

**TOWN OF NORTHFIELD**  
**EMERGENCY SERVICES FACILITY BUILDING COMMITTEE**  
**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2022, AT 6:00PM**  
**VIRTUAL HYBRID (ON-LINE) MEETING**

**MINUTES**

**1. Call To Order**

- a. S. Dunnell called the meeting to order at 6:02PM
- b. Committee attendance: Chief Skip Dunnell, Chief Jon Hall, Bernie Porada, Kevin Connolly, Stephen Seredynski, Andrea Llamas, Chief Mark Fortier, David Quinn, Heath Cummings.  
*Absent; Alex Pirozhkov.*
- c. Consultants: John MacMillan, CBA; William Murray, PLACES; David Hillburn, CES; Amy Gregory, CES; Matthew Sturz, Colliers; Anthony DiLuzio, Colliers.
- d. Public Attendance: Pamela Eldridge, Bill Llewelyn.

**2. Previous Meeting Minutes**

- a. Meeting minutes of October 13, 2022;
  - i. Motion made by K. Connolly to approve, Second by M. Fortier
  - ii. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote

**3. Budget, Contracts, Invoices**

- a. A. Llamas indicated that there were several outstanding invoices that had yet to be approved:
  - i. Colliers invoice #\_\_\_\_\_, dated 9/30, in the amount of \$3,900.00, for Design & Bidding Phase Services.
  - ii. Colliers invoice #\_\_\_\_\_, dated 10/31, in the amount of \$7,400.00, for Design & Bidding Phase Services.
  - iii. Caolo & Bieniek Associates invoice #6629, dated 11/18, \$255,229.19 for Design Development Phase Services.
- b. Motion was made by M. Fortier to approve each of these invoices as presented, Second by David Quinn.
  - i. No discussion on the Motion as brought forward.
  - ii. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote.
- c. Colliers indicated that all was set as far as their Contract Amendment and that this topic could be removed from future Agendas.
- d. Colliers indicated that they are coordinating with CBA as far as their Contract Amendment, and hope to have this resolved in advance of the next Committee Meeting.

(Continued on next page)



#### **4. Designer Update**

**a. CBA asked PLACES to provide an update on the site design, to include both a plan overview and a description of the Permitting process ahead.**

**i. PLACES described the site layout and noted relative elevations and gradients to Main Street and the existing slopes at the current Fire Station. Site elements identified included both staff and public parking spaces (including accessible), covered police parking, generator location, communications tower location, dumpster location, sidewalk connections, drainage and stormwater detention systems, granite curbing, site sign, flagpole, and wood guardrails.**

**1. The need for a dumpster location was discussed vs. using roll-out bins, and it was decided that the Town's preference was to have a dumpster.**

**2. PLACES specified that pavement areas serving the Apparatus Bay would be "Heavy Duty" pavement capable of supporting heavy equipment loads.**

**3. PLACES indicated that their site investigation test holes corroborated the previous geotechnical work that had been done with respect to finding of suitable subgrade material.**

**4. PLACES had their surveyor study intersection sight distances from the proposed driveway locations; this study confirmed that there are no issues anticipated with getting the current design Permitted by MassDOT.**

**5. PLACES indicated the need for a hydrant flow test to determine if the existing transite water main can supply sufficient flow to support the anticipated fire suppression system needs. Additionally, they advised that their scope involved removal of transite at sections beneath the proposed driveway aprons, so that the pipe could be replaced with a stronger material where it will be subjected to vehicle loading from above.**

**6. Slope stabilization mix is specified for 3:1 slopes to the rear of the apparatus bay and paved areas. It is not anticipated that this would want or need to be mowed frequently.**

**7. Places reviewed the location and routing of water, sewer, and electrical service to the site.**

**8. PLACES advised that their preference is to use "country drainage" where possible (surface-level elements such as ditches, swales, and depressions) to create the lowest possible maintenance burden to the Town.**

**ii. Permitting Discussion focused on the setback from Main Street (a Variance will be required for this), as well as compliance with Conservation Commission requirements at the rear of the site.**

**1. The Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANORAD) filing was explained to the Committee. This requires the Conservation Commission to agree to the line**



describing the location and setbacks from existing wetlands. This formal delineation is in progress.

