive administrative responsibilities including annual building inspections, home inspections, burn permits, etc., which require extensive paper work. There is also no confidential area for personnel conversations.
• The current equipment is at the edge of not fitting and limits the ability to perform maintenance on the trucks while they are parked inside. Due to the low ceilings firefighters cannot “repack” hose onto of the engines and tankers after a call or training inside the station. The truck has to be pulled out in order to be on top of the truck.
• PRIMEX concluded their report with the observation that the Deerfield Central Fire Station, due to age and size, limits the ability to accommodate modern apparatus—which typically hold more water and/or have equipment better suited for current building codes--and modern fire service practices. Modern homes burn hotter and faster than older homes due to construction materials and design, requiring quicker response and trucks appropriately designed to attack these fires.

Deerfield Rescue Squad (DRS)

The DRS made between 228 and 331 calls a year between 2010 and 2015, averaging 266 a year. In addition to getting called to nearly every fire call, they also are called to homes for medical emergencies which do not involve fire or police activity. This accounts for their average number of calls being nearly twice that of the Fire Department during the same period.

The PRIMEX report noted the cramped quarters for the DRS truck at the Fire Central Station but did not otherwise specifically address the DRS facilities. The following concerns were identified during conversations with the DRS Captain, Cindy McHugh.
• When library patrons use the side parking area, the space for the DRS truck to exit the building is extremely tight, making a safe and quick response to an emergency call difficult.
• The medical supplies should be stored in a temperature-controlled environment. None is available at the current facility.
• Though DRS must comply with all confidentiality laws (HIPAA) with regard to the citizens they assist and volunteer personnel, the current space lacks any confidential location for review of calls for best practices.

Thank you for caring about Deerfield safety. We look forward to seeing you at the October 13 & 15 station open houses, and the November 12 community conversation in the DCS cafeteria.

Sources:
Primex reports:  
http://www.townofdeerfieldnh.com/Pages/DeerfieldNH_Fire/09112015_FD_Visit_Conf.pdf  
Organized by Deerfield Safety Services Steering Committee:
Dwight Barnes, Aron DiBacco, Matt Fisher, Rebecca Hutchinson (Chair), Dick Pitman, Kevin Verville

To be completed by Town Offices

Resident Address
What are the most important things to consider for meeting Deerfield’s current and future safety needs?

~ Welcome and thank you for joining today’s conversation ~
Background
Over the past decade, several ballot initiatives for additional safety buildings have been defeated. Last year, the Select Board completed a community survey regarding safety buildings. Before moving forward with any additional specific proposals, the Select board is sponsoring this review and discussion of safety service needs in Deerfield. They have enlisted New Hampshire Listens, a service of the University of New Hampshire, to work with local residents to facilitate community discussion of our safety needs. Today will focus on getting your input on priorities and considerations for future decision making.

Welcome and thank you for joining today’s conversation
Today’s conversation will focus on your experiences in Deerfield and asks us all to consider the question:

What are the most important things to consider for meeting Deerfield’s current and future safety needs?

We look forward to your questions, concerns, ideas, and hopes regarding safety service needs in Deerfield. The goal of this conversation among Deerfield residents is to explore such questions as: What priorities should be considered by decision makers? How well are the needs of the town met by the current facilities? What do we know about trends for the future? What are the pros and cons of keeping things the same? We are not seeking consensus of opinions today, but simply to have an informed discussion about what opinions and facts attendees want the Select board to keep in mind when they move forward with this issue.

What is New Hampshire Listens?
New Hampshire Listens is a civic engagement initiative of the Carsey School of Public Policy at the University of New Hampshire. In the same way that we need the physical infrastructure of roads, bridges, and buildings, we need to build, strengthen, and sustain civic infrastructure to support a strong democracy. Since 2010, we have worked at the local and state level to support civil, public deliberation of complex issues affecting New Hampshire residents’ everyday lives. Learn more at www.NHListens.org.

