



Oswegatchie Fire Station Building Committee Minutes

March 5, 2024

1. Meeting called to order at 6:30pm
2. Pledge of Allegiance

Members Present: Robert Tuneski, Ted Olynciw, Beth Sabilia, Richard Muckle, Jen Bracciale, Paul Rafuse, Wayne Gilpin, Rocco Bracciale

Members Absent: Matthew Blankenship

Guests: Brian Baker, Atty. Nick Kepple, Twig Holland, Director Michael Howley, Steve Smith

3. Public Comment:

Brian Baker – 55 year member and past chief of Oswegatchie Fire Department provided his Thoughts and Considerations. (Attachment 1)

R. Muckle agreed with the preservation of the gravesite during demolition.

Steve Smith is a resident of Waterford and is the Project Executive with Downes Construction. Is in attendance to hear what is going on and to keep informed as Downes was selected as Program Manager.

4. Opening Remarks: None

5. Program Manager Selection Status:

B. Tuneski reported the letter to the Board of Selectmen requesting funding in the amount of \$306,650.00 for the selected Downes Construction Program Manager was approved unanimously. This request will be forwarded to the Board of Finance and then on to the RTM meeting in April. Authorization for expenditures will be given after all boards approve the funding.

The term Project Manager will be used going forward.

Review and acceptance of meeting minutes of 2/27/24:

MOTION by T. Olynciw, second by P. Rafuse to approve the minutes of 2/27/24 with the amendment to complete the missing information in the first 3 motions:

- a) Individual making and seconding the motion
- b) Outcome of the vote

And to correct the vote for the Project Manager from unanimous to 5-2

FOR: T. Olynciw, J. Bracciale, R. Muckle, W. Gilpin, P. Rafuse, B. Tuneski

ABSTAIN: B. Sabilia

R. Bracciale arrived following the vote

6. PFAS Phase I Proposal Selection:

The Purchasing Agent received proposals from Barton & Loguidice and Wright-Pierce, both the Town's on-call engineering firms and provided a fee model for committee members. (Attachment2) T. Olynciw clarified what a Phase I study entails: Going through archives of the Town and State. It does not include digging or sampling. A discussion of the proposals ensued.

MOTION by T. Olynciw, second by B. Sabilia to award the Phase I project for 439 and 441 Boston Post Road to Barton & Loguidice

Discussion - T. Olynciw commented that PFAS falls under Phase I and would like the engineer to indicate if they will be testing for PFAS.

VOTE: Unanimous

7. Discussion of Design Attributes:

B. Tuneski identified three elements that drive the space of the building:

- a) Staffing
- b) Number of apparatus bays
- c) Conference/training room

Director Howley was given the floor:

- a) This new building is not the only firehouse in Waterford
- b) The new building is intended to be staffed with career firefighters
- c) The current training room gets quite packed during trainings
- d) There should be a maximum of 6 individual bunkrooms (dependent on square footage)
- e) There should be a minimum of 3 drive through bays with all being the same size.
- f) Will need larger, wider doors – 10'w x 14'h – To tilt the cab indoors for servicing there are doors that follow the slope of the roof rather than rising at a 90° angle. Apparatus sizes are continuously increasing.

Action Item – Members to compile questions for a loose framework of needs to challenge the accuracy of those needs and find information that justifies these needs. Members should email these questions to Director Howley and cc the Recording Secretary who will then compile these needs.

8. New Business:

T. Olynciw submitted emails he had sent to the Recording Secretary. He also had a list of questions for the architect.

B. Tuneski will take these questions to the architect and bring answers back to the committee.

Due to a misunderstanding of the RTM's charge to the committee, Attorney Kepple gave his opinion of the charge for the committee members via telephone. T. Olynciw emailed Atty. Kepple the following day for his opinion – email attached. (Attachment 3)

J.M. Albaine re-evaluated the Oswegatchie facility. Updated findings received by Director Howley. (Attachment 4) Recording Secretary will email document to committee members.

