

**RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
BELMONT, MA**

DPW/BPD Building Committee
Committee Meeting, June 26, 2018
Town Hall, Selectmen's Room

DATE: January 25, 2022
TIME: 2:33 PM

Meeting is called to order at 7:04. Members present are Anne Marie Mahoney, Tom Gatzunis, Mike Smith, Fitzie Cowing, Patrice Garvin, Richard McLaughlin, Judith Ananian Sarno, Anthony Ferrante, Roy Epstein, Bill Shea, Jamie MacIsaac, Ted Galante, Jay Marcotte, Glen Clancy. Member Rosales joins at 7:15.

- Chair Mahoney points out that from now on, Glen Clancy (community development) and Fire Chief will be present (or their designees).
- Goals for tonight
 - Oversight of projects from Daedalus – how much?
 - Article on November Town Meeting about wording because we are “technically” disbanded
 - Discussion of applying for CPA funds
 - Clarify meetings, August?
- Ted presents, starts with a question on whether or not we need anything from him in terms of design for CPA application?
- Member Epstein posits that it's not really design work, just doors and windows
- Ted clarifies that TGAS is NOT doing façade work.
- No clear determination, tabled for now
- Ted continues presentation, overall design update, and host of small details that need attention
- Gerardo and Sebastien have spent countless hours at both sites to truly start to create official designs.
- DPW FIRST
- Much more detailed designs including utilities that may need to be moved/otherwise addressed
- Stairway behind current kitchen room to storage loft
- There are structural trusses over the kitchen room
- To expand the breakroom will “strand” the storage on top of the break room
- Exhaust vent to the back needs to be moved
- Proposals for DPW
- New drawings use bolded walls to show additions vs. existing
- Drawings show storm drain that needs to be accessible underneath the office addition in front
- Discussion of boiler “dino” needing to go in order to lower slab
- Tom asks if the chimney can go, Ted says he would rather not touch it because who knows what happens to the building if we start messing with pieces of the old building
- Discussion of manhole cover and related to new addition – new addition is possibly stick built for cost effectiveness.
- Member Rosales wants flooring, non-exposed manhole cover
- Member Epstein asks how thick the slab is, only 4 inches? Ted says yes and that's sufficient
- Discussion about whether or not mezzanine storage is necessary? Jay has to look.
- Possible to move conduit? Expense?

- Discussion of where to put other storage?
- Back piece – they have talked with modular companies and the companies suggest raised, AND suggest not only a mod back piece but a mod “CONNECTION” piece (where the ramp is) even though we had always envisioned it as stick built.
- Discussion about whether or not to keep window from new building out front into building – Ted has it removed, both members Cowing and Rosales highlight that they remember Mike saying he WANTED to be able to keep an eye on things
- Member Epstein has additional question – you had mentioned an electrical panel, did you say it’s going to be moved or is it staying? Ted moving. Member Epstein – was that in the original budget? Ted yes.
- Member Ananian Sarno asks if there is any new external lighting? Ted says not beyond what is needed for doorways and accessibility.
- From facilities standpoint – it has to be maintained and cleaned – is there a custodial closet? Ted says yes, that’s on his radar as are floor drains for ease of cleaning. Ted asks his team to increase the size.
- Jay asks about floor surface? Ted says VCT tile.
- Facilities says you’ll need a side by side and a walk behind floor cleaner, so storage closet will need to be bigger. Ted asks for specs on cleaning supplies needed, facilities will get them.
- On to BPD
- Ted would like very soon to get a letter from the Historic Commission and Planning/Community (Glen) saying they support the building so they can apply for variances from the architecture approval board to not make the front entrance the accessible one.
- Tom points out they will also need a letter from the LOCAL disability access commission for the variance.
- New stair access on roof, and bump up for elevator
- Discussion about maybe sloping the bump up for the stairs
- Extended discussion about new portions raised beyond the flat roof, ways to mitigate visual impact, reasons for them, etc. Mainly reasons are related to code, safety, fire access, etc. Having them is non-negotiable, but there may be ways to adjust visual impact.
- Member Cowing asks about ventilation for evidence room, Ted says yes it’s included
- Tom asks about the roof elevation for back addition
- Discussion about not having officers have to walk through the bathroom/showers to get to lockers, is it do-able?
- Ted highlights flex space in design in the event that there are ever additional female officers
- More discussion of not entering lockers through bathrooms, request that be looked at
- Ground floor, sally port, booking, first floor rooms, squad room, firearms storage, offices, much attention to natural light
- Member Cowing raises question about budget in terms of surveillance cameras for booking area, where is the reports room? Yes there is a security line item, and Ted will look back at where report room was intended to be, but there is office space on first floor for that purpose
- Second floor addition – Assistant Chief office becomes storage room, offices, phone booth, etc. Leaving existing wall in the captain’s office, exposed brick will be a nice feature, historical touch

