

**DRAFT**

**Meeting Minutes for the Ad Hoc Building Committee (AHBC)  
Hybrid Meeting Work Session: March 13, 2025**

The meeting was called to order at 4:30pm by Co-Chair Michael Cohen.

A quorum of committee members was present:

Co-Chairs Michael Cohen and Bob Higgins-Steele; Members Anthony Garrett, Leif Hamnquist, Anastasia Song. Alternate Bob Panessiti was also present.

Representatives from Truro's OPM (Environmental Partners) and Westin & Sampson were present.

**From OPM:**

Wes Stinson - Apex – OPM Rep

**From Westin & Sampson:**

Michael Richard -PE Civil Engineer Team Discipline Leader  
Della Donahue - Architect & Energy/Climate Resiliency  
William Lefebvre - Architect & Energy/ Climate Resiliency  
Scott Henrique - PE Mechanical Engineer  
Nicole Harvey - Mechanical Engineer  
Colleen Kennedy - PE Civil Engineer  
Abby Structural -Civil Engineer  
Sam Albert - Climate & Energy Resiliency  
Brian Green - Climate & Energy Resiliency  
Billy Herring - Climate & Energy Resiliency

**Agenda Item #1: Notetaker & Administrative**

Mr. Cohen noted that this meeting was a Work Session pursuant to policy Memorandum #56. No public comment. Pursuant to the previously agreed-upon rotation schedule, it was confirmed that Mr. Cohen would take minutes of this meeting. [*n.b., as Mr. Cohen subsequently resigned the committee, Anastasia Song volunteered to complete these minutes.*]

**Agenda Item #2: Staff & Member Update**

Mr. Jarrod Cabral provided a brief update on environmental matters, noting that he was bringing a Warrant to Town Meeting for \$3 million for remediation at Town Hall.

### Agenda Item #3: Design Charette

Westin and Sampson (W&S) Team introduced themselves:

Team lead Della Donahue opened the charette by indicating that the purpose of the meeting was to obtain AHBC input regarding the sustainable design elements and goals for the proposed new DPW facility. She then gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing W&S Climate Resilience Design Standards analysis for the Truro future DPW facility. Highlights included:

- Climate risk ratings under various extreme weather events
- Design life to 2086
- Implementation consistent with Truro's opt-in to the Municipal Stretch Energy Code (IECC 2021 with Massachusetts and other amendments) to include assessment of:
  - Mechanical and electrical systems
  - Building envelope
  - Reporting and testing requirements
- Preliminary Schematic Drawings for a composite Building structure comprising 23,815 sf, a Canopy if 3,850 sf and a salt shed of 2,400 sf.

\*Sustainable Site Design, including schematics for

- Public amenities (compost, community gardens, plaza, bike storage, kiosk)
- Solar canopy
- Solar field
- Vegetative Shading and EV Charging
- The W&S Presentation reiterated the functions required of the Truro DPW as comprising: Administration, Highway, Buildings Maintenance, Fleet Maintenance, Transfer Station support, Equipment storage for the Harbor Master, Emergency Operations, Storm Operations, and fueling for Police and Fire
- It further laid its proposed schedule comprising Study, Conceptual Design, Schematic Design, Design Development, Construction Drawings, Bidding, and finally, taking the package to vote at Annual Town Meeting April 2026
- It discussed design parameters to accommodate 9 Full time DPW Staff, 3 administrative staff, and specific vehicle details.
- Reviewed a decarbonization roadmap with detailed statistics
- Discussed the possibilities of incorporating new energy technologies, including heat pump/geothermal, solar

Comments made during course of W&S presentation in order of commentary:

- Ms. Song asked Ms. Donahue to provide an overview as to how W&S fundamentally approached the project. Ms. Donahue responded that W&S drew from interactions dating to 2018, conversations with Mr. Cabral. Who uses building, public interaction, etc. Then the overlay of sustainability analysis.
- Mr. Garrett requested analysis of Passive Solar Design – he feels it merits examination as a low-cost, efficient option including shading to prevent solar gain and thermal chimneys in selected areas; suggested much would shake out when Energy Modelling completed. Ms. Donahue indicated it's worth analysis but cautioned as to things like passive ventilation given the industrial nature of the DPW facility, where certain mechanical ventilation systems will be necessary.
- Mr. Higgins-Steele requested clarification to note that an all-Electric building design comported with Specialized Stretch Code compliance which Truro had gone to efforts to adopt.
- W&S Mr. Henriques confirmed.
- Discussion ensued regarding use of collected rainwater for fire suppression and other green landscaping benefits.
- Mr. Garrett added commentary regarding the benefits of leveraging a solar canopy area for covering / storage of equipment- dual benefits. He has seen canopy structures serve as the substantial weather barrier for storage
- W&S engineers commented that the group needed to balance cost and features- they would do the math.
- Ms. Song inquired whether W&S was assessing the overall facility electrical load requirement vis-à-vis study of the specific loads sizing – i.e., spreading out for example heavy induction motor loads across time and season to shave peak and raise shoulder – thereby potentially facilitating a smaller overall peak capacity requirement for the facility. This would require W&S discussing with DPW staff aspects of the operations and preventative maintenance regime. Ms. Donahue indicated that W&S Operations Division was in discussion with DPW staff on these matters.
- Mr. Henriques indicated for base building equipment, yes optimization of load / capacity sizing could be done.
- Mr. Garrett noted that DPW staff should spread routine maintenance logically to off-summer peak to minimize AC load. He also inquired if a generator was contemplated in the current design, what the fuel source would be and what the implications were for this of an all-electric building.
- Mr. Henriques indicated that the generator would be classified as a stand-by generator, fuel either propane or diesel. He also broadened the commentary to discuss the possibility of a town optimizing its energy usage across multiple municipal facilities.
- Mr. Garrett noted that many important discussion threads were being raised – and given time constraints of today's meeting he asked Chairman Cohen if it might be possible to schedule a follow-up work session with W&S to delve more deeply. Mr. Cohen confirmed that today's meeting was just to socialize discussion. Mr. Hamnquist indicated that through the schematic design process there would be

opportunities to flush out further discussion. Mr. Garrett countered that it was important to raise these issues earlier rather than later in the process.

- Ms. Donahue asked for direction from AHBC as to appetite for some of the amenities that W&S presentation showed – e.g., kiosk, walking path, bike storage. Mr. Cabral indicated that there was no bike traffic at Town Hall Hill.
- Ms. Donahue moved on to building design – commented that this had been largely code-driven. Mr. Hamnquist requested options and pricing on different configurations, to include analysis of upfront cost vs savings over time. Ms. Donahue indicated the W&S energy modelling would assess options. It was also commented that certain economic analysis would follow pursuant to sustainability modeling by Cape Light and that recommendations would be geared toward maximizing return on investment.
- Mr. Cohen commented as to the importance of natural light in the workspace. Ms. Donahue concurred and pointed out insulated translucent panels having been contemplated in the W&S schematic. She also discussed windows and curtain walls as needing to be triple glazed per code – costly but no way around it. Mr. Henriques noted that only the Admin Area was currently slated for AC consideration.
- Ms. Donahue inquired as to the broader appetite for incorporating Renewables more generally into the DPW design. Mr. Garrett asked whether design could allow for future flexibility of use of renewables, e.g., backfeed or not in the future. For example, while battery storage is currently extremely expensive, it may not be so in the future can design be reconfigured at a later date. W&S engineer Mr. Albert said short answer Yes.
- Ms. Donahue turned to Lower Embodied Carbon Structure Systems including Geo-Thermal. Mr. Higgins-Steele inquired whether W&S had done cost benefit analysis considering tax attributes such as the ITC – was there a good ROI excluding these tax benefits? He cited the town of Middleboro, MA having incorporated geothermal with radiant floors. Mr. Cohen who toured Middleboro stated that the cost recovery was rapid with the dual system. Mr. Higgins-Steele reiterated his interest in pursuing this concept further. Ms. Donahue noted that W&S had a meeting scheduled for the follow week with Cape Light to discuss these types of issues. Discussion ensued on possible efficiency of radiant heated floor in the mechanics area.
- Ms. Donahue discussed regulatory technicalities around contractor selection and use of various building materials as being a potential limitation.
- Discussion and differing opinions were articulated with respect to how comprehensive a lifecycle analysis should be undertaken. W&S suggested they provide a one-page synopsis of suggested courses along with pricing for various analyses.
- Mr. Higgins-Steele reemphasized his desire to size sustainable features responsibly – as much or as little as the town could afford.

