Board of Selectmen

Special Meeting – November 9, 2015

A special meeting of the Deerfield Board of Selectmen was held on November 9, 2015, at Deerfield Elementary School, 35 Pleasant Street, South Deerfield, Massachusetts.

Present:David Wolfram (Chair), Mark Gilmore.Not Present:Carolyn Shores NessAlso Present:Kayce Warren, Town Administrator,
Richard Calisewski, Building Inspector

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 PM, and a quorum was declared.

Selectmen's Comments

There were no comments.

Hearings / Appearances

Alicia Toney et al - Pinck & Co. Inc. – DES Roof Project

Ms. Patti Cavanaugh (Business Manager for FRS / U38 School Districts) introduced Alicia Toney (Pinck & Company), Jean Raymond and Jeff Yost (RDA Design), Ken Cuddeback (DES Committee), Marti Barrett (Superintendent of Schools), Bob Lesko (School Facility Manager), and Dick Calisewski (Building Inspector).

Ms. Toney outlined the expectations for content to be covered.

Existing Conditions and Exploratory Work

Mr. Raymond discussed the existing conditions of the DES Roof. The current conditions had been reviewed by a number of engineers, builders, and other technical specialists. Documentation of the roofing was described. The current design of the roof was discussed.

Carolyn Shores Ness joined the meeting at 6:40 PM.

Detailed descriptions of the roof were presented by Mr. Raymond.

- Insulation requirements of the MSBA are R25 or better.
- For the flat roofs, the building committee has recommended stripping the roof to the metal deck, and build a new roof from that point.
- On the sloped roofs, 500-600 square feet of wet insulation will have to be replaced. Recommendation is to replace the wood deck and insulation in that area only, and only shingles stripped from the rest of the roof.
- An ice/water shield will be adhered to the plywood sheathing
- A sandwich panel with 2" of rigid insulation capped by plywood.
- Asphalt shingles would be placed on top.

Under Mass Building Code: the addition of more than 5% of the rated load of the roof would require structural upgrades. The recommendations as presented would mean less than 5% additional load. For the flat-roofs, no changes to thru-wall flashing is required.

MSBA requires addition of insulation to bring the roof up to R25 (currently at about an R16.5 rating). On the sloped roof, the sandwich panel will add about R11 insulation value, for a total of over R25.

If the cost of the project exceeding 30% of the overall value of the building, the entire building must be brought up to current building code. The project, as proposed is estimated at \$2.1 Million, which is below that threshold. If the price does increase, an application for a variance could be made to the Architectural Access board.

Mr. Raymond presented the various options for flat roof systems.

On the roof now is a 25-year asphalt shingle, and is at the end of its life. Recommended replacement is a 40-year "Hatteras" brand shingle, which has a high wind rating.

The recommendation is also only to strip down to the wood sheathing for most of the roof, and not to strip the sheathing unless necessary.

A standing seam roofing system was considered. Most of the roofing cost for a metal roofing system is upfront – and could be higher in materials than the asphalt roofing.

Question: given that metal roofing may cost more for materials, but is less labor intensive to install, what is the actual difference in cost between metal roofing and asphalt roofing?

Raymond: Square footage prices as estimated:

Asphalt:	\$20 / square foot installed
Standing Seam Metal:	\$42 / square foot installed

The standing seam metal roof priced out was painted aluminum. There are other roof materials that were considered, and longer-term maintenance costs were considered in making these recommendations.

Wolfram: Asphalt Shingles will not support solar panels without invalidation of the warranty.

Cavanaugh: Roofers generally don't recommend putting solar panels on any roof.

A second engineer evaluation of the roof would also be required, if the town wishes to pursue that. The engineering analysis for solar would be \$10,000-\$12,000, and would likely determine that re-engineering the entire structure would be required, in order to support the additional weight.

The third roofing option was to consider synthetic 'slate' shingles; but the cost was more expensive than asphalt, and was not worth the additional cost.

Recommended Solutions and Design

Roof Materials recommendations were for a 30-year membrane roof for flat roof surfaces, stripping the insulation and sheathing to the metal deck. Asphalt shingles are recommended for pitched roofs. The total estimate of the construction cost given these two materials: \$2,160,861.

The next step would be to create detailed plans, and request professional estimates.

Prices were provided as an 'order of magnitude' estimate, and should not be inferred to be a reliable estimate for this actual project. Final estimates will likely be different – one way or the other.

The goal was to determine specific choices for materials, in order to create detailed plans and refine the cost estimate.

Construction costs of 2.1 Million, but other costs of \$500,000. What is that for? Does that include the A/C condensers?

The cost of the A/C condensers are included in the \$2.1 Million estimate. The \$500,000 are soft costs (clerk of the works, OPM, designers, construction contingency). There is a 20% cap on the soft costs for reimbursement.

Example: \$2.1 *Million project = up to* \$425,000 *of soft costs eligible reimbursement at* 52%.

Total project cost (estimated): \$2.6 Million.

There was some discussion on the manner by which shingles may be made mildew or algae resistant.

There was also discussion related to the process of review of the project specifications.

Mr. Calisewski listed his requirements: Manufacturer's specifications for installation of roofing materials, whether training would be required, nail patterns and specifications, flashing specifications, copies of warranty documents, details on the specifications, etc.

Question: Does the warranty include algae?

No immediate response. Generally, warranties cover only erosion of the shingle, or shingle failure.

There was some discussion related to aftermarket products designed to reduce algae, and that some products would violate the warranty.

Question: are there any structural problems?

Answer: No. There have been issues related to leaks, mostly due to snow cover, and ice dams, but the structure is verified as secure and stable.

What is the MSBA reimbursement rate? 52.6%

How much money has already been spent on the roof? \$210,000

The \$210,000 may be reimbursable by the MSBA, but is pending the limitations of the soft-costs cap of 20%.

There was further discussion about specific constructed materials, as well as reasons for specific materials. There was consideration of the design, related to airflow and insulation.

The board was requested to approve the materials recommendations, in order to move forward with the design schematic. The Design should be complete by November 25. The board will be asked to review, and approve, the design by December 2.

Up until the cost estimate for the design is set, the board can move forward with approval of the finances.

Question: what is the cost difference between 2" insulation and 3" insulation 'sandwich'? What can be done to prevent ice dams, or related leaks?

Answer: I would love to put another inch of insulation on the building. However, it's about \$1 / square foot per inch of insulation. (Estimated \$90,000 additional cost).

Ness: I would approve more insulation if the overall cost difference would only be about \$90,000

Answer: We can explore the design options, and see if we can keep the weight below the 5% threshold.

Heating the building is going to be a concern in the future, so if more insulation can be added to the roof, the town will benefit as a result.

Question: Would adding more thickness to the roof affect trim or flashing?

That would have to be taken into account, and determined as part of the final design.

It was MOVED by Ness, SECONDED by Gilmore

To approve the selection of materials as recommended by the School Building Committee (Alternatives A1 and F2). The cost of an additional inch of insulation on the pitched roofs was also requested.

There was further discussion.

Calisewski: Are you going to specify manufacturer of materials? Or include the term 'or equivalent'?

Answer: The state requires a minimum of three manufacturers for any bid.

Calisewski: Will manufacturer's reps be invited and permitted to view the project during the installation process?

Yes, that process is already ongoing.

Question: Should the estimate be specified around the highest duration of warranty?

Wolfram: Given the length of the warranty, the next time the roof needs to be replaced, the building may need to be replaced.

The durability, maintenance options, original construction cost, and replacement cost of the building itself was discussed.

VOTED: 3, 0, 0.

The Board thanked the members of the School Building Committee for attending.

Discussion/Decision Items

APPOINTMENT: FRS/Union #38 Negotiation Committee – Tom Fydenkevez

It was MOVED by Ness, SECONDED by Gilmore

To appoint Ton Fydenkevez (Sunderland) as the Town's representative to the FRS Negotiation Subcommittee.

VOTED: 3, 0, 0.

Award of Auctioneer Services Contract

The Town Administrator reported that five proposals had been received, and were evaluated. The Town Administrator recommended award of the contract to the Zekos Group, as having the most responsive and responsible proposal.

Question: Were reference checks performed on the highest evaluated respondent?

Answer: Yes.

Present also was Doug Bilodeau (Douglas Auctions). Mr. Bilodeau asked several questions, which were answered by the Town Administrator.

It was MOVED by Ness, SECONDED by Gilmore

To award the Auctioneers Contract to Zekos Group.

Mr. Bilodeau disagreed with the recommendation, giving some rationale to that end.

Question: Was advertising considered?

Answer: That was part of the evaluative criteria.

Mr. Bilodeau further discussed the nature of the RFP, stating that it was different from the previous proposal. Ms. Warren stated that the proposal had changed to incorporate some recommendations that were received as part of the previous process.

Mr. Bilodeau expressed disappointment that his proposal was not selected, citing a decades-long operation of an auction business in the Town, and payment of the associated fees related thereto.

VOTED: 2, 0, 1.

Town Administrator's Report

The Town Adminstrator had no report.

Upcoming Meetings

- November 18, 2015, 6:30 PM Town Offices, South Deerfield
- December 2, 2015, 6:30 PM Town Offices, South Deerfield

Other business

Ms Ness raised the issue of Deerfield participating in the Mass Clean Energy Solarize Program, and to participate in grant-writing activities related thereto, and asked if the energy committee could be asked to participate.

Ms. Warren stated that the Energy Committee had already addressed the matter, and had declined to participate. Mr. Calisewski stated that he might know of some individuals who would be willing to represent Deerfield in the local "Solarize Mass" efforts.

Ms. Warren further noted that a final contract with Beacon Integrated Solutions for solar consulting services should be forthcoming.

Ms. Warren noted that the Town Accountant would be out for a medical procedure on November 17, and would be out for at least two weeks, but she may be able to work from home for some of that time.

<u>Adjourn</u>

It was MOVED by Ness, SECONDED by Gilmore

To Adjourn.

VOTED: 3, 0, 0.

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:05 PM. Respectfully Submitted,

Douglas C. Finn