

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE

5:30 P.M. Tuesday
October 12, 2010

MINUTES

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

Welcome and Opening Comments:

Chair Smith welcomed the members to the meeting and noted “we have quite a few things to go over tonight.” He noted the first item on the agenda was the review and approval of the Minutes from October 5, 2010. A motion was made/seconded (MacDonald/Stanbury) to approve the minutes as written with all in favor.

Chair Smith noted Mr. Bartlett was present and they would be covering various town infrastructures and equipment. Chair Smith began with a brief discussion about the purchase of a new Brush Chipper and the Equipment Management Capital Reserve Fund, which they decided to discuss later.

Union Street Bridge Capital Reserve Fund. Mr. Bartlett noted the Union Street Bridge has shown accelerated deterioration and must be reconstructed. He went on to note the project would be an 80/20 split with the town being responsible for 20% of the cost. Mr. Bartlett added that money had been appropriated from the West Peterborough TIF District Fund. Ms. MacDonald noted that the justification sheet stated “an additional four payments will be made to make up the difference to reach the required amount; it should say *one* more payment.”

Mr. Bartlett explained the bridge program. NH DOT will do an assessment of the bridge, noting “the Main Street Bridge is not a good example to go by on this.” He said “for reasons we are now all familiar with that project has quadrupled from the original restoration estimate.” Mr. Bartlett noted “the \$44,500 will get us to where we need to be to continue the engineering process and any additional costs.” He noted the town had recommended their current engineering firm of Hoyle, Tanner & Associates. He explained some of the economy of scale by doing so and said he expected the work (engineering portion) to begin this winter.

Mr. Bartlett concluded the conversation by noting “we will be watching what pans out on the Main Street Bridge and the time frame so both bridges are not closed at the same time.” Ms. Stanbury asked if the \$44,500.00 came from the West Peterborough TIF with Mr. Bartlett

replying “yes.” Ms. MacDonald asked about the life span of the TIF with Ms. Ogilvie replying the TIF District had been amended to be consistent to the bond and had 13 years left.

When Ms. MacDonald asked what happens if not all the money in the TIF is spent Ms. Ogilvie and Mr. Bartlett discussed a few options that were available but basically advised that uncollected TIF funds go back to the General Fund. Mr. Bartlett reiterated “we have to understand the engineering ramifications before we get into the public process.”

Rehabilitation of the Transcript Dam. Chair Smith read a question from Ms. Chollet who was unable to attend the meeting. She wrote that she would like an evaluation of the importance of the dam adding “I may be confused, but I thought this dam was not tremendously important other than the historical importance” and asked “what are the thoughts about waiting? Would this be a bad choice?”

Ms. Lewis asked if the \$300,000.00 price sticker was a firm number or just a placeholder. Mr. Bartlett replied “given the condition of the Transcript Dam, whether we decide to breach it or rehabilitate it, if nothing is done it will breach itself, **soon.**” A brief discussion about the condition of the Dam’s “low hazard” status (it is not even inspected by DES anymore) followed.

When asked about potential funding for the dam, Mr. Bartlett noted DES, Fish and Game Department and various River Committees that may be approached for potential grants or funding.

Mr. Bartlett reminded the members “there are no funds available to rehabilitate the dam, there are only potential funds to breach it.” He added he had talked to the Water Resources Advisory Committee and they had agreed to host a public process that would incorporate the decisions made on the Main Street Bridge and the Retaining Wall and how those decisions may forecast the fate of the Transcript Dam. He added “I hope we will have recommendations by Town Meeting” adding “breach or repair, either way there will be an expense.” He went on to explain “breaching is not as easy as it may seem” and spoke about the breaching process including the “tons of sediment behind the dam.” He concluded with a review of some of the organizations that may provide grant monies for the project including DES, Fish and Game Department, and even private entities that get involved with river rehabilitation. Mrs. Harris asked several questions about the effect of the upstream waters from Jaffrey and the Sharon Hills and the coordination of water discharge.

A brief discussion about the property values if the river were lowered as well as the reclaiming and use of the silt to be used in the reconfiguration of the river followed. Mr. Bartlett noted “it really depends on the Main Street Bridge, we need to solve the Main Street Bridge issues first and then we can address the Transcript Dam.”

Ms. MacDonald asked about the status of the recommendation made to DOT by the Board of Selectmen with Chair Smith replying “it is in the paper.” He read a brief portion of the article that essentially said the DOT had approved an investigation into a temporary bridge north of the Main Street Bridge to accommodate traffic during the bridge reconstruction project.

Mr. Bartlett noted the DOT had asked for a scope and fee to determine the value of a north crossing. He added "it may save time and money." He noted the Public Hearing was scheduled for October 26, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. in the Upper Hall of the Town House. Mr. Bartlett once again reiterated that at this time the bridge will be reconstructed to look like it does today, it will be a phased construction with the introduction of a traffic oval to improve traffic capacity and reduce emissions at the intersection. He added "all of this is in the original report from Hoyle, Tanner and Associates from February 2010." Mr. Bartlett concluded by once again saying "the decision will be made on two things, time and money." A brief discussion about the 20% (now \$800,000.00) portion of the project that was the town's responsibility followed.