#### **Agenda Items #4: Next Meeting Agenda**

Mr. Cohen suggested that AHBC members send any suggestions to the co-Chairs at soon as possible.

#### **Agenda Items #5: Next Meeting Date**

Mr. Cabral asked W&S to prepare a schedule of the next few months. Ms. Song requested a budget/burn rate to accompany.

Mr. Cabral asked for AHBC preference for continuing meeting cycle. Discussion ensued around 2 week vs 3 week vs 4 week schedule.

Decision was made to convene next AHBC meeting on 3/27/2025 as a hybrid meeting with a 4pm start time. Mr. Cabral confirmed Select Board chambers were available this date and so booked it.

Mr. Garrett asked for W&S information to be delivered well in advance of AHBC meetings to allow committee time for proper review.

Mr. Panessiti expressed his personal concerns around potential facility cost but felt that the DPW proposed facility would cost not less than \$25 million; and the design should reflect specific needs of the DPW.

Ms. Girard-Irwin suggested that AHBC meetings be slated for 2 hours rather than the current target of 90 minutes to avoid hitting time the constraints that appear to post problems at each meeting. She further commented that next meeting should incorporate discussion around necessary square footage of monolith. Committee concurred this should be discussed at an upcoming meeting. W&S suggested this discussion follow completion of Schematic Design.

Mr. Hamnquist discussed some scheduling mechanics around creation of construction documents, bid timing, and possible delay for rebid; a concern being if that after 2026 Town Meeting the final bids come in high this could require further voter authorization. Details were discussed around Special Town meeting timing and bid outcomes. Mr. Hamnquist noted that bid documents should be drafted in such a way as to incorporate flexibility of “alternatives” that would provide options for award (presumably in such a manner as to provide a legitimate pathway around a the need for second Town Meeting for financial authorization).

W&S separately raised the issue of water supply / potable water and how this analysis proceeds vis-à-vis the DPW facility process. Mr. Cabral stated his view that the current authorization permitted pursuing the water supply issue on its own track, but he needed to check the budget.

#### **Agenda Items #6: Adjourn**

Mr. Cohen called for a motion to adjourn which was seconded and unanimously approved.  
The meeting was adjourned at 6:21pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anastasia Song

## **Ad Hoc Building Committee Remote Meeting Minutes**

March 27, 2025 Present: Co-chairs Michael Cohen, Bob Higgins-Steele, Members Anthony Garrett, Anastasia Song Alternate Bob Panesitti

Absent Member Leif Hamnquist

### **1. Co- chair Higgin-Steele will take minutes**

#### **2) Public Comment.**

Dennis O'Brien Truro voter Dennis O'Brien apologized and wanted to correct the record on the origin of the \$20 million cap included in the citizen petition presented to the Select Board (SB).

Mr. O'Brien stated that it was the OPM who stated on March 14 that at a citizen's meeting that the project could be built under \$20 Million if there were substantial cuts made, not Committee member Anthony Garrett. Mr O'Brien stated that he and Tony Garrett had not talked about cost outside of the Committee. Mr. O'Brien and Member Garrett have never spoken about the petition.

Furthermore Mr. O'Brien stated that on March 21, Mr Garrett stated that he believed that the project could be built for between \$ 20-\$25 million and that \$ 20 Million was a worthy goal.

Mr O'Brien felt that Voter Chris Lucy's comments at the April 2 SB meeting were false and inappropriate.

