

TOWN OF NORTFIELD
EMERGENCY SERVICES FACILITY BUILDING COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2022, AT 6:00PM
VIRTUAL HYBRID (ON-LINE) MEETING

MINUTES

1. Call To Order

- a. Mark Fortier called the meeting to order at 6:02PM
- b. Committee attendance: Chief Jon Hall, Bernie Porada, Kevin Connolly, Stephen Seredynski, Andrea Llamas, David Quinn, Chief Mark Fortier, Alex Pirozhkov, Heath Cummings; Absent; Chief Skip Dunnell
- c. Consultants: John MacMillan, CBA; Matthew Sturz, Colliers.
- d. Public Attendance: Bee Jacque, Pamela Eldridge, Tessa Powers, Debby & David [*surname not recorded*].

2. Previous Meeting Minutes

- a. Meeting minutes of June 15, 2022;
 - i. Motion made by K. Connolly to approve, Second by D. Quinn
 - ii. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote (with abstention by H. Cummings).

3. Budget, Contracts, Invoices

- a. Colliers (OPM) Amendment: On hold pending site recommendation and Notice to Proceed (also need to identify a completion date). B. Jacque indicated that it was her understanding that the Committee had developed a checklist to be completed prior to the Committee and Select Board making this recommendation and issuing the notice.
- b. Caolo & Bieniek (Designer) Amendment: on hold pending site recommendation and Notice to Proceed (also need to identify a completion date).
- c. Caolo & Bieniek invoice #6569 was recommended for payment by Colliers on 6/30/2022.
 - i. A motion was made by K. Connolly and seconded by D. Quinn.
 - ii. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote
- d. Colliers advised that another invoice had been received earlier in the day (7/13/2022) and had not yet been reviewed by Colliers to make a recommendation for payment. A. Llamas advised that this was a separate agreement and that approval of this invoice did not require a Committee vote.
- e. After other items of discussion, the conversation circled back to the OPM and Designer Contract Amendments. A. Llamas advised that it was an action item for the Select Board to approve the OPM and Designer contract amendments. It was determined that the next Committee Meeting would be a

Public Meeting that would also serve as a symbolic step in moving the project from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

4. Designer Update

- a. Caolo & Bieniek presented the original Concept Plan (1A) for purposes of comparison to the revised concept plans.
- b. CBA subsequently presented the new Concept Plan (2A), characterized by the building being rotated by 90 degrees and a drive-through apparatus bay. CBA indicated that the intent had been for the 3 Chiefs to be able to review this plan alternate in advance of the meeting, but there was insufficient time for this to occur.
 - i. CBA indicated that a configuration similar to Concept 2A had been prepared back when they were interviewing for the project.
 - ii. CBA shared that the drive-through configuration would allow vehicles to back in and always be facing outward, which could potentially reduce response times.
 - iii. CBA also showed how a rotated building configuration would intrude further into the 100' wetland buffer zone, potentially complicating the grading required to avoid the 50' no-build buffer zone where no disturbance is allowed.
 - iv. Other key site elements were reviewed, including the public parking, first responder parking, and police carport location requested by the Chiefs for the revised concept.
 - v. CBA advised that placing the building in the rotated configuration would slightly intrude on the 25' front property line setback, which might require pursuing a variance with the Zoning Board of Appeals. CBA indicated that it may be advantageous to ask Town boards if there is precedent for such a variance being granted; a previously granted variance for exceeding a setback would suggest a higher likelihood that this variance would be granted.
 - vi. CBA provided a brief overview of where the different departments would be located in the revised configuration.
- c. A discussion period ensued. Committee feedback included:
 - i. A question regarding whether it would be possible to expand the apparatus bay in the future with the new configuration. CBA confirmed that it would not be able to be expanded due to encroachment onto regulated land (wetlands).
 - ii. A question regarding the favorability of having three driveways off of Main St. CBA advised that previously there were two, but one was a large vehicular apron, and that if the Town expressed a preference for three driveways, MassDOT would be inclined to approve it (especially since two are directly related to public safety). Discussion ensued regarding the tradeoffs with wayfinding and potential vehicular conflict, how this would impact response time, and the need for signage.

- iii. The need for public parking spaces was reaffirmed due to trail/recreation access for the land beyond, as well as to provide parking for public trainings held at the station.
- d. M. Fortier asked CBA which concept alternative would have less impact on the wetland buffer zone. CBA responded that the two options were roughly equivalent. CBA added that the site construction cost of the drive-through configuration would be incrementally higher due to more grading, pavement, and stormwater.
- e. The question was raised as to how the Conservation Commission might view snow removal, as well as the need for detention basins and/or cisterns. CBA advised that surface detention (basins) are cheaper to construct, but that their preferred option would be to locate infiltrators beneath the paved areas that would need to be filled anyway.
- f. The design idea about lowering the apparatus bay was discussed. CBA shared the conceptual floor plan and explained that it would be difficult to achieve without introducing ramps or stairs at pass-through doors between the main wing of the building and the apparatus bay. CBA also mentioned the potential difficulties this would create at separating clean vs. potentially contaminated spaces upon return from calls / decontamination procedure. Colliers followed up with a question about any site grading challenges that might be created by lowering the apparatus bay slab, to which CBA responded that they did not foresee any.
- g. A discussion ensued about decontamination logistics and storage of turnout gear at the station.

