

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE

6:00 P.M. Tuesday
November 16, 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 and Rodney Bartlett, Director, DPW.

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 of November 9, 2010. A motion was made/seconded (Patten/Lewis) to approve the Minutes as written with all in favor. Member Chollet abstained as she had not reviewed the Minutes.

Chair Smith began with a request for clarification on the Water Resources Committee's request for a groundwater quality assessment. "I would like you to weigh in on this" he said to Mr. Bartlett. Mr. Bartlett briefly reviewed the Advisory Committee's Charter and their focus on ground water quality. He explained "basically their request is two-fold, to find out if the water is good or bad and where it might be. They want to establish a baseline for monitoring water quality." He briefly reviewed the projects done in Hollis and Dublin, New Hampshire where water samples were taken from wells. These samples were tested to identify the components of the groundwater. He went on to note "it is a fairly large expense in sampling groundwater in wells while looking for all the components they are looking for." He added "bedrock and aquifers change but the two most prominent contaminants are radon and arsenic." He went on to briefly note the state's minimum requirement for private wells is testing for bacteria and pH. "That is it" he said, adding "but they are headed in a good direction, the well ordinance in Salem (NH) requires a litany of testing before a CO is issued." He also noted "there is an educational piece that goes with this."

Mr. Bartlett went on to note some significant changes in the Department of Environmental Services in Concord. He mentioned hiring freezes and limited promotions and added "I am not sure what the DES role will be in the future, I am not sure where that cooperation will go." Ms. Chollet requested clarification about the elements in the water constantly changing and asked "if the water is tested and then in six months or a year will the results be the same or is it a constant testing thing?" A brief discussion about well nomenclature and fissure levels followed. Mr. Bartlett also told the members about more information on the DES web page and that he could send them a link. He also noted MTBE as another classic. "It is soluble in water and can move

horizontally or vertically, it can be anywhere so that is the type of thing you should test for once a year” he said.

Mr. Patten asked about the anticipated revenues of \$40,000.00. Mr. Bartlett noted that was representative of the labor costs for DES to go out and do the work (but not be billed). Mr. Patten then asked “so if we vote for this is it kind of a crap shoot?” Mr. Bartlett replied “I don’t know” and reiterated “I don’t know that DES will commit to the program once Dr. Wunsch leaves.” (Dr. David Wunsch has been involved with these projects and is leaving his position as a State Geologist with DES). He reiterated their work loads and hiring freezes “and with the new legislation coming in I don’t know what will be done with some of these projects.” He concluded by noting “I think the program is a good one but in general any program with the state right now is up in the air.” “OK, thank you” replied Chair Smith.

Main Street Bridge:

Mr. Bartlett noted there had been numerous meetings about the bridge and a potential north crossing. He told the members “the Achilles Heel of the north crossing is what flood level we will have to design for and what that means.” Mr. Bartlett spent a significant amount of time explaining 50 and 100 year storms and reviewed stream crossing rules from DES. He noted evaluations of flows and gauge heights by engineers and concluded by noting “if it cannot pass the 100 year storm criteria, I don’t believe that it will happen. If it can then we would be legally able to build a structure that meets the requirements.” Mr. Patten asked if MacDowell Dam had been considered in all the engineering consideration with Mr. Bartlett replying it had. Mr. Bartlett also noted the focus of the Summer Street residents on flooding and that the time frame for the project had become critical. He told the members he was waiting on addition engineering reports that should arrive in a week to ten days.

The members reviewed the options for the north crossing as well as a phased construction and the amount of time involved with each. “Shortening the time frame has become a priority” reiterated Mr. Bartlett.

The members discussed the time frames of the options, the aesthetics of the new bridge, the role and involvement of the Heritage Commission and the Cultural Resources Division in Concord. They reviewed the 80/20 formula for the construction and clarified the Main Street Bridge involved state and town monies, the retaining wall is federal money and the sidewalks are town money. Mr. Bartlett also stated there would be a single contractor for the project and briefly reviewed construction sequencing and management by the town, adding “the majority of the work will be done in 2012 with follow up in 2013.”

Transcript Dam:

Mr. Patten asked “is the \$300,000.00 just for the removal of the dam?” Mr. Bartlett replied the money was for the reconstruction and maintenance of the dam. He added “but if you want to talk about removing the dam there is grant funding for that.” Mr. Bartlett went on to say “either way there is an expense on our part.” Mr. Bartlett replied that he felt confident the \$300,000.00 “would put the dam back into an OK position” adding “it is not even inspected anymore.” A brief discussion about the build-up of silt and the removal or the dam versus the rehabilitation of

the dam followed. The members agreed with Mr. Bartlett when he concluded “we will need to do something because if we don’t the dam will breach itself.”

North Peterborough Dam:

Mr. Bartlett explained the location of the dam on a large aquifer and how “you can only go so far to the left and so far to the right to stop the flow of water underneath the dam spillway” adding “the water will continue to go around or under the dam no matter what we do.” He noted that if the seepage continues the dam could fail structurally leading to negative impacts for the upland wetlands and water recharge for the north aquifer. A brief discussion followed with Mr. Bartlett concluding “it was last worked on in the 80’s it should be looked at anyway.”