Please Note:
We are delighted to have this event covered by the press, local bloggers, and others who wish to record community affairs. We want to balance your interests with our participants’ ability to express themselves in a safe environment, share an incomplete thought, or convey a personal story as a part of this process. We respectfully request that all representatives of the media (formal and informal) please ask permission to tape, photograph, identify, or quote an individual participant directly. Attendees who wish to film may do so from our designated film area. Filming may not be done of or by participants from within the small discussion group. This is so we can promote an open exchange of ideas. We are happy to work with media who want to film and photograph large group activities. Thank you!
Detailed Outline
9:30 AM Welcome – Rebecca Hutchinson, Deerfield Safety Services Steering Committee
Remarks – Michele Holt-Shannon, NH Listens

About the process: This conversation is ...
- Designed to focus on what is important to you.
- Designed for participants to be here the whole time. Please do what you need to be most present. Feel free to take a break or step outside for a phone call if needed.
- About a constructive focus and looking forward to desired actions and solutions.
- Organized to allow the greatest possible time for everyone to both speak and listen, which is why we use small, facilitated groups where ideas can be explored, differences understood, and preferences for action expressed.
- Respectful of your time. We will keep time and respect yours by ending on time.

Group agreements for a productive conversation ...
- Share “air time”
- If you disagree, consider asking a question rather than arguing to prove your point
- It’s OK to disagree, but don’t personalize it. Stick to the issue, not the person who is disagreeing with you
- Speak up if the process doesn’t seem fair
- Speak for yourself, not for others and not for an entire group (use “I” statements)
- Personal stories stay in the group unless we all agree we can share them outside of the group
- We all share responsibility for making the group productive
- Be respectful and use respectful language
- Respect the facilitator’s role
- Listen first.

9:50 Round 1 Introductions in Small Groups (20 minutes)
➢ Your small group has a neutral facilitator whose role is to:
  o Help with the process and keep time,
  o Serve as a reminder of our agreements to be fair and respectful,
  o Make sure everyone gets a chance to participate, and
  o Record key information for the Summary Report
➢ Reminder: Your group will need someone to report out to the large group at the end.
➢ Introductions: Please share your:
  o Name, and a hat or two you wear in the Deerfield community
  o How you are connected to the topic of Deerfield’s safety needs, and
  o One thing you love about living in Deerfield

10:10 Round 2 Information Review (20 minutes)
➢ Spend a few minutes reviewing the information starting on page 5. We will be asking “What do you notice?” or “What is most important to you about this information?”
Brainstorm: To get started, spend time getting the most important issues on the table. Don’t worry about the details at this point, just make sure the primary issues have been named. What do you notice and what is important to you? What are the key topics you hope to discuss this morning?

10:30 Round 3 Key Questions and Priorities (40 minutes)
- Consider the framing question: “What are the most important things to consider for meeting Deerfield’s current and future safety needs?” Spend some time talking about the key issues and their importance to you, keeping in mind the values and issues you have just been discussing.
- It might be useful for each person to speak briefly about their perspective and key questions. The following questions may be helpful to prompt your thinking (but you will likely not have time to address each one individually):
  - What priorities should be considered by decision makers?
  - How well are the needs of the town met by the current facilities?
  - What do we know about trends for the future?
  - What are the pros and cons of keeping things the same?
- Spend time here exploring differences and commonalities in your group. What questions remain? Has anyone gained insights or new understandings? Any new ideas to note?

11:10 Round 4 Final Priorities (20 minutes)
- Based on your group conversation, “Are there any common-ground thoughts or ideas in this group? If so, what do we want to say at the end of the evening? If not, what diverse points of view do we want to convey?”
- Your group will need to prioritize its top insights and/or recommendations to report out to the large group and select someone to speak. The reporting out should include no more than two or three specific statements. To arrive at this point, the group should take a step back and look for both the unique ideas and those that seemed to recur. Group ideas together that seem to be related, but don’t lose track of the unique ones.
- A single consensus is not required, but if one emerges, or perhaps if the group wants to put forward two or three primary points of view, that is fine. These will represent your key recommendations or findings.
- The written small group report will convey a more complete view of your group’s ideas for the final report (this will be taken directly from the flip chart notes and will be included directly in the report as finalized by your group). You will likely not have time to represent all of your ideas in the large group report out (two minutes!).

11:30 Reporting out (15 minutes)
- Each group will be asked to provide a VERY BRIEF summary of their most important findings, concerns or recommendations. If you are asked to speak for your group, please be brief and share what has been compiled by your group, including common ground and divergent views. (You will have two minutes!)