MOTION by R. Muckle, second by W. Gilpin to adjourn

VOTE: Unanimous

Meeting adjourned 8:06pm

Respectfully submitted by

Linda Finnegan, Recording Secretary

***Oswegatchie Fire Company #4 New Station
Thoughts and Considerations 03/05/24***

1. Since we don't have a crystal ball and are not aware of what the Economic Development Commission and Planning Department have in mind, the building should be designed with the future needs of the Fire Service and Town. Price should not be the determining factor of doing what's physically and morally responsible for the taxpayers of the town. It is less expensive to build it now than making costly renovations in the future. Take a proactive approach and do it right the first time.
2. The building should be designed with the cost of ownership to the Town in mind especially if it is being designed to have a life expectancy of 50 plus years.
3. Building construction techniques such as masonry exterior walls and a peaked metal roof should be strongly considered. A/C should be installed & propane heat should be considered so it could be easily modified for natural gas if it became available in the future.
4. Bays should be double deep with drive through feature for easy egress and exit and accommodate a minimum of 4-6 apparatus. They should be sized to accommodate a minimum of a 50' long aerial fire apparatus. Doors should have an overall width of 12' and overall height of 14'. Floor drains should be installed for washing of apparatus and equipment.
5. Building should be constructed to accommodate a whole house generator, cascade compressor and fill station, hose washer and dryer, turn out gear washer and dryer with plumbing/electric installed for a second unit. Gender specific sleeping quarters and bathrooms, training/meeting room, day room, kitchen area and Chiefs office at a minimum.
6. Keep in mind the history of this department and make accommodations to display artifacts and maintain them.
7. In the grass area behind the current day room is where the Departments Dalmatian Mack is buried and the area is identified with a grave marker. In front of the building is a Fire Department granite monument, bench in the memory of a deceased member and flag pole. All should be relocated to memorialize the history of the Department. Over the bay doors on the front of the original structure constructed in 1929 is a sign with the Departments name that should be incorporated into the new structure design.

Brian E. Baker

Past Chief Oswegatchie Fire Co. #4 Inc.

Phase I & Phase II Environmental Study on 439 & 441 Boston Post Road Fee Model for Environmental Study Costs			
Description	Wright-Pierce	Description	Barton & Loguidice
Phase I: Task 1a and 1b-ESA-441 Boston Post	\$3,500	Phase I ESAs	not -to- exceed \$6600
Phase I: Task 1a and 1b- ESA-439 Boston Post	\$2,500		\$6600 includes both parcels
Phase I: Task 2 Hazardous Materials Surveys		Phase I: Task 2 Hazardous Materials Surveys & Sampling	\$14,800
Phase I-Task 2 Business Environmental Risks	\$500 per parcel		
Phase I-Task 3 PFAS Evaluation	\$500 per parcel		
Phase I-Task 4 AUL's	\$400 per parcel		
Phase I-Task 5 Reliance Letter	\$250 per Letter		
Phase I-Task 6 Meetings & additional services	not-to-exceed \$500		
Phase I Proposed Total Fee	not-to-exceed \$23,760	Phase I Proposed Total Fee	not-to-exceed \$52,852
Phase II: Task 1 Preliminary Site Inspection	\$3,500	Phase II: Task 1 Preliminary Site Inspection	\$21,725
Phase II: Task 2 Test Borings, Soil sampling, Well Installation	\$25,600		21,725,000,000.00
Phase II: Task 3 Groundwater Sampling Survey	\$8,700		\$250 to \$500
Phase II: Task 4 Reporting, Data Analysis and Project Coordination	9,000		500
Phase II Proposed Total Fee	not-to-exceed \$52,852	Phase I & II Total Fee	not-to-exceed \$43,125
			\$12/per PLM analysis \$48 for Charfield TEM Follow up \$28 for lead-based paint analysis \$85 for PCB analysis

Linda Finnegan

From: Robert Tuneski <j_robert_tuneski@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2024 6:59 PM
To: Linda Finnegan
Subject: Fwd: RTM charge to form a Building Committee for the Oswegatchie Fire House.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nicholas Kepple <nkepple@sswbagg.com>
Date: March 6, 2024 at 2:52:11 PM EST
To: Robert Tuneski <j_robert_tuneski@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: Fwd: RTM charge to form a Building Committee for the Oswegatchie Fire House.

FYI. Nick
 Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nicholas Kepple <NKepple@sswbagg.com>
Date: March 6, 2024 at 1:54:59 PM EST
To: Ted Olynciw <tedolynciw@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: RTM charge to form a Building Committee for the Oswegatchie Fire House.

Ted. My opinion remains what I stated last nite, that my recollection is the "repair" amendment arose to deal with the specific circumstance of the Committee having the authority to make repairs to the building during the design and building of a replacement facility.

Nick
 Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 6, 2024, at 1:38 PM, Ted Olynciw
 <tedolynciw@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello Nick,

During last night's meeting of the Oswegatchie Fire House Building Committee Bob Tuneski called you and asked your interpretation of the charge issued by the RTM on 2/6/2013. I believe your comment was that the Committee was charged to design & build a new Fire Station.

The original motion was as follows:

" due to the extremely deterioration condition of the Oswegatchie Fire Station, that it be replaced with a new building; and recommend that the RTM establish a building committee to oversee its design and construction".

The motion was amended to add "repaired and or" prior to the word "replaced".

So, the new motion that was approved now says " due to the extremely deterioration of the Oswegatchie Fire Station the it be REPAIRED AND OR REPLACED with a new building; and recommend the the RTM establish a building committee to oversee its design and construction.

My understand is that the building committee is charged with either repairing the existing or building a new building. Others of the Committee stated that the charge is only to design & build a new Fire Station.

Now that you have the actual motion, what is your opinion on the intent of the motion that was approved by the RTM?

