

**TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH**  
**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE**

**6:00 P.M. Tuesday**  
**November 30, 2010**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Chairman Leo Smith, Vice Chairman Leslie Lewis, Richard Freitas, Leandra MacDonald, Susan Stanbury, and Roland Patten.

**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 welcomed the members and noted the first item on the agenda was to review the Minutes. A motion was made/seconded (Stanbury/Lewis) to approve the Minutes as written with all in favor.

Chair Smith told the members “our goal tonight is to wrestle the rest of the schedule to the ground and find out where we are going to be.” The members agreed they had “made it up to the Police Department” and began there. It was noted the Police Storage Addition and Garage Roof had been successfully split to \$25,000.00 and \$15,000.00 respectively and moved forward to FY 2012. Ms. Ogilvie noted the Library request had been shifted out to FY 2014 to help the bottom line, “but then other things start to pile up in the future.” Another member asked for confirmation that the Water Quality Assessment request had been moved to FY 2014 as well with Chair Smith replying “yes.” Ms. Stanbury pointed out the Fire Department’s request for their parking lot reconstruction had been split (\$30,000.00/\$30,000.00) between FY 2012 and FY 2013 with another member noting “and payment of Ambulance 2 has been split up.”

Ms. Ogilvie pointed out the North Peterborough Dam in FY 2014 noting “that is a big year.” Ms. MacDonald agreed noting “it *is* a big year; looking at a 43% increase in the next year out is hard to deal with.”

Ms. Lewis asked if the Fire Department parking lot was more important than the Police Department parking lot. In the brief discussion that followed the members agreed that the re-creation of the municipal lot in its new location with lighting was important for the town, not just the Fire Department. Ms. MacDonald noted “is it s good idea, and if it is actually used, it will be quite handy.” In referring to the current CIP split between FY 2012 and FY 2013 however she added “it would make sense though to do it all at once if we can.” The members agreed and the total of \$60,000.00 was placed back into FY 2012.

The members briefly discussed the replacement of three Police vehicles with Mr. Patten clarifying “it is the 2009 Crown Victoria, the 2006 unmarked Chief’s car and the four-wheel

drive vehicle” with a brief discussion following. Chair Smith noted “the big issue is the North Peterborough Dam” adding “in terms of balancing it in.” The members discussed the estimated \$75,000.00 for the feasibility study. Chair Smith noted “it is important to keep it on the schedule” but asked “is it necessary to keep the feasibility study in FY 2012?” adding “I am not so sure.” The members discussed the information Mr. Bartlett had given them about the Dam and the amount of undermining that would continue no matter what was done. Ms. Stanbury noted “it seems to me that we won’t know until the feasibility study is done.” Ms. MacDonald added “we better start racking up some money for it.”

Chair Smith noted “we can get the study done and then address the issues” adding “we may have to bring it back next year but for now let’s leave the \$75,000.00 in for FY 2012 and start to build up revenue from there, spreading out the \$375,000.00 over a few more years.” Chair Smith then noted “and the other was the Public Works Facility, we have got some wiggle room there.” A brief discussion about the placement of the initial \$100,000.00 in FY 2015 for this request followed. Ms. MacDonald noted “before we put that into budget doesn’t someone need to come to the town with a location or something?” adding “or is that for the determination of a location?” A brief discussion of the Evans Flats Steering Committee’s efforts followed with Ms. MacDonald noting “in the end they did not find a place.” Chair Smith noted “what Rodney is asking for now (we assume) would be located by the new Waste Water Treatment Facility.” Ms. MacDonald replied “but this is something that has not that has been voted on by our Board of Selectmen.” Ms. Ogilvie agreed interjecting “it is the recommendation of the Master Plan Steering Committee, but that is not enough to get it going.” The brief discussion that followed included Ms. MacDonald’s suggestion of the request “is not ready to go on the CIP until you have X, Y and Z in place.” Not all members agreed however, that if a Municipal Facility Complex were to be established, that the WWTF was the best place for it to be. Ms. MacDonald noted “I don’t think we can look at moving Public Works without looking to our Fire and Police Departments” adding “but that may be the kind of thing that is a political decision and I am not sure where we fall in this.” Ms. Stanbury interjected “all of this may be premature.” Chair Smith noted “we know the need for a facility for Pubic Works, Police and Fire are real. The issues are timing and how realistic something like this could be achieved?” The members agreed to keep the Public Works Facility on the CIP and “just push it out.” Ms. Stanbury mentioned the pending activity and the cost of the bridges coming up. With respect to the Public Works Facility, Chair Smith added “I don’t see anything happening within the next 10 years.” The members also discussed the pluses and the minuses of Mr. Bartlett moving his office to the new treatment plant. One member noted “moving him out to the margins would pretty much mean all communication would be electronic.” The members complimented Mr. Bartlett on his communication skills and his success with intermixing with the public and contractors on all levels. One member noted “he does a great job PR-wise” with another noting “it is a plus having him here (located in the Town House),” with Ms. Ogilvie agreeing.