12:00 Next Steps and Closing: Please fill out the evaluation – it matters to us!
**Background Information**

The following information about the current status of our safety buildings was compiled from the 2015 Risk Management report conducted by PRIMEX (Deerfield’s insurance carrier), Deerfield Police, Fire, and Rescue Squad activity statistics, and information from safety services leadership.

**Demographics – Potential Population Growth**

United States Census data indicate that the population of Deerfield grew from 1,178 in 1970 to 4,280 in 2010, 263% over the past 40 years. The Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission Population Projection is for Deerfield to grow to a population of 6,160 by 2050, or 41% over the next 40 years.

**Cost**

Often our first question is, “But what’s it going to cost and how will we pay for it?” Citizens who returned a Select Board survey last year asked for more information regarding the need for new safety service facilities. Because no specific building proposals are currently being developed and will not be proposed until we first discuss our current status and thoughts about future needs, potential costs are unknown.

**Deerfield Police Department (DPD)**

In 2015, the DPD made 173 arrests (an increase of 67% over 2014), 47 of which were for drug offenses (an increase of 13% over 2014). Calls for service, traffic accidents, and moving violation stops, citations, and warnings are not included here, as they do not have direct bearing on the limits and usefulness of the departmental facilities.

The current police station at the George B. White Building was adapted as a police station in 1991. There are two areas of concern about these facilities: the safety of those who visit and work in the building, and inefficient police operations.

In the area of safety, PRIMEX stated that our police facilities lack:

- … a secure entry to facility that is separate from the public entry.
- … a safe processing area for prisoners. Currently prisoners are handcuffed to a bench in a public area. Often prisoners have behavioral outbursts which can create an unsafe situation for themselves, police officers, and whoever is nearby.
- … self-contained restroom/sanitation facilities; Currently prisoners must use the same facilities as the general public.
- … adequate smoke & fire detection systems. … any type of fire suppression system (sprinklers, etc.); Vital Records and evidence are at high risk in the case of fire.
- … any type of video surveillance/monitoring/recording; Video monitoring discourages criminal activity; Video recording may be used to assist in prosecution and also can protect employees with allegations of abuse or harassment toward arrestees.

Barriers to effective operations include the lack of:

- … adequate evidence/property storage and management; Drugs and weapons need extra security; Video cameras should cover this area 24/7.
- … adequate sound proofing; Current station lacks adequate construction to maintain privacy. Personnel discussions and interviews with arrestees and/or witnesses cannot be adequately private because all walls are hollow and many do not go floor-to-ceiling.
- … adequate file storage space.
Of particular urgency is the lack of facilities needed to keep juvenile and adult detainees separated by sight and sound as required by law.

Recommendations from the PRIMEX report included construction of separate entrance for prisoners away from general public and a larger booking room separated from other police areas, as well as creating separate facilities for juvenile detainees.

In his note to the committee that wrote this guide, Police Chief Duquette reiterated the risk Deerfield has relative to the legal requirement to keep juvenile detainees separate from adult detainees. He noted that officers have adopted different methods of dealing with this situation when it comes up, including dealing with juvenile at the scene to avoid bringing them back to the station, trying to locate a probation office, and transporting them to Rockingham County Jail, often when they are working alone.

He also described the frustrations of working in the current cramped space. This has impact on effectiveness as well as morale: though they wish to keep an organized station, there is not enough space for everything. This makes it difficult to maintain the professionalism they aspire to and also impacts their ability to recruit and retain qualified new officers. He closed with an invitation to the residents of Deerfield to visit the station so they can see the situation for themselves.

**Deerfield Fire Department (DFD)**

The DFD made between 90 and 131 calls a year from 2010 to 2015, averaging 113.5 calls per year. As of August, there were 90 calls in 2016.

The current fire department stations are located at the center of town and in south Deerfield. The PRIMEX report evaluated the central station on Church Street. As with the police station, there are two areas of concern about these facilities: the safety of those who visit and work in the building, and inefficient fire department operations.