Thanks
Ted Olynciw

J.M. ALBAINE ENGINEERING, LLC

14 Lincoln Road, Waterford, CT 06385 Email: jma724@snet.net
www.JMAlbaineEng.com

Oswegatchie Fire Station
441 Boston Post Road, Waterford CT

Temporary Framing Inspection
REPORT #2 -- March 4, 2024



Att. Michael Howley
Director of Fire Services
Public Safety Building
204 Boston Post Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Subject: Oswegatchie Fire Station
Inspection /Assessment: Building Structural Safety
Project # JMA22-327-062

The following is a follow-up to our visual inspection conducted in October 1st, 2022 and documented on Reference No. 4 on page 3 of this report. Our objective is to provide an update of the current structural condition of the overall building shoring as designed and constructed per our recommendations in 2011. I met with Rocco Bracciale and Wayne Gilpin at the Fire station for a visual inspection / walk through conducted on February 17, 2024.

Executive Summary:

The installed temporary shoring on the original building under scope, built in 1928, is in good condition and no significant sign of distress or deficiency was observed nor detected that may indicate a concern regarding the safety of the building, specifically the roof of the older section (1928) in the current condition as supported by the shoring. The shoring is holding up the damaged main roof over the Apparatus Room, Day Room, Hall Room, and Kitchen, all located in the older building, the subject of the shoring.

Moreover, the intersecting roof framing between the 1928 structure and the flat roof from the 1985 structure is a critical area where lots of damage on the roof rafters have been observed due to the flat roof bearing on the older 1928 roof.

In addition, an area on the roof intersection between the 1928 & 1985 (Area 1, see Page 4) was observed where the sheathing (the decking between the roof joists) appears moisture saturated, with significant water damage, though no leaks were seen on the day of the inspection.

Furthermore, another that was pointed out is a soft area on the flat section of the roof on the 1985 building, see Area 2, Photo 2 on page 5. This section has not been supported by our office.

As per the previous report (Ref. 4): it is our opinion that the temporary shoring is not a substitute for the overall building stability as stated in Reference 1 above and quoted below:

"Please note that the installed temporary shoring served the function of stabilizing the roof to prevent a sudden roof collapse. The shoring are designed to provide a safe working area/platform during the projected work to repair or replace the roof; this framework has been designed for temporary application as other elements such as the exterior walls are subject to local or global failure (such as from high wind pressure or suction induced by hurricane forces)."

It is factual that since the installation of the shoring, the building has been subject to two major hurricane forces, Irene in August 2011 and Sandy in October 2012. These hurricanes had wind velocity of 66 mph & 80 mph respectively, and the building withstood these forces with no major consequences.

The deficient roof framing is being supported by the shoring, however it will be subject to deterioration when water intrusion is present which will further weaken such framing. It is imperative to keep the existing roof framing in a dry condition.

Furthermore, the current Connecticut Building Code (2022) requires building to be designed for a wind velocity of 108 mph in Waterford, which translates to building forces increment of 82% above those from Hurricane Sandy, therefore presenting a high risk of building damage and stability in the case that such storm may come through our area.

Conclusion:

The shoring installed in 2011 are providing the required support as originally intended, mainly reinforcing the weaken roof framing over the Apparatus Room, Dispatcher Room, Day Room, Hall Roo, and the kitchen. These shoring were installed principally because of the dismal condition of the roof framing (see Ref. #2).

The shoring was found in good conditions with negligent movement changes since they were installed, thus ensuring the safe function of those areas under potential heavy snowstorms.

However, the existing roof framing was stabilized by providing vertical supports at the peak (ridge) down to solid structure and reinforcing the existing rafter tie connections to the existing rafters (refer to Reference 3, Section "A", Dwg S-2 and Section "B" Dwg. S-3). The existing rafters (2 x 6 @ 24" on-center) were not reinforced at the time due to the nature of the work (temporary), and they remain the weakest link in the chain as water intrusion from the roof will further deterioration on such elements of the roof framing.

Regarding the building lateral stability caused by hurricane induced lateral forces and to a lesser degree seismic forces, the area of the building under consideration is vulnerable as reported previously due to the weakened state of the exterior walls specially in the Apparatus Room as previously reported.

Although the building has withstood two significant hurricane events in the last 12 years, there still exist a significant risk of building overall stability if a significant hurricane passes through the areas because of the condition of the exterior bearing wall (shear walls) and the existing roof rafters that were not reinforced at the time of the installation of the shoring.

Current Recommendations:

The two areas mentioned above, where roof soft spots, indicating water saturation of the decking, were flagged, should be repaired as long as the Buildings' functional life is extended in the foreseeable future, and best time to repair these areas in the coming Summer time.

I trust this information is adequate for your needs. If you have any questions or desire further information regarding this report, please contact me at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Jose-Miguel Albaine, M.S., P.E.
Consulting Design-Structural Engineer



Reference Documents

- 1) Report / Letter dated March 6th, 2011 by JM Albaine Engineering - Project # JMA10-327-06.
- 2) Report / Letter dated February 5, 2011 by JM Albaine Engineering - Project # JMA10-327-06
- 3) Design /As-Built Drawings By JM Albaine Engineering S-1 to S-7, Revision 2, dated March 05, 2011.
- 4) Report / Latter dated October 31st, 2022 by JM Albaine Engineering – Project # JMA22-327-062



PHOTO 1

**AREA 2: FLAT ROOF SECTION
(1985 BUILDING)**



PHOTO 2