Member Garrett has concerns about the Committee's process, cost and citizens cost concerns. Member Garret has never stated a specific number. He believes the project could be built " in the low \$20 million range" He believes has been consistent and he would like to see a schematic design developed with committee input.

Alternate Panesitti corrected Mr O'Brien's statement. Mr O'Brien does not speak for the Committee or

Co-Chair Higgins Higgins-Steele outlined a potential meeting with Take Back Truro

Voter Chris Lucy reiterates he has no conflict of interest in commenting at public comment. Mr Lucy asked the SB to remove Member Garrett from the AHBC  
Lucy requests the selectmen consider removing Tony Garrett from the committee.

**3. Approve meeting minutes** – Co-chair Cohen will complete last meeting's minutes by the next meeting

#### **4 Updates**

-Director Cabral discussed site remediation project of on site hazardous waste which is expected to take about 6 months to complete. The total project cost is estimated at \$3 million. This is separate from the DPW facility cost.

-Director Cabral discussed a well on Conservation Trust land to serve both the DPW and Town Hall. Zone 1 and 2 protections would be contained on the DPW/Town Hall site

-Weston and Sampson's 2027 design included 32,000 sf

There have been 6 revisions since 2019

-The DPW Study Group has made 9 presentations w/ 3 revisions

-Director Cabral appreciated the Study group's work and input

Director Cabral, W&S and Apex the Owner's Project manager (OPM) reiterated their support on moving forward with the Consolidated design.

#### **5 Project Cost, Schematic Design, Cost cutting**

-Mr. Millett from Apex reviewed cost options \$33 million for a 23,000 square foot building.

-He emphasized that there is no \$15 million or \$17 million option. To reduce the cost, they would need to cut out a third of the building.

-W&S presented a schedule the schematic design phase, involves investigation and analysis, with a first look the first week in May

-Optimally value engineering to reduce cost is done at the completion of schematic design

- Weston and Samson confirms that a campus-style layout would not result in significant savings.

-The OPM explains that cutting the project by a third would be a drastic reduction, much larger than the typical 7-15% cuts Jeff Alberti of W&S states that the current 23,000 square foot is a 40% reduction from the initial proposal, more cuts would require compromises in functionality and potentially increase long-term costs.

-Member Song requests a budget for the engineering work and expresses concerns about the escalating costs due to various economic factors.

- Jared provides information on the schematic design budget of \$248,500.

- Tony points out discrepancies in the building's square footage calculations.

- Some members suggest the need for more direction from the Select Board. Sue, the Select Board liaison, reminds the committee of previous decisions made and offers to address any specific requests for guidance.

-Member Panesitti advocated focusing on efficiency and meeting community needs rather than a specific budget

-Member Song is concerned about over-engineering for a distant future.

-Higgins-Steele advocates for additional roof space to provide for un foreseen needs due to Climate change

-Member Garrett expressed the importance of getting through the schematic process as currently laid out

-The Study Group presented a revised floor plan reducing vehicle storage from 12,000 to 7,800 square feet, with an additional 2,000 square foot lean-to canopy.

-Co-Chair Cohen commented that the Citizens petitioner a 20 million dollar cap undermined the Committee's work Co-Chair Cohen reached out to Anthony Garrett of the Study group to clarify the source of the cap. A heated discussion ensued. Member Garrett left the meeting and returned late3r er.

Member Song moves to Defer the vote to another date when the full original committee is present. Vote was 5-0 to defer until April

### **Next steps**

- Weston and Samson to complete schematic design by May 30th, 2025.
- W&S to provide a budget of the run rate for Weston and Samson's work going forward, including billable time for the next 2 weeks.
- W&S review and provide input Study group's schematic design recommendations. Continue with the consolidated plan design process through schematic design completion.

W&S so far is within the \$240,500 budget for schematic design.

- Apex will to explore options for conducting a constructibility review with a contractor not bidding on the project.
- Committee defers voting on pursuing a second schematic design until the full original committee is present at a future meeting.

Meeting adjourned 6 PM

Next Meeting April 17,2025

Respectfully submitted by Bob Higgins-Steele with Help from Zoom AI