In the area of safety, the fire facilities lack:

- adequate communicable disease/sanitation facilities, including separate areas for disinfecting equipment and personnel.
- interior diesel emissions management systems; Current facility also has no air purification system. Space and other restrictions in the current facility may make installation of any system difficult at best.
- any type of fire suppression system beyond equipment stored inside the facility; The overcrowded conditions would make firefighting within the building very dangerous.
- adequate turnout gear storage and laundry areas; The increasing number of firefighters with cancer and job-related health issues demand attention be given to exposure to carcinogens on the job and in fire stations. Gear and equipment should be stored in a ventilated room and there should be separate laundry areas for turnout gear.
- overhead door safety sensors. These protect against entrapment between the floor and edge of the door, and have been required since 1982.
- adequate SCBA (air tank) fill station. Because the station lacks the equipment to contain these high pressure tanks when they are refilled, they are held by a person who has no protection against potential shrapnel if a tank should rupture.

Barriers to job effectiveness include the lack of:

- space to work in an effective manner, including exiting the buildings quickly when called to a fire.
• … enough space between the trucks to open a “till” and still be able to walk between the trucks without difficulty.
• … space for up-to-date equipment, which is generally larger and more maneuverable than most of our current equipment. More space for larger equipment such as larger doors, higher ceilings and more apparatus space (with higher ceilings) will be needed should we need to purchase new equipment. This is also a current issue when other towns provide aid coverage. Typically a neighboring town will “man” the station while our firefighters are at a fire scene. Our station’s ceilings are too low to park their trucks so they leave them outside running.
• … designated office space. The Chief has extensive administrative responsibilities including annual building inspections, home inspections, burn permits, etc., which require extensive paper work. There is also no confidential area for personnel conversations.
• The current equipment is at the edge of not fitting and limits the ability to perform maintenance on the trucks while they are parked inside. Due to the low ceilings firefighters cannot “repack” hose onto of the engines and tankers after a call or training inside the station. The truck has to be pulled out in order to be on top of the truck.
• PRIMEX concluded their report with the observation that the Deerfield Central Fire Station, due to age and size, limits the ability to accommodate modern apparatus—which typically hold more water and/or have equipment better suited for current building codes—and modern fire service practices. Modern homes burn hotter and faster than older homes due to construction materials and design, requiring quicker response and trucks appropriately designed to attack these fires.

Deerfield Rescue Squad (DRS)

The DRS made between 228 and 331 calls a year between 2010 and 2015, averaging 266 a year. In addition to getting called to nearly every fire call, they also are called to homes for medical emergencies which do not involve fire or police activity. This accounts for their average number of calls being nearly twice that of the Fire Department during the same period.

The PRIMEX report noted the cramped quarters for the DRS truck at the Fire Central Station but did not otherwise specifically address the DRS facilities. The following concerns were identified during conversations with the DRS Captain, Cindy McHugh.
• When library patrons use the side parking area, the space for the DRS truck to exit the building is extremely tight, making a safe and quick response to an emergency call difficult.
• The medical supplies should be stored in a temperature-controlled environment. None is available at the current facility.
• Though DRS must comply with all confidentiality laws (HIPAA) with regard to the citizens they assist and volunteer personnel, the current space lacks any confidential location for review of calls for best practices.

Sources:
Primex reports:
http://www.townofdeerfieldnh.com/Pages/DeerfieldNH_Fire/09112015_FD_Visit_Conf.pdf

Organized by Deerfield Safety Services Steering Committee:
Dwight Barnes, Aron DiBacco, Matt Fisher, Rebecca Hutchinson (Chair), Dick Pitman, Kevin Verville
Appendix D

Deerfield Safety Services
Deerfield Community School
11.12.2016 Transcriptions

Group A – Mark
- Doing nothing costs money, too
- Liability is a concern
- Security of current holding space for arrestees
- Risk of being sued related to privacy and confidentiality
- Reluctance to pay for improvements
- Need and solution must be communicated
- Payment/construction schedule to consider (one shot or phased?)
- Fire protection to consider – home liability?
- Impact on character of town
- Space for rescue vehicles – delay in rescues (and fire)
- No room for full time EMT or fire staff
  - Risk to volunteers
- Need full time EMT staff and ambulance
- Demographic trends
- Comparisons to other towns
- Standards have changed
- Impact of traffic with present facility
- Ambulance ability to respond to multiple demands – wait time?
- Communication is hard without town meetings
- Data and persuasion needed
- Credibility and integrity of the services
- People are not involved – do not support the current situation
- Draw in more people
- Other issues that get in the way, like outreach

Priorities:
- Police is #1 priority
- Phased solution
- Focus on response time of fire and rescue
- One center vs. several centers – long term solution?
- Create solution to include people who weren’t here today – outreach and involvement.
- Communicate facts, data, human impact, and personal stories.

Group B – Sarah Garstka
(Round 2) What do you notice? What is most important to you about this information? What are the key topics you hope to discuss this morning?

- Confidentiality is an issue
- The town has grown, but the safety services haven’t
- Issue of liability
  - Police facility is in multi-use building
  - Concerns about the safety of FD volunteer’s
  - Location should be optimized
- Parking is an issue
- Concerned about losing insurance coverage
- Concerns about continued ability to recruit and retain volunteers and staff
- Reminder that current facility is better than last
- Need a comparison for understanding – other towns?
- New space would save money because money is being spent to make equipment work in current space
- Is a new space necessary or can we make better use of current space?

(Round 3) What priorities should be considered by decision-makers?

- Space for Fire Department
- Ways to work with what we already have in order to save money
- Look at other towns
- Importance of liability
  - Location – center of town to speed up response time
- Consider funding structure – spread out vs. lump sum
- What does the FD/PD want? Need vs. want must be established.

(Round 3) How well are the needs of the town being met by current facilities?

- Volunteers and staff are working hard to work with the facility – the facility is not making their jobs easy/efficient
- Pride in facility – the FD is proud of the facility at the fair
- History of the building
- Must understand what the needs are before we can answer this question
- Are community members getting the best service?
- Unable to fit standard equipment
- Wait times for fire and ambulance

(Round 3) What do we know about trends for the future?

- We will likely continue to grow
- Especially the elderly population and families seeking a rural community
Increased elderly = increased need for these services, especially rescue squad
Fast response time = peace of mind
• We are losing businesses due to rising energy costs in the state
• How well do the roads/other infrastructure facility travel through town for business purposes?
• Possible need to move to paid staff from volunteers
• Timing is good because we don’t have any competing projects at the moment

(Round 3) What are the pros and cons of keeping things the same?
• Pros:
  o Reduced cost/taxes
  o Preserve town history
  o No more forums like these?
• Cons:
  o Quantity/quality of services may suffer
  o Missed opportunity – timing is good now, no competing projects. In the future, there likely will be.
  o Ability to retain volunteers is questionable
  o Liability/risk
  o Can’t buy new equipment/if new equipment is bought, it is custom made to fit space (more expensive)
  o Unable to protect current equipment (protect investments)

(Round 4) Are there any common-ground thoughts or ideas in this group? If so, what do we want to say at the end of the evening? If not, what diverse points of view do we want to convey?
• Common ground:
  o Fire station is not adequate
  o Money is important
  o Only a small part of town is represented today. In order to vote with the town’s best interest in mind, every resident needs to understand full scope (or they won’t want to spend the money)
  o Location is critical

(Reporting out) Top priorities or insights of group.
• Keeping community: rural feel, small-town character (like knowing the names of the police officers in Deerfield), volunteer spirit
• Emphasis on the Fire Department as top priority. The need is different, but group B believes that the police department is better able to utilize their current space whereas the fire department requires a new space
• Community needs to be educated fully on the problem and need
  o Information must go to whole town
• Liability and risk is a major factor
• Need for services will continue to outgrow facilities
• Important to look at other towns and see what has worked there (example: Nottingham has a new fire complex)

**Group C – Kathy**

(Round 2) What do you notice? What is most important to you about this information? What are the key topics you hope to discuss this morning?

• Town is growing
• Projected to keep growing
• Surprised at increase in PD calls from 2014 to 2015 – what is the bigger trend? Is this going to continue to grow?
• Police facilities seem lacking in a lot of ways
• Difference between safety issue and issue of convenience
• Lack of separate bathrooms in police department – arrestees in public areas near kid’s programs
• No facility for juvenile detainees
• “Work around” not efficient, not a good use of time
• At least a separate PD, if not a safety complex for PD/FD
  - Separate from other community programs, offices, and businesses
• Move some fire resources to fairgrounds station – forestry or rescue maybe – to save space and improve response time
• Add to central station
• Modify existing buildings vs. building a new one (GBW or Central)
• Build on rescue association land
• Mutual aid equipment has to idle in winter because it won’t fit in building – risk of damage to equipment is high
• Efficiency and communication of resources in combined facilities
• Think of future needs – phased construction