- Asst. Chief MacIsaac raises concerns about evidence room and how it has to be configured, they will discuss in depth with Ted
- Discussion of façade material, they want to do grey running bond metal panel. Has “joint” look like brick
- Possibility of light or dark grey material
- Also possible stacked grey panel, joints are heavier but “bricks” are smaller
- Member Smith is very much on board with the additions, hopes that roof can be adjusted visually but likes the grey running bond panels
- Member Epstein asks about side entry door, are we fixing that? Ted says yes it will be significantly cleaned up
- Member Smith wants to see property lines, and community path, and have that reconciled with the parking situation. Ted says he thinks a survey needs to be done. Question about who pays for the surveyor. Glenn is going to look and see what community development has. Member Smith is still concerned about parking layouts and how it jibes with community path. Ted says not much has been done with parking layout as of now.
- Member Smith brings up the issue of moving the entrance to the PD from the corner to Pleasant St. as on the drawings presented tonight the Pleasant St. curb cut is absent
- Ted says he’s happy to work with either entrance, but that they are planning for now for working with the existing entrance in the event that we cannot make the Pleasant St. entrance work.
- Member Epstein asks if it matters for Ted’s design? Ted says no
- Glenn Clancy asked to look into whether or not town can make it work
- Member Rosales revisits the original sally port as a possibility but committee and designer all say that is no longer a possibility.
- Reiterating what we need – disability access, building dept and historic commission letters so we can go before the variance board
- Ted finishes, on to Tom regarding on site person for projects
- Walk through of the options for oversight from Tom
- Tom feels that the onsite oversight is there already at the DPW, and maybe doesn’t need additional supervision from Daedalus.
- Chair Mahoney – The gist is, BPD absolutely must have the oversight, and DPW is pretty straightforward and is at a site where the folks there know what good work looks like.
- We are not required legally to have an OPM for DPW because it’s under 1.5 million
- Member Rosales asks if we get rid of the OPM on this, who has the authority to stop the contractor if things go sideways? Ted says the committee could authorize someone else.
- Glenn asks Ted what they sign off on in terms of where TGAS responsibility begins and ends for ensuring good work, Ted illustrates that they have general responsibility but not down to, for example, measuring distances of rebar, or ensuring slump tests for foundation.
- Member Epstein is concerned. Yes we have the expertise but they are very busy, so do they have the time?
- Ted says his recommendation is to have an OPM, on both projects, at least part time at DPW
- Member Epstein points out that we had never really budgeted past the schematic design phase.

- Glenn says there's stringent processes to approve the items to even come into town or to get the building permit, and there's not necessarily an OPM required.
- Member Shea wants final cost estimations, and person on site for key dates from Daedalus
- Tom says those specific dates we already have the expertise for, and don't need Daedalus
- Glenn points out that we have Ara Yogurtian, and he's been a clerk of the works (for town hall) and can do what we need.
- Member Cowing asks directly to Glenn/Ara/Jay/Drew – CAN you do this and do you feel it's a reasonable burden? Glenn – yes, Jay – yes, Drew is new to town and unable to answer, but will check with Steve Dorrance and get back to us
- Ted points out, to Member Rosales' point, we will need a specific designee to be the person who gets to say "STOP" to the contractor
- Chair Mahoney states that we don't want to lose the 22k worth of expertise of Tom, and fill in the rest for DPW
- Member Rosales mentions liability, we want someone else besides town employees to shoulder some blame if stuff goes wrong.
- Chair Mahoney makes a motion that we have full OPM services for Police and for the DPW we utilize Tom's services as outlined for the DPW for a total of 22,040.00 and onsite representation be our town employees. Member Cowing seconds, passes unanimously.
- Review of meeting dates, July 10 and 31 at 7 in Selectmen's room
- Adjourned at 9:33