

TOWN OF NORTHFIELD
EMERGENCY SERVICES FACILITY BUILDING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2022, AT 4:30PM
VIRTUAL HYBRID (ON-LINE) MEETING

MINUTES

1. Call To Order

- a. S. Dunnell called the meeting to order at 4:37PM
- b. Committee attendance: Chief Skip Dunnell, Stephen Seredynski, Andrea Llamas, Chief Mark Fortier, Chief Jon Hall, Bernie Porada.
- c. Consultants: John MacMillan, CBA; David Hillburn, CES; Eric Romeo, CES, Amy Gregory, CES; Matthew Sturz, Colliers.
- d. Public Attendance: Alex Pirozhkov, Judy Wagner, Bee Jacque, Pamela Eldridge.

2. Previous Meeting Minutes

- a. Meeting minutes of December 21, 2022;
 - i. Motion made by M. Fortier to approve, Second by J. Hall
 - ii. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote. (*De facto abstention by B. Porada, who had not yet arrived at the meeting for this vote.*)

3. Budget, Contracts, Invoices

- a. Invoices presented for approval:
 - i. PM&C invoice #221750, in the amount of \$8,000.00, for Cost Estimating Services.
- b. Motion was made by M. Fortier to approve each of these invoices as presented, Second by S. Seredynski.
 - i. Motion PASSES, Unanimous by roll call vote.
- c. CBA Additional Services Request to authorize them to proceed to the Construction Documents phase of work was discussed. A. Llamas advised that the Select Board had voted to approve funding for this Additional Services Request at their meeting the prior evening. CBA noted that in many cases there is a formal document authorizing this in writing and specifying the anticipated project cost, which is typically issued by the Awarding Authority (in this case, the Town of Northfield). A. Llamas advised that the Town would issue this in a letter to CBA tomorrow, 12/22.
 - i. S. Dunnell advised that it was the Building Committee's recommendation to the Select Board to approve this, so there should be no further action required by the Building Committee on this item.
- d. CBA provided an update on the Estimate Reconciliation Meeting, held earlier today, 12/21. The two estimators (AM Fogarty, PM&C) reviewed each other's estimates line item by line item to identify discrepancies between their unit costs and quantities. Based on this analysis, Colliers will provide a

Reconciled Estimate averaging the two numbers. CBA advised that it appears the estimate may have slightly decreased since the number that was shared two weeks ago (but certainly hasn't increased since then).

- e. Colliers advised that some items were being carried in the project currently as Alternates, and that a final list of Alternates will need to be voted on at the next Building Committee Meeting.
 - i. CBA explained that Alternates are portions of work which are broken out and priced separately from the main contract scope – at the time of Bid, the Awarding Authority has the option to elect whether to include Alternate(s) based on the bid numbers received, in order to keep the project on budget. Alternates are typically developed as a value engineering tool and are usually kept as simple as possible.
 - ii. CBA further explained that, per MGL Ch. 149 procurement laws, Alternates must be numbered and taken in order, to level the playing field for Bidders and avoid bid manipulation.
 - iii. CBA advised that some items currently carried in the estimate as Alternates are not intended to be Alternates, but relate to items where it is unclear at this time what will be needed (i.e. Fire Pump, Bi-Directional Amplifier, Communications Tower). Some items are true Alternates, such as the Police Carport structure and an Alternate to fully electrify the building.
 - iv. Colliers advised caution in identifying too many items as Bid Alternates, in that too many may discourage some Contractors from bidding.

4. Discussion – Recap of 12/13/2022 Energy Committee Meeting, Recommendations

- a. CES provided a summary of what was presented to the Energy Committee and reviewed their Powerpoint presentation. CES highlighted the need for an efficient and reliable system as the driving criteria behind building systems selection.
 - i. All systems considered were mixed-air VAV (Variable Air Volume) with hot water reheat, and all systems included radiant floor heating with Makeup Air Units and a Vehicle Exhaust System at the Apparatus Bay. CES showed a diagram of this proposed system and its components.
 - ii. Baseline (Oil Boilers), high-efficiency (Gas Boilers, Heat Pump), and full-electric (carbon-free, Electric Boiler, Heat Pump) scenarios were considered. Based on the Option selected, different components would be used to meet heating and hot water needs.
 - 1. S. Seredynski asked whether a gas system would use natural gas or propane. CES confirmed that in this instance, it would be propane.
 - iii. CES advised that the full-electric option would use air-source heat pumps, a system which would be operating at or near the limits of this technology given Northfield's climate. This would require a backup to ensure reliability.

- iv. CES shared a comparison matrix describing how the different systems would perform a number of functions, including Ventilation and Humidity Control. Control Systems, remote units at offices, Compressor locations, Heat generation/rejection, and overall efficiency were also compared in this matrix.
 - v. CES explained that maintenance requirements are anticipated to be similar across all scenarios considered.
 - vi. CES presented a Cost Comparison matrix, which indicated a trend of increasing cost along with increasing efficiency systems. This analysis included: First Cost, Utility Cost, Maintenance Cost, and Lifetime Cost. The baseline system and high-efficiency systems were determined to be a medium overall lifetime cost, whereas a full-electric system would be anticipated to be the most expensive by approximately 4-5 times. Due to the low potential for solar on this particular site to offset electrical use, the utility cost would be anticipated to be highest in a full-electric scenario, which contributes to its high cost. CES advised that it was unlikely that the Town would see payback/ROI on a full-electric option.
- b. M. Fortier agreed with CES' analysis and opined that it appeared a full-electric scenario seemed to be cost-prohibitive for the proposed building. He asked what feedback CBA and the design team needed from the Committee. CBA asked that Judy Wagner (Energy Committee Chair) provide feedback for the Committee to consider in directing the design team on how to proceed with the working drawings.
- i. J. Wagner advised that the Energy Committee would be submitting written comments, pending feedback from the full Committee.
 - 1. One comment was that there were few details provided about the building itself and the envelope construction. CBA advised that the building would be wood-framed, offering greater thermal resistance than metal construction. The proposed building would have a R-21 wall assembly with fiberglass insulation. The roof would be wood truss system with either a fiberglass or blown-in cellulose insulation, to a R-49 insulation value. CBA advised that the Massachusetts Energy Code is already very stringent, and to go much further beyond that would result in diminishing returns on investment. Windows would be thermally-broken, high R-value, argon-filled insulated glass. Insulation would also be provided at the foundation level to avoid ground conductivity.
 - ii. The Energy Committee also felt generally that the proposed building should be generally prepared for future uses/expansion/upgrades.
 - iii. The Energy Committee was generally in support of System 2 (high-efficiency, gas boilers w/ heat pumps), due to the carbon benefits and increased efficiency this would afford. J. Wagner further advised that the Energy Committee's experience has been that retrofitting efficient

systems is extremely difficult, and that it was important to make a good decision in the initial design.

- iv. There was a brief discussion amongst the Energy Committee members about greener power generation options that would not necessarily be a part of this project, but more information would be provided as soon as possible.
 - c. S. Dunnell thanked the Energy Committee for their input and agreed that System 2 (high-efficiency) seemed like the best approach for this building from a life-cycle cost perspective.
 - d. CES noted that the system would include provisions to tie in electric components should these upgrades be desired in the future, as well as EV charging and other foreseeable future electrical loads.
 - e. J. Hall added that there was a high probability of EV's coming online in the foreseeable future and that any future planning to facilitate this would be prudent. CES asked how many vehicles Police and EMS could foresee for purposes of numbers and sizing of EV Chargers. J. Hall advised that this might be 4-5 vehicles, plus radar trailers and other accessories, and that EV chargers should be planned for at the carport location. EMS advised that electric ambulances are not too far out in the future, but are not immediately foreseen for the Town – a single EV charger for a potential future ambulance would be helpful.
 - f. A Motion was made by S. Dunnell, seconded by S. Seredynski, to advance the design based on System 2 (high-efficiency, gas boilers + heat pump).
 - i. J. Hall asked to clarify if this would include future provisions to upgrade to all-electric. S. Dunnell advised that the current trajectory of heat pump technology suggests that this might be feasible in the future. J. Wagner concurred, advising that future upgrades should be considered and advocating for "Option 2+". CES further advised that upgrading to all-electric would require a larger electric service to the building to account for the additional load of all-electric equipment.
 - ii. The Motion was amended by M. Fortier, and the amendment was seconded by J. Hall, to incorporate the recommendations of the design team with regard to incorporating future provisions into the project.
 - 1. Amendment PASSES, unanimous by roll call vote.
 - iii. Motion PASSES, unanimous by roll call vote.
5. Discussion – Permitting Status (ZBA Conservation Commission)
- a. Colliers advised that they have reached out to the ZBA's administrator to begin coordination regarding the Variance the project will require, in addition to the Board's formal approval of the project.
 - b. Colliers further advised that the Planning Board has reached out to the project team with a checklist and a list of requested materials in advance of formal approval hearings. S. Seredynski advised that there will be a hearing for Site Plan Review, and otherwise anticipates a straightforward Permitting Process.

- c. **Colliers stated that Conservation Commission is currently in an information-gathering phase and will extend the hearing to their next meeting to further study the delineation of the wetlands behind the proposed building site. S. Dunnell added that the Commission had enlisted the help of an independent third-party reviewer to further study the delineation.**

6. Public Comment Period

- a. **Prior to commencing public comment, S. Dunnell advised the project team that the repeat flow test results came back more favorable, due to the original use of suboptimal hydrants for conducting a test. S. Dunnell asked CBA how these test results should be shared with the professional team. CBA advised that CES will review the results and confirm that the flow rates and pressure are sufficient to avoid the need for a Fire Pump. CBA will discuss with their subconsultants regarding the tapping location for the water main to see if this can be optimized for pressure and flow.**
- b. **J. Wagner advised that, as an abutter to the project, she is very interested in how the building will look and will remain engaged in the project.**
- c. **B. Jacque expressed appreciation for the thorough presentation and the ongoing engagement with the Energy Committee.**

7. Next Meeting / Adjournment

- a. **Colliers discussed scheduling the next Meeting for a time when it would be advantageous for the design team's schedule. CBA advised that some point during the week of January 16th would be ideal and identified the 19th - 24th. After discussion, this timeline was amenable to the Committee, and 6:00pm on 1/19 was selected.**
- b. **S. Dunnell asked the Town/Select Board to consider sending a letter to former Committee members formally thanking them for their efforts on behalf of the Town.**
- c. **Motion to adjourn by M. Fortier, seconded by B. Porada, 6:00PM, 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.