2. PLACES advised that the new delineation included an oxbow branch of the river, which extended the Riverfront Area setback further into the site than previously anticipated. In order to work within this revised Riverfront Area setback, there is a considerable amount of further Permitting work that will be required to demonstrate that this site/design is the only viable option for the required use. This will be under the jurisdiction of both the Conservation Commission and the State Department of Environmental Protection. PLACES does this work and will continue to work on the required Permitting.
  3. PLACES advised that they have a high degree of confidence that the required Variance for the building front setback will meet all of the defined State criteria that would allow the ZBA to grant the Variance.
  4. PLACES advised that the required sewer connection at the rear of the site is considered a "temporary disturbance" under the Wetlands Protection Act, and is permissible as shown.
- b. PLACES reviewed the current site design.
- i. CBA advised that the need to screen the rear of the building would be greater, as the apparatus bay is not as developed aesthetically as the front of the building.
  - ii. CBA and PLACES addressed the Sallyport access and the location of "Authorized Entry Only" signage, as well as standard MassDOT public safety signage.
  - iii. CBA and the Town discussed the potential to extend Town sidewalks across the front of the proposed building. PLACES advised that their past experience suggested that MassDOT would allow the Town to construct sidewalks to DOT standards within the right of way, on the condition that the Town maintain them.
  - iv. Further discussion ensued regarding the riverfront setback/wetlands. PLACES advised that the new setback line based on SWCA's updated delineation encroached approximately 100' further into the site.
  - v. Colliers asked the design team to confirm that an ambulance would be able to access the Sallyport. CBA and PLACES confirmed that this will be possible.
  - vi. Colliers inquired regarding the MassDOT requirements for distances between curb cuts, and dimensions of those curb cuts. PLACES advised that the driveways were 24' wide, more than 150' apart, and had a 25' radius at Main Street which would accommodate apparatus traffic.
  - vii. Colliers further inquired about the likelihood that the below-grade stormwater storage structures will be required, as these tend to be costly. PLACES advised that it is about "50/50" at this point. CBA



- advised that these will be located in areas that will receive fill and would be located in place of fill material anyways.
- viii. PLACES advised that snow will be relocated over the embankment, or plowed up to the guardrail.
  - ix. PLACES advised that bollard lighting was currently being considered where practical, to light very defined areas and control light leaving the site.
- c. CBA reviewed the current building floor plans.
- i. CBA advised that the floor plan has not changed significantly since the prior meeting.
  - ii. CBA presented building elevations with views of all four faces of the building. Building heights, detailing, and materials were reviewed. The guiding design thought was to keep the façade within the architectural character of the building with traditional materials.
    - 1. Cement board, double hung windows, cement board trim to resemble white painted wood, clapboard, shake siding, and stone veneer.
    - 2. A small bump-out with an architectural gable was incorporated along the Main Street façade to minimize the scale of the long building face and overall structure.
    - 3. A cupola was added to further complement the surrounding neighborhood architecture. CBA added that the possibility to include a mansard roof could help reduce the scale of the building further.
    - 4. The rear of the building was reviewed in greater detail, including the mechanical mezzanine.
  - iii. CBA presented building sections to describe the different levels in the interior, focusing on the lowering of the apparatus bay relative to the front part of the building. MAAB has advised CBA that there is no public requirement for access to the apparatus bay and the building meets Code as shown.
    - 1. A mezzanine/training unit is accommodated at the rear of the apparatus bay. The Committee inquired what height this mezzanine was – CBA advised that it is approximately 11' in the center, 6' at the ends.
  - iv. CBA followed this with 3D exterior views of the building, beginning with a bird's-eye view to illustrate the relationship to the apparatus bay that would not be visible at ground level.
  - v. Discussion ensued with questions from the Building Committee.
    - 1. S. Seredynski asked about the use of a metal roof in place of asphalt shingles. CBA replied that a metal roof would be more costly and have a higher potential for ice and snow to sheet off, requiring reinforced or relocated gutters. Additionally, there is not much precedent for metal roofs on Main Street.
    - 2. In response to a question from M. Fortier, CBA advised that the structure was being conceived as wood trusses, with a



ceiling assembly such that sprinklers would only be required below the ceiling and not above.

- vi. CES provided an overview of the mechanical and electrical building systems.
1. Hot water for heating, including a central boiler; Air Handling Units (AHU's) with one serving each side of the building (split type, can be fed by either heat pumps or Dx; Vehicle Exhaust and make-up air for the apparatus bay; Sallyport exhaust system. CES advised that ceiling fans would be provided at the apparatus bay to keep the heat down in the space, and that this area was currently conceived as hydronic slab heating.
  2. CBA advised that the team is currently studying the possibility of a full-electric option. The estimators are currently evaluating the cost impact of this potential change. Colliers advised that they have begun outreach to the Energy Committee to solicit their input on this matter. CBA further advised that the team had met with Eversource about their incentive programs this morning, so that is being pursued also.
  3. CES advised that the electrical service was currently conceived as a 1200-amp, 208V, three-phase service. In the event that a full-electric building option was selected, the outside Automatic Transfer Switch and the interior switch gear would need to be upgraded in support of a 2000-amp service. M. Fortier asked if these electrical service configurations were sized to support future growth at the facility – CES advised that the plans currently accommodate (2) level-2 EV charging stations, but do not currently accommodate EV emergency vehicles, etc. CES further stated that fast EV chargers would require an upgrade to 480V service to the building. There is some allowance for future use in the design now, but to include fast chargers in the future would require a separate service and additional space allotment on the site. The Committee discussed the need to ensure that the building was designed to account for all foreseeable future needs, within reason.
  4. CBA further advised regarding the need for a 50'-75' antenna to achieve the same signal strength as the previous station. Additionally, the 800MHz radios do not penetrate the existing building very well – CBA advised that there is now a Code requirement to test a Public Safety building for radio signal to determine if a Bi-Directional Amplifier (BDA) system is needed. This project anticipates that a BDA system will be required, at a cost of approximately \$60,000-\$80,000, and carries this in the estimate.
  5. CES also advised that the technology portion of the building project is currently being documented as written narrative for cost estimating purposes.



- vii. Discussion ensued about the need to understand the full picture of project costs. Colliers advised that the process would include the team receiving an estimate from two independent estimators, one retained by the design team and one retained by Colliers/the Town. A reconciliation meeting would be held once both estimates were in hand, and the result of that process would be a single estimate number to use as a point of reference.
- d. Design Working Group Agenda item was discussed. Colliers advised that the purpose of forming this group would be to expedite getting feedback to the design team as they work through the building design. After some discussion, it was determined that a formal Working Group was not needed, that the current format of the Chiefs meeting in their capacity as Department Heads was sufficient for this purpose.
  - i. From a standpoint of IT, the Committee discussed the need to organize what vendors will be used for the Emergency Services Departments going forward in the new facility. Colliers and the Town will review the current IT contracts and determine the need for any further procurement activities.
  - ii. A Motion was made by D. Quinn, Seconded by K. Connolly, to form a Design Working Group consisting of the three Chiefs, and other parties as needed to advance the design of the Facility.
    - 1. The roles of the Working Group and full Committee were clarified; the Working Group would work with Town stakeholders and other parties as needed and advise the design team regarding the detailed design. These recommendations would then be referred and explained to the full Committee at appropriate junctures for final approval.
    - 2. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote.
- e. K. Connolly inquired why a full kitchen was not included in the design. CBA advised that the Chiefs determined that only a kitchenette was needed to meet the anticipated needs of the users.

#### **5. Site Investigation**

- a. A. Llamas advised that the Closing for the Snow Parcel was scheduled for November 30<sup>th</sup>, which will complete the formal acquisition of the property.
- b. Colliers asked the Committee what the formal process would be to assign an address to the property, for purposes of coordination with the utility providers (particularly MassDOT electrical). S. Dunnell advised that he would follow up with the Town Highway Department to advance this item. PLACES advised that all Permitting applications will be submitted after November 30<sup>th</sup>, when the Town is expected to formally own the property.

#### **6. Public Comment Period**

- a. P. Eldridge asked about the feasibility of adding solar panels to the roof of this building. CBA advised that the only part of the building that faces south is a small chevron of the main building roof, and half of the apparatus bay.



This would require that the panels be installed at a significant pitch for proper performance. Additionally, PV panels would create potential for trapped snow, which would increase the structural requirements of the pre-engineered metal building and would therefore have an associated cost impact.

- b. B. Llewelyn inquired if the building lot had already been formally created. A. Llamas advised that the ANR plan had been approved and that the formal closing for that was anticipated to occur on 11/30. A follow up question from Mr. Llewelyn asked if the State would possibly allow some of the parking to occur on their property. PLACES advised that it was unlikely that this would be allowed by MassDOT without significant additional coordination.
- c. A suggestion was made by a member of the Public to conduct a field trip to the proposed project site. S. Dunnell concurred with the suggestion, noting that it could be helpful to build understanding and support for the project.

**7. Next Meeting / Adjournment**

- a. Next Meeting will be scheduled for December 12, 2022, at 6:00pm
- b. Motion to adjourn by D. Quinn, seconded by H. Cummings, 7:40PM, 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.