



TOWN OF KINGSTON
CAPITAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
ZOOM / 3/8/23

The following minutes were approved by the Capital Planning Meeting during their March 22, 2023 meeting. Motion to approve was made by David Kennedy and seconded by Heath Emberg: the motion passed 4-0-0.

Date: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 at 5:45pm

Location: Virtual (Zoom)

Meeting called to order at 5:49pm and began with a roll-call vote.

Committee members in attendance: Heath Emberg, Chris Brielman, David Kennedy, and Wayne Bouley.

Other attendees: Keith Hickey, Town Administrator; Carl Pike, Treasurer; Matt Penella, Conservation Agent; Sue Woodworth, Director of Parks & Recreation; Matt Durkee, Schools Facilities Director; Brian Kender, Territory Manager at The Garland Company; Jill Proulx, Superintendent of Schools; Sheila Vaughn, Selectman.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- This meeting is being recorded. Anyone intending to make an audio or video recording of this meeting should notify the Chair at this time.
- No additional announcements

APPOINTMENTS

Review of Departmental Capital Improvement Requests & Planning Thereof:

- **Conservation Department**

Calista Farm:

Matt Penella, Conservation Agent, explained that Calista Farm is a Conservation property that was purchased approximately 10 years ago but has never had any public parking or real access for the public. He said that this project will allow for two vehicles to park and will help make people aware of the park. He added that he has requested funding through the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) and that they are reviewing the application. Mr. Emberg said that the project was listed in the 5-year capital plan as unfunded and asked Mr. Penella for clarification on whether he always intended for this project to be funded by CPC. Mr. Penella confirmed that the project will predominantly be funded by grants and that the project looks like it is going to be less expensive than initially thought. He added that he thinks the project will be completed fairly quickly after the funding is available.

Mr. Emberg asked Mr. Penella to describe the property for those who are unfamiliar with it. Mr. Penella explained that the property was an old farm in the estuary area and has historical significance. He said it was a working farm for a long time and was put up for sale in 2010. He said a development was proposed for a subdivision and the Conservation Commission of the time reviewed the filing and worked with the owner to purchase the land. Mr. Penella said that the Conservation Department is trying to change the management regime of grassland to make it a better habitat and to control some of the invasive species that are taking over a bit. Mr. Emberg asked for clarification for the parking surface and Matt Penella stated it would be a combination of pavement and crushed stone. He added that the project includes adding split rail fencing to outline the parking area to keep people from driving across the field.

Wetland Restoration of Blackwater Forest:

Mr. Penella explained that the Blackwater Forest is also the former Carlson Property off Winthrop Street, located in north Kingston near the Duxbury line. He said that the 46 acre parcel has a lot of topography to it and it is filled with mostly pine and oak woods. He added that in the middle of the property there is a cranberry bog that has not been in use for 20 years or so and has grown in quite a bit in that time. He said a large development was planned but the Town purchased the parcel through the Chapter 61A right of first refusal process. Mr. Penella explained that the Town received a grant through the Federal government to fill in exterior ditches so there is no standing water - former bogs have a lot of standing water. He said that completing this project will boost the ecology and will remove artificial mosquito breeding areas. He added that the property contains the beginning of the Sampson

Brook that eventually comes out at Blackwater Pond and this project will help make the headwaters cleaner and colder. Mr. Penella added that the design process is underway as the grant has funded a company to do all of the engineering and survey work so they are hoping to break ground in the near future. He said the project will benefit wildlife preservation and will help regenerate the white pines. Mr. Kennedy expressed his gratitude.

Mr. Bouley asked about walking trails and Mr. Penella explained that there were already existing trails around the bog, around the larger wetland area, and other spur trails and that Conservation will be adding a kiosk and split rail fencing.

- **Recreation Department**

Air Conditioning (Mini-Splits) in Reed Building:

Sue Woodworth, Director of Parks & Recreation, explained that the Reed Building was built in 1926 and there is no central air conditioning. She said they have installed some mini-splits in side rooms but due to high summer temperatures reaching nearly 100 degrees, it can be very difficult to run programs inside. She said that this request is to install mini-splits in the lower hall and the upper hall of the auditorium. Mr. Kennedy asked for details on the size of the units and Ms. Woodworth said that she has been working with Brad Norman, the Facilities Director, on the request and he can provide additional information, should the Committee like it and added that the vendor determines size based on the size of the space. Mr. Emberg asked if there is a need for units in the offices or other areas within the building and Ms. Woodworth said they already have several installed. Mr. Emberg asked if any grants are available for funding and Ms. Woodworth said there are no funds available at this time.

Opachinski Field Restoration:

Ms. Woodworth explained that this \$242,762 request for rehabilitation and restoration of two athletic fields and drainage improvements at the Opachinski Complex is before CPC for funding. She presented it to them last week and they are scheduled to vote on the requests tomorrow. Mr. Emberg expressed his concerns about field safety and drainage, noting the likelihood of a high water table with the fields' proximity to the wetlands. Ms. Woodworth said that there are details about the drainage plan included within the CPC application. Mr. Emberg asked if this would be a permanent or at least semi-permanent solution to the drainage issues on the fields and Ms. Woodworth confirmed that there is a detailed plan for drainage, similar to the drainage in the parking area.

Mike Ladd joined the meetings at 6:10pm

Mr. Emberg asked for clarification on field maintenance and Ms. Woodworth explained the process the Recreation department goes through from seeding in the fall to correcting any field issues before opening day in the spring. Mr. Emberg asked if having Capital Planning Committee vote ahead of the CPC meeting would help and Ms. Woodworth said that any community support is considered and an affirmative vote would likely help but the timing did not seem as though it would work since the CPC is voting tomorrow evening and Capital Planning is not expected to vote for two more weeks. Mr. Kennedy asked if Finance Committee has voted on the request and Ms. Woodworth said she did meet with the Finance Committee to review the Recreation operating budget but these projects were not brought up at the time. Mr. Bouley asked if the fields have to pass a certain standard in order to host tournaments and Ms. Woodworth confirmed that they do but said the standards have more to do with guidelines such as having dugouts and scoreboards. Mr. Bouley asked about other sports that are played on the fields. Ms. Woodworth said that the fields are used for a variety of sports including lacrosse, soccer, baseball, softball, and football. She said the Kingston Youth Sports Organization is an organization that began in 2004 and has had a significant impact on the complex upkeep. She said they charge a user fee annually and they determine themselves all of the different fees and help keep the fields going.

- **Kingston Schools Department**

Kingston Elementary School Roof:

Matt Durkee, Facilities Manager for Schools, explained that the roof was installed in 1997 and is at the end of its useful life. He said over the past 4 years the district has been submitting applications to the MSBA accelerated repair program, which has been paused this year and potentially will be next year as well. He said it is possible that by combining the requests for both the KES and KIS school roofs that we could be accepted into their Core program, which is a program that is usually used for larger projects like new buildings or additions but with the amount of work with the two buildings, he said we might be accepted into that program. Mr. Durkee explained that at this point with KES, we are at a crossroads with the roof but if we move forward with a roof restoration rather than a replacement, it would dramatically reduce the pricing. He said that a roof restoration would not require removal of the rooftop units and would instead run liquid poly over the top of the existing roof. Mr. Durkee said after taking core samples and performing an infrared scan to see the amount of moisture that has been absorbed in the insulation, the roof meets the qualifications for a restoration. He added that the figure being considered takes into consideration the pitched roofs with a standing metal seam roof for those locations and, due to the large dollar amount, can be broken up into 2 or 3 years, if need be. Mr. Kennedy asked how long a restored roof would last and Mr. Durkee said a restored roof has a 25 year lifespan and has a 20 year warranty.

Mr. Kennedy asked if we are looking at the building as a whole as to whether we want to renovate the current buildings or build new schools and expressed concerns about whether we are thinking long term. Mr. Durkee stated that to provide an educated answer to that question, the school would need to undergo a demographic study. He added that just from knowing the facilities, he could potentially see putting an addition onto KIS if there is increased need for classrooms in the future.

Mr. Emberg asked for more information on the roof polymer roll-on and Mr. Durkee introduced Brian Kender, the Territory Manager for The Garland Company, an expert on building envelopes. Mr. Kender explained that with fluid-applied restorations there are many different types of materials but in New England, due to the temperature fluctuation, materials like silicon and epoxy coatings are not used. He said fluid-applied roofing systems are built up on top of the existing membrane. He explained that it is quiet and has zero VOCs (volatile organic compounds) and can be installed on buildings that are occupied because there is no dust and no debris. He said he believes it also qualifies for LEED credits (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design). He added that on average, it is 2lbs per square foot of material and the roof at KES is 72,000 square feet. Mr. Kender explained that not all roofs can be restored but there is a window of opportunity that KES currently is in but that window is closing. He said that right now the insulation is only 3.75 inches and with a roof replacement, instead of the restoration, we would have to increase the thickness to comply with current standards. Mr. Emberg asked for clarification on the current standards and Mr. Kender said the standard is 5.5 inches but if you have a flat deck, you have to put in a tapered insulation and flashing heights need to be reviewed and considered. Mr. Emberg asked about the R value and Mr. Kender said the current R value is R30 and stated that it is more insulation than he had anticipated, based on the age of the roof.

Mr. Ladd asked if Mr. Kender does roof replacements as well as restorations and Mr. Kender confirmed that The Garland Company is a full service manufacturer of building envelopes and added that most projects they do are replacements because roofs are too far gone to restore. Mr. Ladd asked if there are similar projects that the Committee could compare this to and Mr. Kender said that Newton-Wellesley Hospital is a great example and for them, the zero VOCs was especially important for them. Mr. Kender said they have completed plenty of projects that have this material. He added that The Garland Company has been around for 125 years and is employee owned, based in Cleveland, OH. He said they work with owners and architects, attend pre-bid meetings, and if a project goes our way we conduct daily job-site inspections.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Kender if he saw the architectural shingles and asked if The Garland Company does that as well. Mr. Kender responded that he recommends a retrofit and said to leave them in place and put standing seam metal on top of it. Mr. Emberg asked about the life of the standing seam metal

and Mr. Kender replied about 30-40 years, depending on the materials selected. Mr. Ladd commented that the shingles are in bad shape and Mr. Kender confirmed that they have done a lot of repair work to the shingles.

Mr. Ladd asked what the downside would be to a roof restoration and Mr. Kender said that a replacement would have a higher R-value but otherwise, there really is no negative. Mr. Ladd asked how they would access the lower layer if there were issues and Mr. Durkee responded that if there was anything that needed to be accessed under the restored layer, it would be done through the interior. He added that if there were any failures, we could cut into the material and make a repair from the top, plus, there is a 20 year warranty on the materials. Mr. Kender stated that one of the advantages of the coating is that it encapsulates the roof and there are no seams, which is usually where most of the issues are on roofs. Mr. Emberg asked if there is any rust or deterioration of the roof decking and Mr. Kender said that the only way a roof deck would rust would be water infiltration through the insulation but based on the infrared scan, the insulation was 95% dry so that is highly unlikely.

Mr. Bouley asked about the integrity of the seam that would be created if the Town decides to break this project into three parts. Mr. Kender explained that they could put in an expansion joint to separate the coating and said there would have to be some ti ins to separate the two but it can certainly be piece-mealed together. He added that once the installers get going, it moves quickly and he anticipates that it would take two months to install. Mr. Kender noted that it is most economical to do it all at once.

Mr Ladd asked if Mr. Kender's company does the install or if they sub it out and Mr. Kender said they are a material manufacturer. He said they help with the design and then the set of specifications goes out to bid. He said it has certain specifications to make sure a good roofing system goes on there and that they have to have three manufacturers that can fit the specifications for publicly bid projects. He said at the completion of the project, Garland provides the warranty so they have to make sure the installers are adhering to the guidelines and have to ensure it's being installed correctly. Mr. Ladd asked if the warranty still covers any issues if the contractors do something that jeopardizes the roof and Mr. Kender said they absolutely do.

Mr. Kennedy asked if the funding would come right away if the request passes at the Annual Town Meeting or if the job would be completed the following summer. Keith Hickey, Town Administrator, said that if it passes at Town Meeting, the funding would be available on 7/1. He added that the planning and bidding could happen between Town Meeting and 7/1 but the contract and the work couldn't begin until 7/1.

Mr. Emberg asked Jill Proulx, Superintendent of Schools, if she would like to add anything as it relates to the discussion on demographics. Ms. Proulx echoed Mr. Durkee's statements and agreed that we would need a demographic study before the schools could make a recommendation on a new school, a renovation, or an addition. She added that demographic studies are several thousand dollars to do. Mr. Emberg asked if she has any concerns that the need for a new building would come prior to the end of life of the building that we are considering restoring the roof of and asked if she had other concerns as related to the KES building. Ms. Proulx said that concerns come from a lack of data and said that if we were to consider a new building then it might make sense to conduct a demographic study. She said that while KES has experienced growth over the last 2 years, she is unsure that will continue. She reiterated that without a study that it is difficult to even speculate.

Sheila Vaughn, Selectman, asked what the projected cost difference is between a roof replacement and a roof restoration and Mr. Durkee said a restoration is estimated at \$2,977,500, which includes design and contingency, whereas a roof replacement is \$3.4m plus approximately \$90k for design and OPM fees plus another 5% contingency.

Facility Review and Prioritization Project:

Mr. Durkee explained that this request is for \$20k per building to fund a contract with an architectural firm to go through the exterior of the buildings, excluding the roofs, and then to generate a detailed report on all of the failures on the exteriors including flashing, doors, fencing, sidewalks, and everything on the exterior of the campus. He said with the detailed list including project estimates, it will help the Schools and Committees better prioritize the projects to focus on what needs the most attention and in what order. Mr. Durkee added that ideally, funds would be included within the operating budget so they could fix envelope issues as they come up but right now the budget is so thin that is not possible. Mr. Bouley asked if Mr. Durkee expects more issues at KES since it is older than KIS and Mr. Durkee confirmed that he does. Mr. Emberg asked if the architectural firm will ultimately recommend we build a new building and Mr. Durkee said they will not as they will be tasked with merely finding issues in the envelope. He added that there is no reason we can't keep these buildings alive. Mr. Kennedy questioned whether it would make more sense to consider building a new school rather than spending money on repairs and Mr. Durkee said that KES was built with additions and he doesn't see any reason why we can't continue in a similar fashion, should a need for expansion occur.

KIS Roof:

Mr. Durkee explained that the roof at KIS does not qualify for restoration so a replacement is recommended in the 2026/2027 time period. He said they are doing everything they can to repair it for

now and this request is for \$50k: \$5k for the infrared scanning to identify where moisture is getting into the roofing system and collecting in the insulation and \$45k for the roof repairs. Mr. Kender stated that we could use the poly material on some of the larger sections of the roof but unfortunately, the roofing systems at KIS are too far gone and would not qualify as a restoration candidate. He said that if you do an aerial view of the roof you can see black sheets installed over the white PVC. He added that during a prior storm, he believes that a snow blower was used and caused a significant amount of damage to the roof. Mr. Ladd asked if there was any potential for lower pricing if the Town pursues both roofs at the same time and Mr. Kender said he would have to check. Mr. Emberg stated his desire to extend the life of the roof as long as possible and Mr. Durkee confirmed that this large scale patching is the best thing to do until we can replace the entire roof.