“Dreamland” – what it would look like

• Combined facility or separate facilities (PD separate for safety issues?)
• Adequate space for all
• Every safety personnel would feel as though they have what they need to do their job as best they can
• Central location with best response time to entire town
• Buildings that can added on to in future vs. full renovations again (is GBW meant to be built upon?)
• Tie plan for future safety needs – 20-30 year plan
• ADA
• Training room, conference room, laundry facilities, kitchen needs met, human needs met
• Emergency Operations Center – supported communications, no other businesses in space

PD – Wants:
• More PD to separate building, maybe the existing legion building or non-existing
• Extra room at PD for rescue
• PD is a liability as is
• Sufficient space for holding evidence, safe public area, office space, central location
• Flexibility for future. 5 years, 10 years, more
• All agree not OK as is
• What is the need for expansion?
• Liability risk – time is an issue
• Short-term solution: move PD to end of building to improve privacy
• Safe environment within PD for records, evidence, juveniles vs. adults
• ADA compliant
• Generator
• Proper communication

Rescue – Wants:
• More space for vehicles, equipment, and personnel
• Better accessibility for emergency vehicles
• Space for future
• Proper storage for supplies
• Confidentiality/privacy
• Liability concern
• Best response time
• Access need for ambulance services – joint with other towns, maybe?
• Look at different needs for building that houses an ambulance – plan for potential future need
• Make sure planning reflects future needs

General Concerns:
• Community input at building design phase
• Separate wants from needs
• Communication to average voter – those who aren’t here
• Look at needs related to non-safety (i.e. library parking next door)
• Dollars – must be reasonable enough to pass at town meeting
• Practicality – don’t overbuild, no “Taj Mahal”
• Prioritize PD over FD
• Willingness to separate two issues (PD and FD)
  o Look at both separate and combined solutions
• What is the next step after today?
• Long-term vision – we don’t want to do this again in five years
• Would like to see 20-year plan
  o Build for 10, plan for 20
  o Add on options
• What is meant by “safe exit of FD for calls”?
• Will outside consultation be beneficial?
• ADA – federal compliance
• Department input continue through process
• Renovation of existing vs. brand new (cost of three department’s needs vs. one complex)
  o Oversight through process
  o How would a professional FD affect needs vs. a volunteer FD?

Final Priorities/Reporting:
• Police department facility is inadequate and is a higher priority
  o Due to liability
  o Security mandates, federal compliance for federal money
  o Personal safety for public 8 officers
  o Timing is critical
• Explore all options of existing buildings, other possible buildings in town, renovations, altering of current space, and new construction
  o Cost
  o Adequate for future
  o Long-term solutions
  o Consult with other communities that have done this
  o Input from diverse backgrounds
  o Efficiency
• Future planning
  o Phased construction
  o Comprehensive solution
  o Flexibility of space
  o Best bang for our buck

Group D – Ed French
(Round 2) What do you notice? What is most important to you about this information? What are the key topics you hope to discuss this morning?

- Primex – are they conflicted in how they review?
- Didn’t realize their wasn’t an ambulance
- This report doesn’t address the difference between facts and needs
- How is NH Listens paid? What town budget line?
- Do we need an ambulance? Wish better information was provided
- What do the outcomes look like vs. other communities in terms of medical emergencies
- Being asked to comment without having information is problematic
- Police are concerned about bathroom facilities with pre-school students
- Can police facility be better utilized
  - Expand into leased space
  - Expand upwards
- How often do you really need some of the items that primex notes
- We should do our best, but we can’t do everything
- Have outer shell at GBW building to use better
- Need a comprehensive review of safety metrics
  - What are Deerfield’s safety groups dealing with?
  - Based on this, how can we address?
- Need to drill down as to what is actually needed
- How should population growth be considered in determining next steps? Growth control?
- Have all options and alternatives been reviewed?
  - For example, moving one Fire Department/Rescue sub-station to the fairgrounds
- Not convinced as to what is really needed
- Communication in the town is wanting
- Can we really afford this? Are there less expensive alternatives?
- Steering committee needs to be a diverse group made up of community members
- Need department consultations and resources
- Who appoints committee members?