5. Proposed Site Investigation

- a. Status Update on the Formal Selection of the Snow Property Parcel.
 - i. A. Llamas advised that the Select Board had received the survey report at their meeting on 7/12. This was reviewed in Executive Session and will be sent to the land owner for review pending minor modifications to be made by the Surveyor. It is not anticipated that this will be a hurdle in the acquisition of the property. The Select Board has not yet voted to select the Snow Property as the site on which to locate the Emergency Services Facility.
 - ii. B. Jacque indicated that it was her understanding that the Chiefs were going to review the revised Concept Alternatives together and bring a recommendation to the Committee, so that a vote could be held on making a recommendation to the Select Board to approve both the site and the Design Concept. The Committee advised that they had already formally voted to recommend the selection of the Snow Property site to the Select Board as the preferred location for this facility.
- b. Discussion ensued concerning the status of Phase I deliverables from both Colliers and CBA. D. Quinn indicated that the Committee was in receipt of all expected deliverables. CBA indicated that their understanding was that

the Concept Study phase would achieve a consensus plan and budget, to allow them to advance the design.

- c. M. Fortier suggested that the Chiefs meet together to review the two Concept Plans before the next Committee meeting, in order to make a recommendation to the Committee at large regarding which Concept to pursue in greater detail.
 - i. CBA advised that Concept 2A represented an increase by about 500 square feet of floor space due to inefficiencies and reconfiguring spaces within the floor plan. This would make this Concept incrementally more expensive than the other.
 - ii. Chief J. Hall concurred and advised that the Chiefs would want to consider in their review the impact to the neighbors and general public and how noise, lights, etc. could be mitigated.
 - iii. S. Seredynski advised that room for expansion should be considered in the Chiefs' review. The expansion topic was briefly discussed relative to comparable Town facility sizes and projected needs.
- d. B. Jacque suggested that the Chiefs' review should confirm that the departments' needs are met, as well as explain the decision-making process and the trade-offs that were considered as a group. The purpose of this exercise would be to demonstrate the thoroughness of the evaluation effort that will underpin the Chiefs' recommendation to the Committee, and to describe how the new facility will function to support each department's operations.

6. Public Comment Period

- a. P. Eldridge asked whether it would be possible to avoid encroachment into wetland buffer zones. CBA responded that it would be very difficult to achieve the needed square footage without decreasing the footprint by going to a 2-story building configuration and/or encroaching further on the front property line setback.
- b. S. Seredynski advised that a significant public education effort might be required to explain the project to the public. He further advised in his capacity as the Chair of the Planning Board that the team would need to be well-prepared when presenting to the Board for Site Plan Approval. He suggested coming before the Board twice, once in an informal capacity for discussion, and a second time when seeking formal approval of the project. CBA indicated that this was their planned approach.
- c. Debby & David posed two questions in the meeting chat:
 - i. A question regarding whether there will be warning lights on Main St. to stop traffic for exiting emergency vehicles. The Committee responded that it is unknown at this point, but may be a challenging coordination issue with MassDOT. This item will be investigated further as the design is advanced.
 - ii. A second comment was received opposing the notion of lowering the apparatus bay elevation.

- d. **T. Powers indicated that she had been unaware of the plans to construct a facility at this location and had several concerns regarding setbacks, visibility, and trespassing. The Committee reviewed the Concept site plans with regard to setbacks and landscape buffer areas and advised that efforts would be made to mitigate any impacts to abutting properties. In response to concern regarding pedestrians cutting through the rear of the property when parking at the library, the Committee advised that trail access would be permitted and encouraged from other locations. The Committee and CBA further advised that the design was still very much conceptual, and that there would be further opportunity for neighbors and the public to have concerns addressed during the formal Site Plan Approval process.**

7. Next Meeting / Adjournment

- a. **It was determined to hold off on scheduling the next meeting until the Chiefs had an opportunity to meet and review the design concepts.**
- b. **Motion to adjourn by D. Quinn, seconded by K. Connolly, 7:46PM, passed by unanimous roll call vote.**

AGENDA ITEMS LISTED ARE THOSE REASONABLY ANTICIPATED BY THE CHAIR TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING. NOT ALL ITEMS MAYBE DISCUSSED AND OTHER ITEMS NOT LISTED MAY BE BROUGHT UP FOR DISCUSSION TO THE EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW.