

Safety Services Draft Minutes.december8.2015.docx

Newbury Safety Services Building Committee

December 8, 2015

Approved December 15, 2015

I. Attendance Record

		Nov 4	Nov 10	Nov 17	Nov 24	Dec 1	Dec 8	Dec 15	Dec 22 29
Alex Azodi omegaengineering@tds.net	√			• √		• √			
• Barbara Freeman mehrenfreeman@aol.com	• √			• √		• √			
• Bob Messenger bmessenger1@myfairpoint.net	• √					• √			
• Dennis Mires dennis@thearchitects.net	• √			• √		• √			
• Patricia Sherman psherman2@myfairpoint.net	• √			• √		• √			
• Ken Tentarelli committee@kenliz.net	• √			• √		• √			
• Ron Williams jrwlakeside@earthlink.net	• √			• √		• √			
• Dan Wolf dan@hodan.com	√			• √		• √			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Also in attendance on December 8 was Ken Holmes of North Branch Construction
- II. **Procedural**

The meeting agenda was read by Mr. Tentarelli.

- **Minutes**

Approval of the November 24 meeting minutes is postponed until December 15.

III **Discussion of material presented by the architect**

Mr Mires provided elevation drawings that include a flat roof design for the fire station (file elevations.pdf).

Next he provided cost comparison data for biomass, propane, and geothermal options (file energy cost analysis_12-08-15.pdf). The data applies to systems sized to support three buildings: fire station, police station, and library. The geothermal system costs cover wells, associated piping, heat exchanger, and pump. It does not include interior distribution equipment as these costs are the same for all options and are included in building costs. Mr Mires observed that because the Town of Newbury obtains very favorable propane costs, biomass is not cost effective in his opinion. He highlighted that geothermal has a 7.5% ROI (Return On Investment) and a payback of 12.7 years. The payback is about 4 years greater than other similar buildings in his experience. He feels the decision of whether to adopt geothermal will depend on how strongly the Town feels about alternative energy solutions.

Mr Mires presented a site plan that shows ledge removal and drainage features (file site plan_12-08-15.pdf) and a cost estimate for site work to implement this plan (file site work cost estimate_12-08-15.pdf). Runoff will be managed by a stone lined basin and a bioretention pond (possibly also a second small bioretention pond). The ponds will drain via the existing path under route 103 although a larger pipe may be used to better control flow even though the overall flow rate will not be increased. The stone basin will need to be cleaned periodically estimated to be at a greater than one year interval. A significant portion of the site work cost is attributable to ledge removal.

Next Mr Mires provided project cost estimates.(file overall project cost estimate_12-08-15.pdf) Three columns are shown. Column A is applies to 4-bay fire station design; column B are incremental costs for addition of a fifth fire station bay; column C are incremental costs for addition of alternate energy heating and air conditioning. In response to questions from the committee Mr Mires and Mr Holmes explained:

t The complex roof structure of the one building solution accounts for its higher cost than the two building solution. The costs consider a full gable roof on the fire station; a partial flat roof would add approximately \$100,000 to the two building solution cost.

fThe higher per-square-foot construction cost of the police station (\$1,030,000/3000 sq-ft = \$343/sq-ft) versus the fire station (\$1,600,000/7584sq-ft = \$211/sq-ft) is due to the large bay area space that has no interior partition costs and is not air

conditioned, ballistic protection in areas of the police station, the larger number of doors in the police station. In their experience police stations typically have higher per-square-foot costs than fire stations.

The costs assume the two buildings are constructed sequentially. If both buildings are constructed simultaneously then a savings of approximately \$180,000 could be achieved.

Ms. Freeman requested that Mr Mires provide written cost estimates for the partial flat roof design.

IV **Discussion of building options**

Ms Freeman suggested, and the committee agreed, that the list of building options be referred to as “alternatives” rather than “pros/cons.”

Ms Sherman recorded alternatives suggested by committee members that should be presented to the Select Board. She will update the template to include these alternatives for discussion at our next meeting.

V **Open Issues**

Mr Mires to provide written cost estimates for a partial flat roof fire station.

VI **Input from the public**

Mr Wright reminded the committee that the Select Board charged the committee with providing plans for locating new Safety Services buildings at the Bald Sunapee site. The Select Board will not consider plans that include remodeling of the existing Safety Services building.

VII **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, December 15, 2015 at the Vets Hall.

Mr. Tentarelli adjourned the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Tentarelli
Committee Chair