(Reporting out) Top priorities or insights of group.

- Need to understand why it is a need and what the options are
- Money matters/tax impact – how do we pay for solutions?
- What are future costs to stage a solution vs. population growth? Make this part of a strategic master plan.

**Group E – Leah**
(Round 2) What do you notice? What is most important to you about this information? What are the key topics you hope to discuss this morning?
- Concerned about liability and being sued
- We have a report, so we need to do something
- Police department – separate juveniles and adults
- Public restrooms used by all – even the arrested criminals
- Police department should not be in the same building as the after school care
- Do we build on safety complex?
- Concerns about scale and historical

Other Key Things:
- The priority should be the needs of the whole community, not that we have a piece of land available.
- Geography: central location for best response time
- There are safety concerns and conflicts for those trying to meet our safety needs
- Current facilities are inadequate
- Safety buildings are not up to code
- Concern for safety of safety personnel because of inadequate facilities (liability)
- Is staffing adequate? (Liability and response time)
- What will we do with old buildings?
- Concerned about expediency of response
- Detainees can be loud and are heard by many people
- How can you be discreet with current facility?
- No discussion on highway department – road conditions are important to safety
- The space recommendations are not six times what exists (not huge)
- The long wait time for an ambulance is important
- This area is rural

(Round 3) What are the pros and cons of keeping things the same?
- Pros:
  - No extra money is spent
- Cons:
  - Potential for lawsuits
  - Safety of safety personnel
  - Response time
  - Safety of after school kids
  - At some point, it will have to be dealt with
  - It will cost more later
  - The industrial aspects of fire/rescue will remain in our historic district

(Round 3) What do we know about trends for the future?
• We will grow
• Future residents will care about safety facilities
• Will we have enough volunteers?

(Reporting out) Top priorities or insights of group.
• Concerned with expediency
  o Response time
  o Location
  o Staffing
  o Size of building to be able to move equipment
• Concerned with liability and being sued
  o Not up to code
  o Do something about the report
  o A mixed use facility has conflicting needs
  o Safety of safety personnel
• Do we build a safety complex?
  o Cost (construction and operations/maintenance)
  o Location for response and moving out of the historic district

**Group F – Laura Scott**

• Lack of privacy
• Policy facility is inadequate/unsafe
• Kids with police detainees
• Lack of private entrance
• No private bathrooms
• Proximity of EMS access to library parking – slows down response time
• Newer vehicles don’t fit in central building
• Noise from fire department – why is because of building?
• Moral issues – police
• Why need complex? Two separate buildings?
• Fire department hazmat concerns
• Lack of police storage – safety and proper storage
• Proper storage of rescue equipment
• Rescue team goes on all fire calls
• Police also respond to fire calls
• Kid-friendly access to police/station
• New station, new building, new location
• Doesn’t need to be shared with fire
• Potential location: Candia/North Road (250 sign location)
• Locations need to meet all safety needs
• Costs to be considered
  o Together vs. separate
  o Cost of land
• Fire station spatial needs
• Move fire department away from historic downtown
• How safe are we now? How can efficiency improve safety?
  o Invest in safety
• Fire location
  o Concerns: safety, residential in nature, road configurations
  o Positive: center of town, community involvement
• Location
  o Future expansion needs to be considered
  o Fire department downtown – keep “look” of downtown
• Remodel vs. new cost
• Need more info on rescue squad needs
• More information needed on specific problems caused by facilities
• Legal liabilities due to facilities
  o RSAs/lawsuits/best practices available
  o Funding sources – available to fix or in jeopardy if we don’t fix
• Use of fire department
  o Building at fairground – short term fix?
  o Better utilization of current structures?
• Look at previous plans to see if useful to build
• What happens to existing buildings when new buildings are done? Is there a plan in place?
• Rescue squad in existing building while police and fire in new?
• Pros and cons, differences in cost of having separate vs. complex?
• Don’t recreate the wheel. Look at what has worked in other towns/what other towns have done
• Phasing/stages – short and long term planning
• Need to know how police function/run/best practices

(Reporting out) Top priorities or insights of group.
• Police are #1 priority
• Police need a new space
• Evaluate complex vs. separate structures
  o Operational costs, land costs, construction costs, cooperation between departments?
• Phasing
Immediate
- Evaluate existing structures for re-use

