

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE

6:00 P.M. Tuesday
November 9, 2010

MINUTES

Present: Chairman Leo Smith, Vice Chairman Leslie Lewis, Richard Freitas, Leandra MacDonald, Susan Stanbury, Roland Patten, Sue Chollet and Bertha Harris.

Also Present: Carol Ogilvie, Director, and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Welcome and Opening Comments:

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. noting the Minutes of November 9, 2010. Ms. Stanbury had a name correction on page 3. A motion was made/seconded (MacDonald/Patten) to approve the Minutes as corrected with all in favor.

Presentation of Recreation Request:

Chair Smith then welcomed Recreation Director Jeff King to the meeting. Mr. King in turn introduced the Recreation Committee Chairman Tina Kriebel. Mr. King noted "there are three projects in our CIP" adding "none of them are new, all of them have been on the plan for some time." Mr. King noted he would introduce the projects from the smallest to the largest in size. "First" he said, "are the multipurpose athletic fields."

Multipurpose Athletic Fields: Mr. King reviewed the department's desperate need for additional field space. He noted they could create a Capital Reserve to set aside funds so that they could act on land acquisition as it becomes available or "do straight up new construction."

Mr. King explained the definition of the multipurpose noting the dimensions and shapes of particular sports differ with some things like field hockey and lacrosse requiring rectangular fields and others square fields. "Thus the term multipurpose" he said.

Mr. King also noted the need for more softball fields explaining "we have a couple at Adams (Playground) "but they are not large enough for adult softball activities." Mr. King told the members about the adult's modified league using restricted flight balls. "That is the only way the adults can play at our facility" he said.

Mr. King gave brief history of the potential use of the sewer lagoons once the new Waste Water Treatment facility was up and running. He noted the lower two lagoons were not going to be usable "but we still have hope for the upper two offering some potential." He noted "we are also working with the School District for sharing their fields as well as renovating the current field and constructing a new field at PES."

Chair Smith asked if the \$25,000.00 a year would be adequate for the build out of a new field with Mr. King replying “no, but it is a start.” Mr. King then gave a brief review of field price tags – from the bare basics (no bleachers, fencing, concession stand, rest rooms or maintenance) to an athletic field with all the amenities. “When you have a full service facility the price tag goes up” he said. Mr. King also spoke briefly about construction in phases.

Mr. King went on to describe the various children’s and adult recreation programs and how they share the fields. He concluded by noting “they are heavily used.”

Mr. Freitas asked what PES meant with Mr. King clarifying the initials (Peterborough Elementary School) and briefly reviewed how the field at the school could be rehabilitated and how a new field could be configured with additional fill on the north end of the lot. “Sounds like a good joint project” said Ms. Stanbury.

Multi-use Pavilion: “This has also been on our list a few years” stated Mr. King. He gave a brief history of the old ice rink “that was not constructed right and was a maintenance nightmare.” He noted it was undersized and could not accommodate competitive ice hockey. Mr. King noted “rather than throw good money after bad we want to expand it to be 200 by 85 feet (regulation size) and put a roof over it.” Mr. King noted “I see it as multi-use facility” noting it would afford the ConVal Hockey Team a place to practice “in their state” (they currently practice in Winchendon, MA) as well as hockey leagues, public ice skating and lessons. He noted that since the hockey season lasts only about two months the Pavilion could also be used for a rain location for summer playground activities, reunions, receptions, parties, flea markets, talent shows, public programs such as dog obedience classes, car shows and craft fairs.

Ms. Chollet asked for clarification of the anticipated revenues. “Is that fundraising?” she asked. Mr. King replied “yes, based on the project cost of the pavilion it is 60% or \$417,000.00.” He went on to note other outside groups raising money as well as working with the School District to “help each other out.” “It would certainly be nice if that materialized” replied Ms. Chollet. Ms. MacDonald interjected “it is not engineered ice?” with Mr. King replying “no.” Mr. King went on to describe the concrete pad facility. A brief discussion about the southern exposure and melting ice followed.

Chair Smith asked Mr. King if he had a chance to investigate other towns and municipalities to see what they have. Mr. King replied “we did, but we did not get a lot of response, this would be fairly unique.” Mrs. Harris asked about fees with Mr. King replying “yes, but it is too early to determine that schedule.” Mrs. Harris then asked about use of the Pavilion by other towns. Mr. King replied by reviewing the current non-resident participation program. Mrs. Harris “they pay right?” adding “we are in a recession even though your pocketbook doesn’t show it.” Mr. King replied “talking as a tax payer and a resident that is not a fair comment Bertha. I take offense to that comment.” Mr. King went on to explain “we are out 6 to 7 years before construction – if it even happens; it is too early to estimate fees now. We could start talking about fees in 2011 but those numbers will mean nothing.” Ms. Kriebel interjected “we have made a very clear distinction in all our programs that fees are paid, and there is a different fee schedule for non-residents.”

Adams Pool: Mr. King noted “this has been on for the last three years or more.” He added “it is still there and still works. It will be 76 years old.” He reviewed the results of a consultant’s report from 2007 adding “we basically have three options for potential renovation and repair and all that information is in your packets.” He added “the cost was \$69,2171.00 then with a projected 8% increase in cost for every year the project is not done.” When asked about the cost and the current economy Mr. King noted he had spoken to the consultant and “he felt the number was still fairly solid.”

