



**Town of Ridgefield
Public Safety Facilities Committee
Minutes
UNAPPROVED**

February 12, 2026, 7PM

ANNEX, Large conference room, 66 Prospect Street, Ridgefield, CT

Please note – these minutes are not verbatim.

Committee Members Present: David Brickley, Pamela Dunaway, Denis Graves (via telephone), Wally Martinez, Adam Safir (arrived at the beginning of agenda item 2), Stephen Scalzo, Ed Tyrrell

Committee Members Absent: None

Presenters in Attendance:

Wally Martinez called the meeting to order at 7 pm.

1. **Public Comment** – None.

2. **Working Groups' Initial Due Diligence Requests**

- a. Steve Scalzo reported that the Finance group (David Brickley, Denis Graves, and himself) discussed the research structure they need to complete. They determined that they will review the cost of the existing proposal, research comparable costs for similar construction in comparable towns, break down costs into project components, and update the costs to 2026 values. They will meet with the Board of Finance to ensure a thorough understanding. Pamela Dunaway asked if tax assessor property values for potential sites would be helpful. The committee agreed that while it will be helpful, they are not ready to discuss actual property addresses yet. When it is time, they will likely work with a commercial real estate broker.
- b. Adam Safir reported that the Needs Assessment and Site Evaluation group (David Brickley and himself) broke down the tasks into the following four questions; what are the needs for a police and fire facilities, who needs to use the police and fire facilities, where are the best locations, and, how can facilities be constructed to be most efficient (who, what, where, how). To answer question one, who, they will consider standards required such as American Heart Association, OSHA, NSFA, and USFA, survey of officers and firefighters, fleet needs, equipment needs, and training

needs. They will also look at financial data such as potential grant funding and ISO rating (public protection rating that impacts insurance). Question two, what, will require review of any space and flow analyses for people and vehicles and different concepts of operation and function. Question three, where requires looking at calls per service data but there is also some proactive activity such as educational and mutual aid events to be considered. They will also get a traffic study, census information, and planning and zoning information. Question four, how, will address the cost comparisons of any of the potential locations. David Brickley added that once site locations are identified, geotechnical information will be needed to determine the investment needed to bring each of the most suitable sites to building pad status, at which point they can look at design proposals that can be compared equitably, apples to apples. Denis Graves asked if the group finds an issue with high turnover, please share with the Finance group. Pamela Dunaway asked that if the group comes across any data showing that the current facilities impact a new recruit's decision to join the Ridgefield Fire or Police Department, please share with the whole committee. It is important to make Ridgefield a number one choice for new recruits. Wally Martinez added that if the working groups learn any information that could be significant to another working group, please share it immediately with that group.

- c. Pamela Dunaway reported that the Community Engagement working group (Ed Tyrrell and herself) added some due diligence items to last week's list. Subscriptions to the alert system have increased from 36 to 88 demonstrating community interest. Please visit RidgefieldCT.gov and click the green banner across the top of the page to subscribe. The upcoming survey will be sent to all these subscribers. She has a list of survey questions to finalize after the group presentation from Chuck Hancock. They have started reaching out to locations and organizations like Founders Hall to establish contact and prepare community outreach via those connections. Adam Safir asked when the committee should engage with the community regarding the committee findings. Wally Martinez suggested that the committee stay open to public input at these meetings, transparent via distribution of committee updates, and aligned with the committee charge, without setting deadlines for additional events. Pamela Dunaway added that she envisions communicating with the community at committee milestones not time intervals. For example, once the needs assessment is complete and the committee fully grasps all the details, it would be an opportune time to reach out, share those findings, and receive feedback. The committee agreed. Public Comment from Chuck Hancock, 480 North Street, suggested that the committee push emails to the community with the meeting discussion items. Geoffrey Morris, 231 Ivy Hill Road, supported the committee's transparency efforts and suggested that a written pros/cons for each potential site location will be very helpful. Roger Kavanaugh, 120 Prospect Street, suggested that the committee charge was very specific and needs a timeline. Wally Martinez

responded that the committee is still learning how much data they must review and how much more they will have to gather. They have too many variables and unknowns to place restrictions or limitations on themselves at this moment. David Brickley added that he too likes the idea of a schedule once they have enough data to add a timeline to the plan.

3. **KBA Follow-up Work** – March 5 is their tentative presentation pending consultation cost approval. The committee hasn't received any data from KBA to review in advance. Ed Tyrrell impressed upon the committee the urgency of a meeting with KBA because they need answers before we can move on to other research.

Steve Scalzo motioned to carry this item to the next agenda. Adam Safir seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

David Brickley motioned that the committee review material, compile, and share with KBA a list of questions for KBA to address at the March 5 meeting. Denis Graves seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

4. **General Discussion** – Ed Tyrrell stated that the committee will have been successful if it proposes one combined building or two separate new or renovated buildings that meet the greatest needs of both departments and that are passed by the voters. Pamela Dunaway shared that success regarding community engagement would be having provided information thoroughly and clearly that all community members understood all the details of the project. Adam Safir added that a yes vote after information is provided thoroughly, and feedback is received and incorporated into the committee's work. Steve Scalzo suggested that if all the constituencies are engaged and satisfied to enough degree to pass the vote. David Brickley added that passing the vote on the most cost effective and realistically achievable proposal, whether one or multiple buildings, would be a success. Wally Martinez added that perfect is the enemy of the good. Their mission is to create a solution that is good enough to meet the needs and gain the majority support of the community.
5. **Old Business** – none.
6. **New Business** – Adam Safir asked if this committee could appoint other community members to complete specific tasks. Wally Martinez will find out.
7. **Adoption of Minutes** –

Steve Scalzo motioned to approve the February 5, 2026, meeting minutes. David Brickley seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Chair Wally Martinez adjourned the meeting at 8:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,
Etna Monsalve