Short term

Long term

Group G – Tonya

(Round 2) What do you notice?
- Missing information on violent crimes. Is this reported in the data presented in the criminals in public hallways
- Criminals should be kept apart from community in public settings for basic safety.
- Children’s facilities should not be in the same facility as police.
- Did not realize before that there is a different egress from building for emergencies

(Round 2) What is most important to you about this information?
- Previous lawsuits/litigation resulting in costs to town
- Might detract from attracting/recruiting future staff if buildings are inadequate
- Pay is based on stipend and points – pay comes from department budget

(Round 2) What are the key topics you hope to discuss this morning?
- Space is needed in the fire department
- We need an ambulance in town
- We need dedicated, paid employees for these roles. We need to attract/retain quality staff not just rely on volunteers. Pay needs to be evaluated. Currently 50% of the budget is dedicated to pay.

(Round 3) What are the most important things to consider for meeting Deerfield’s current and future safety needs?
- Adequate compensation for paid staff. Gather actual data on how wages are determined – is it enough to attract and reward/retain trained staff? Did we allocated enough money in budget for future?
- Adequate facilities are needed to support the three different functions.
- Multiple efforts need to be made to arm voters with information to encourage two-way dialogue so they better understand what increases are proposed to support. ARM PEOPLE WITH INFO/DATA.

(Round 4) Are there any common-ground thoughts or ideas in this group? If so, what do we want to say at the end of the evening? If not, what diverse points of view do we want to convey?
- Tax base to pay for these things/improvements/growth needs to be expanded, but how?
Properties on temporary/seasonal taxes contribute a good chunk
- Private roads
- Need to maintain rural integrity of town as opposed to something seen as frivolous spending on more than we need to meet basic needs for complexes
- Need to make sure that facilities that are built to accommodate vertical growth/expansion as needs increase. Also need to ensure that buildings are made that can accommodate every ability.
  - History – feeling that this building (community school) was said to have built to meet today’s needs, but when the growth happened, the vertical growth could not happen due to code descriptions that could have been identified prior to construction. Foundation could not support weight.
- Recycle buildings, like the Legion Hall. Consider: recycle or build new?
- Costs today and costs tomorrow arm us with data.
  - Cost to build vs. buy/renovate
  - Cost of payroll/training – is it adequate?
  - Bond vs. lump sum expense

(Reporting out) Top priorities or insights of group.
- What are the needs based on data – buildings new vs. recycled
- Employees and volunteers – data on payroll, training, and retention
- Inform and invest – engage community with data
- How to pay for it?
Appendix E: Participant Evaluations

This analysis includes 42 evaluations out of 67 total event participants. Of the 67 people who participated, 42 completed the evaluation survey (62.6%). Forms from 7 individuals were excluded because they preferred their answers not to be included in research. The following information is generated from the remaining 35 responses (52%).

- The average age of participants was 63 years old. Reported ages ranged from 35 years to 82 years old.
- About half of participants were male (52.5 percent) compared to 47.5 percent female.
- Though participants had varying levels of education ranging from a high school education through graduate school, the majority of participants (73.7 percent) had earned a Bachelor’s degree or Graduate/Professional degree.
- When it came to political leanings, about 25 percent of participants identified as very conservative or somewhat conservative. 22.5 percent identified as moderate. The remaining 52.5 percent identified as liberal or somewhat liberal.
- 100 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the conversation helped them become better informed about the issues being discussed.
- 93 percent of participants strongly agreed and 7 percent agreed that their opinions were respected in this conversation.
- About 95% of the respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that the issue that was discussed is more likely to be addressed as a result of this conversation.
- About 84% of the respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that the conversation improved the likelihood that they will be involved in their community in the future.
- About 72% of the respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that the conversation helped them to learn new and better ways to participate in problem-solving in their community.
- 100% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that the conversation was valuable.
- 73.8 percent of the respondents strongly agreed they were satisfied with their facilitator. 23.8% agreed, and one respondent disagreed (2.3 %).
- 100 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their facilitator did not impose their ideas or values on the group.
• 78 percent of respondents strongly agreed and 16 percent agreed that everyone had an equal chance to express their views.