Mr. King also reviewed the construction of a Splash Pad, describing it as a “zero entry facility” where there is no risk of a child drowning because there is no standing water. He noted the Splash Pad was the #1 request when the playground was renovated in 2005. “So it makes sense to combine it with the pool project.”

A brief discussion about obtaining a bond followed Mr. King noted that information was also in the packets. It was also noted that monies previously assigned to the Recreation Department CIP had been going to repairing the pool. “We are working toward a renovation for the pool at this time” said Ms. Kreibel. Mr. King agreed adding “the money has been used to keep up with what we have.” He briefly reviewed how water and chlorine uses (thus costs) are down because the leaks had been fixed. “We would like to give the voter the chance to say yes or no” he said.

Bob Lambert, Budget Committee Liaison for the Recreation Department introduced himself and noted “What Jeff has brought in is not just a wish list. We have all worked very hard on it.” Ms. Chollet asked “if the pool renovations were not put through would the pool have to be closed?” Mr. King replied “it depends.” He reviewed the status of some of the equipment (re: the pool filters that have a predetermined life of 20-25 years that are now 46 years old) as well as noting the flow and turnover rates were measured at less than the state standards. “The state has been very understanding with us, given the age of our pool.” He went to note “for lack of a better term they are grandfathering us. But if we have an equipment failure or a health issue, they will shut us down.” Ms. Kreibel added “we will still operate the pool to the best of our ability until we encounter a failure we cannot pay for.” She added “if the public votes it down that is fine, but no one can say *no one told us.*”

A brief discussion about user fees and revolving versus general fund reimbursement followed. As new residents in town both Mr. Freitas and Ms. Stanbury noted their surprise that there was not a user fee schedule for town residents. “I was quite taken back” said Ms. Stanbury. A very brief discussion about user fees for residents followed. This discussion included the fact that the pool was built as a WPA project under President Roosevelt and the legal ramifications of it.

Mr. King was done at 7:00 p.m.

Presentation from the School District:

Richard Bergeron introduced himself and noted the School District had been coming in to this Committee for three years. He introduced Kimberly Saunders, Assistant Principal and Marian Alese, Business Administrator for the SAU. He distributed the District’s 2011-2016 Strategic Plan emphasizing it was still in draft form “the Board has not even seen it yet” he said adding “we welcome your input and questions.” Mr. Bergeron also pointed out the difference between

the Strategic Plan and the CIP “but for an accurate CIP you need to know what the school is planning.” He spoke briefly about the purchase of curriculums noting “a new curriculum may often cost as much as a new roof.”

Ms. Alese reviewed the Strategic Plan with the members. She noted the need to continue maintenance and upgrades to the facilities that included the structural integrity of the buildings, the HVAC and mechanical systems, electric compliance and student and staff safety and ADA requirements. She briefly reviewed the failure of the bond request in 2010 and how the SAU went to the Department of Education and submitted two applications for building aid, having met the deadline of June 23, 2010. Ms. Alese explained the applications were for efficiency and life safety issues in all buildings and involved a reimbursement of 55 cents on the dollar.

“We think this is a real coup” interjected Mr. Bergeron, adding “money we normally invest will be reimbursed to us, I am quite proud of the SAU for accomplishing this”

The members went on to review the list of projects by school that included replacement of two roofs and the adoption of the elementary art program.

Ms. Saunders spoke about the future, curriculum adoptions and the curriculum renewal cycle. She noted “this allows us to prioritize, we are not always looking at one area, and every program has a chance to be reviewed. She also mentioned the national standards as well as those adopted by New Hampshire “and how they will align with our present standards. We are prepared for what is coming” she said.

Mr. Bergeron mentioned the new web site to be rolled out by the District. “We are very excited about it” he said. He noted it was much more user friendly with access to all sorts of information.

A brief discussion about the Strategic Plan and the CIP followed with Ms. Saunders noting that while there would be no new curriculum adoptions this year, “we don’t know the maintenance costs until they *are* adopted.” She added “we try to avoid spikes but sometimes you reach a point where you cannot push things out any more.”

Chair Smith asked about the impact of the teacher contracts with a brief discussion following. Mr. Bergeron noted “it is a complex process of budget development. We have to start with basic assumptions that right now our 13 members can not agree on.” He noted a budget retreat was scheduled for December and added “we will hammer out those assumptions.”

Ms. MacDonald had a question about the bond with Ms. Alese replying with the facts of how the bond was written. After a brief discussion about the accelerated roof failure on several elementary schools Mr. Bergeron mentioned the SAU may or may not take part in a class action law suit for restitution and why. Mr. Freitas interjected “I would be curious to know who the roofer (or roofing company) was” with Mr. Bergeron replying he did not recall but could get that information to Ms Ogilvie.

The SAU was done at 7:45 p.m.

In conclusion Chair Smith reviewed the justification sheets with Ms. Lewis asking about Public Works. Ms. Ogilvie noted that Mr. Bartlett was prepared to come back next week. It was noted that the members were still waiting for Chief Guinard to get back to them with new contractor quotes. Ms. Ogilvie noted she would follow up and confirmed that the Chief need not show up in person next week. Chair Smith noted he felt the members would need another hour to hour and a half with Rodney and then take at least one more session to review the requests. "We have seen everyone once" said Chair Smith adding "it is my guess we will need the (November) 16 and maybe he 23rd to review but we are in good shape time wise." He concluded by noting their recommendations were scheduled to be presented to the Budget Committee on December 14th.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton,
Administrative Assistant