North Peterborough Dam Reconstruction. It was noted there was no Justification Sheet for this item with Ms. Ogilvie replying "it is essentially the same as last year and will be included in your new packets."

Union Street Reconstruction Upgrade. Mr. Bartlett noted "this is a new justification sheet this year, it is a new project." He went on to explain the project would provide infrastructure improvements to the sidewalks, roadway and drainage system. He noted the project would cover 8/10 of a mile "more or less," include the area from Prospect Street to Scott Winn Road, and cost and estimated 1.6 million dollars. Mr. Patten asked "why not beginning of Union Street? The need is there." A brief discussion followed with Mr. Bartlett giving several piecemeal options of how the project may play out. Ms. Lewis asked about the importance of this particular project "in relation to other parts of town" and asked "are there other roads you consider to be in worse shape?" Mr. Bartlett immediately replied "East Mountain Road, it is a classic example." Mr. Bartlett went on to say "when I talk to them I get a really mixed response. They don't mind driving slow on the road." Ms. Lewis replied "alright, but if we are going to spend 1.6 million dollars on a road, in the scope of *other* roads, are there others we have neglected?" Mr. Bartlett responded by reviewing several road projects and explaining that reclaiming and repaving is one thing "but involving sidewalks and utilities the price jumps significantly." The members briefly discussed the costs of the different options involved in the road projects and the amount of years the town would get out of each option. Mr. Bartlett concluded by offering to create several scenarios as examples for the members. "That would be very helpful" replied Chair Smith.

Ms. Stanbury asked about revenue from the NH DOT Block Grant Program and Mr. Bartlett explained the formula used for receipt of funds. Several members commented on the progressive reduction of that contribution over the years.

Mr. Bartlett also mentioned state plans for the Route 101 Bridge over the Contoocook. He noted "they have engineers contracted for the end of this year that will take three to four years with project completion in 2017 or 2018." He warned "this is another issue when we put together our CIP, we may have to move some of our projects to accommodate that."

North Peterborough Dam. Ms. Ogilvie provided the justification sheet for this project, so the members went back to this review and noted it was "pretty much the same information as last year." Mr. Bartlett spoke briefly about the position of the aquifer to the dam adding "the dam will be in need of some rehab in the future." Mrs. Harris interjected "this summer would have been a great time to do it."

Town House Painting. Mr. Bartlett reported that the Town House was last painted in 2008. He noted the building should be painted every five years hence the \$30,000.00 in Fiscal Year 2013. Mr. Patten asked if contractor's bids had been significantly lower due to the economic times with Mr. Bartlett replying he had seen some changes as a result of the economy.

Ms. MacDonald asked about the energy audit that had been conducted on the Town House and a brief discussion followed. Mr. Bartlett briefly spoke about the recommendations of how to make the building smarter and more cost efficient. He also noted the new boiler system (pellet boilers) with its vacuum driven storage for pellets.

Public Works Facility. Mr. Bartlett simply noted "I am going to keep it in here until certain decisions are made." A discussion about the municipal facilities complex search (housing Fire, Police and DPW) followed. Mr. Bartlett concluded by noting "it is a good reminder in my mind to look at these things." The members also briefly discussed the status and potential future use of the Lagoons, the fate of Evans Flats and getting Mr. Bartlett's workforce at a single site and under one roof (with the exception of the Recycling Center). The discussion concluded with Mr. Bartlett noting "we have a lot of important decisions to make." Mr. Patten added "small town, big city problems."

Ms. Stanbury noted that she did not see anything about the Armory or Evans Flat in the CIP. Mr. Bartlett explained the town has been working on a renovation design and the scope and fee bid request was in process. Mr. Bartlett also noted the supervision of the Armory had been delegated the Recreation Department. Chair Smith noted the Armory would be addressed in the CIP, through a Recreation Justification Sheet.

Storm Drainage Reconstruction/Stormwater Upgrade. Mr. Bartlett noted "many of these are repeat projects from years past."

Sidewalks. Mr. Bartlett mentioned the Downtown area, Pine and Granite Streets among others. He briefly discussed the financial responsibilities of the town, NH DOT and Federal Highway.

Equipment Management Capital Reserve Fund. Mr. Bartlett reviewed the program, noting "we will be updating these sheets." He noted the intention of the plan was to schedule the replacement of vehicles and equipment in an orderly fashion "but that doesn't always happen" he said. He gave the example of the street sweeper. "Last year we were supposed to replace the street sweeper, but the loader was in more dire shape so it became the priority." He added he would have the Fleet Management Justification Sheet completed by the next time he met with them adding "the dollars amounts probably won't change dramatically but things may be moved around." Chair Smith noted the time and the impending Select Board meeting and suggested they adjourn at 6:40 p.m. for the evening. "We will have Rodney come back" he said.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton,
Administrative Assistant