A brief discussion about the Armory followed that included the restrictions of its acceptance, renovations to the building and programming. With a sigh Mr. Patten noted “I have sat through 15 meetings on the Armory and there are no decisions.” He noted the current economy and added “nothing much going to happen to it renovation-wise; a community center is the best use right now.” He noted “predicated on a decision that the space was needed for the town, we will

have Rec (Recreation Department) run it for now.” A brief discussion about the real need for the facility and where the money to renovate it is coming from followed.

Regarding a new fire station, the members agreed “a real need is not that urgent” with Chair Smith noting “talk to the Fire Department – they will tell you they are fine where they are.” Ms. MacDonald interjected “they would rather have a new engine.” Mr. Patten concluded “I think we need to look long and hard before we do anything.”

A brief discussion about the school budget followed. Chair Smith noted “not that we plan on these things” but mentioned the positives of the RiverMead expansion and the plans for a boutique hotel at the Granite Block. He noted “there are going to be some things happening to create positive impacts on our tax rates.”

The member briefly discussed the West Peterborough (extended to 2025) and the Greater Downtown TIFs and how their monies were dedicated (sidewalks, crosswalks, stormwater separation, etc.) The members also discussed the Union Street Reconstruction project noting the start location was at the Recreation area west to Scott Winn Road. Ms. MacDonald asked about West Peterborough TIF funds to assist noting “it (the road) goes right past the Nubi Neighborhood” which is located in the West Peterborough District. After further discussion about the road issues and other similar roads in town the members recommended the project stay on the CIP but the initial \$200,000.00 for the feasibility study be used to consider starting the project at the intersection of Elm Street, as well as look at the priorities of other streets in town. Mr. Patten specifically mentioned the previous “horror show” on Cheney Avenue as well as Old Dublin and Old Street Roads, which had to be rebuilt within a short period of time from initial reconstruction. “It just wasn’t good” he said adding with a chuckle “I was not in charge then.”

The members discussed the FY 2014 feasibility study at an estimated cost of \$200,000.00. Mr. Patten noted “\$200,000.00 is a lot for a study, it is huge.” Ms. Stanbury asked about the length of the reconstruction project and a discussion about the problems Union Street has with water retention and drainage followed.

The members also discussed FY 2014, with one member noting “there is a big bump there.” Ms. Lewis noted “there are four bonds starting in 2014, one for the pool and three for Rodney” adding “maybe we should reel Rodney in a little bit!” After another brief review the members agreed “the Public Works Facility and the Union Street Reconstruction projects are on the wish list.” Chair Smith reiterated the need for the feasibility study to consider the project from the Elm Street intersection “and look to see what else is out there.” Ms. MacDonald interjected “really, how a ¼ mile road needs a million dollars is beyond me, I can’t get there.” Ms. Lewis noted “they did Cheney Avenue, Orchard Hill and Lookout Hill for \$250,000.00 all together.”

In conclusion Chair Smith asked Ms. Ogilvie to send out the updated draft of the spreadsheet and asked the members to review it and e-mail Ms. Ogilvie with any questions, comments or suggestions. He noted they should meet again and decided on Tuesday, December 7, 2010 at 5:30 p.m. *[later changed to 6 p.m.]* “We will plow through it one more time and see where the numbers fall” he said.

In closing Ms. MacDonald noted “just one more thing” and went on to suggest to the members “we really ought to have a meeting post-budget and pre-town meeting to look at what the reality of the numbers is.” She added “here we are at the CIP but are we really vetting the actual capital improvements? adding “what *is* and what *is not* real money?” Ms. MacDonald went to say “we need to remind ourselves to look at it after the budget process.” Ms. Stanbury agreed adding “I am also interested in the overall budget picture with all these bonds.” Another member noted “our job is to sift through the requests and hold the tax rate static” adding “look at FY 2014, 15 and 16. They are creeping upon us, is our tax base going to keep up with that?” Still another member noted “let’s concentrate on this year and bring it in static.” Chair Smith noted the continued deterioration of revenues, especially from the state adding “those are going to continue to happen.” Chair Smith then concluded suggesting “take another look, move things around and we will get together again next week.” When asked he told the members “We go to the Budget Committee on December 14<sup>th</sup>” adding with a smile “I still have a little time, I always say that and Carol curses me.”

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton  
Administrative Assistant