Auditorium Ceiling and Wall Repair:

Mr. Durkee explained that the ceiling and walls need to be repaired and repainted. He said that after discussions with Mr. Ladd during the site visit and after further consideration of the volatility in the costs of labor and materials, Mr. Durkee would like to recommend increasing the quote by \$15k. He said he has concerns that if the original figure of \$68,900 is too low that the project would be delayed. He clarified the updated request should be \$83,941. He said the majority of the cost of the project is for labor to set up the scaffolding over the auditorium seats.

Playground Repairs:

Mr. Durkee explained that the playground at KIS is in need of immediate repair and this request is to replace swing chains, seats, slides, and different fittings that keep the whole unit together. Mr. Pike stated that if we can repair the KIS playground for \$25k when we are spending \$550k at Grays Beach for a new playground, we better jump on this without any questions or concerns. Mr. Emberg stated his support on repairing things to keep it up but has concerns about the wood chips being considered capital as wood chips will not last 5 years and without that within the estimate, this project would fall beneath the \$25k which is the minimum amount that Capital Planning Committee reviews and recommends in their article to Town Meeting. Mr. Durkee clarified that the inspection and quote came from a certified playground inspector and said that he agrees that having annual playground fixes captured within the operation budget would be good so the schools wouldn't have to wait until Town Meeting to ask for funds for something like this.

MEETING MINUTES:

Motion by Mr. Kennedy, second by Mr. Breilman:
Move to approve the 2/8/2023 minutes, as written.

5-0-0 by roll call vote

Motion by Mr. Kennedy, second by Mr. Bouley:

Move to approve the 2/11/2023 minutes, as written.

5-0-0 by roll call vote

Motion by Mr. Kennedy, second by Mr. Emberg:

Move to approve the 2/22/2023 minutes, as written

3-0-2; Mr. Brielman and Mr. Bouley abstained

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN UPDATES & FUTURE ORDERS:

- C.I.P updates from the Town Administrator

No updates

- Discussion regarding placing advanced orders for capital items

Mr. Kennedy requested this agenda item regarding placing orders for acquisitions further into the future and expressed his concern regarding supply chain delays. He asked for clarification on whether we could place orders to be put on a waiting list of sorts and then seek approval and funding at a later date. Mr. Pike said that the Town has to have the authorization to do the purchase and he said that he is not sure any major contractor is going to want to sign a contract with the town until there is evidence that there is town authorization for the procurement. Mr. Hickey agreed with Mr. Pike and said that the Town has to authorize the lease purchase before we can have the actual purchase order. Mr. Kennedy asked if there is enough time to add a future orders article to the warrant and Mr. Hickey confirmed that there is, if that is something that the Committee would like him to pursue. He reminded the Committee that the warrant is scheduled to close on 3/14. Mr. Pike added that functional managers have to be planning this somewhat differently and always know that they are not going to get their vehicles for some time and they plan for delays. Mr. Pike asked for clarification on Town Meeting's ability to authorize an expenditure for FY25 or FY26 and Mr. Hickey stated that Town Meeting will authorize expenditures for FY24 but not fund them until future years. He added that it would be binding the Town with the proposed funding for those departments and would be committing the town to acquiring those. Mr. Pike added that when the Town commits to a 5 year lease but then requests funding at Town Meeting it is odd since the Town has a legal obligation to pay said lease making the vote somewhat irrelevant.

FUTURE MEETINGS

- Discussion to prepare voting of the capital requests in the next meeting

Mr. Emberg confirmed that Wednesday 3/22/2023 works for the Committee members and for Keith for their next meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

There were no comments or questions.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Mr. Kennedy, second by Mr. Bouley:

Move to adjourn.

5-0-0 by roll call vote

Meeting adjourned at 8:06pm.