Ms. Stanbury noted both the Fire and Police Department’s facility requests were in and asked Mr. Bartlett if he had any comments on those requests. Mr. Bartlett replied he has not done a lot of work with the Chiefs noting “David Croumie our Building and Grounds Supervisor works with them.” Mr. Bartlett reviewed the parking changes at the Fire Station included bringing the municipal lot secluded in the back out to the front where it would be better lit and more convenient. “It is a good long term fix” he said. The members then briefly discussed the paving and drainage issues at the Police Station as well as the coordination of work between the two facilities.

Mr. Bartlett was done a 6:55 p.m. but before he left he gave a brief report on the new Waste Water Treatment Plant. “It is 20% done and on schedule” he said. He talked about the lagoons and their potential uses as well as the “mound of dirt” at the most northern lagoon for wetland mitigation (a 2.59 acre area) for the connector road completed last year. He added tours were available on Wednesday afternoons at 3:00 p.m. “just go out and ask for Bob Severance” he told the members. Chair Smith noted he had been out and was impressed. He also noted the potential for the fields but acknowledged the work that goes into building a field “it is not just dirt and grass” he said. Mr. Patten added “do it right and it will be a big plus for the town for years.”

The members went on to review the spreadsheet. They discussed certain revenues and what accounts they came out of. They discussed bond anticipation with Ms. MacDonald noting “I would like to see all the line items together so it is clear.” Ms. Stanbury agreed interjecting “it is confusing, it must be confusing for the public too.”

Chair Smith then asked how the members would like to review the department requests. They decided to just go through them one by one.

OCD:

The Groundwater Quality Assessment was discussed once again. The members generally thought it was a good idea but may have to be put off to a better economical time. Ms. Lewis noted she was still a bit unclear on what the Water Resources Committee will do with the information, and how that information helps the town as a whole. The members discussed the request, the testing requirements and the potential changes at the DES. Chair Smith suggested they keep the request on the schedule and perhaps bump it out a year or two. Mr. Patten noted the information was “a bit vague on the revenue side.” A brief discussion about the DES labor being forgiven followed. Ms. Stanbury added “it will also give the public a few more years of education and more people

would want to participate in it.” Ms. Lewis suggested placement in FY 2014 with Chair Smith interjecting “let’s see where that gets us.”

The members briefly reviewed the other requests including a discussion about the Open Space request and their rationale of requesting funds when their total is so high. Ms. Lewis noted “if they actually use it the balance goes right down.”

Fire Department:

The members reviewed the request for the new ambulance and discussed the lease-purchase options. They also reviewed the plan for the parking lot with Ms. Lewis noting “that is a great idea.” One member suggested splitting the ambulance request for all \$230,000.00 in FY 13 to \$115,000.00 in FY 13 and FY 14, and the parking lot reconstruction for \$60,000.00 in FY 13 to \$30,000.00 for FY 12 and FY 13. The members discussed the Command Vehicle and decided to see where they stood at the end of the process to make a recommendation.

IT:

No disagreements “it all looks OK” said one member.

Library:

The new circulation desk was discussed. Ms. Lewis noted she did not quite understand what Mr. Price meant when he told them the staff was unable to see the doors from the desk. It was noted that from different angles visibility was poor and staff was actually facing the opposite way when checking patrons out. Mr. Patten asked about the future plans of the Library and a brief discussion followed.

Ms. Stanbury asked to go back to the Fire Department for a moment and asked for greater clarification about the establishment of a comprehensive capital reserve fund for equipment and vehicle purchases. “We really did not discuss that” she said. The members reviewed the vehicle replacement schedule and discussed several options including the push back of Engine I with Mr. Patten telling the members “that is a back up Engine, it only goes out when it is absolutely needed at a fire, it doesn’t go out on a daily basis.” He added “I think in fairness he is not going to be in trouble with it.”

Police Department:

It was noted that an update had been received from Chief Guinard regarding a new quote for the storage and garage roof projects (\$25,000.00 and \$15,000.00 respectively). Ms. Lewis noted while the two could be separated “it would be best to get it done all at once.”

Recreation Department:

The members reviewed the timing of a bond and the fact that the townspeople would get to have their say about the pool. Ms. Lewis noted “so right now the money set aside is being used for maintenance.” Ms. Chollet noted she felt the plan was well thought out adding “let the people decide.” A brief review of the New Hampshire Municipal Bond Bank followed.

When the Pavilion came up for discussion Ms. MacDonald interjected “I don’t get it.” She added “it is not worth it for two months of ice a year.” Mr. Patten replied “that is not all it is used for.”

Ms. MacDonald asked about the status of the Armory with another member replying “it is not done yet.” Ms. MacDonald immediately replied “the Pavilion is expensed over 6 years, the Armory will be done by then.”

Ms. Chollet commented on the necessity of children having a safe and supervised place to go throughout the summer months. “It is not the money we should be looking at right now, the kids need a place. The more generous side of me says yes.”

A brief discussion about the size and potential uses of the Pavilion followed. Chair Smith suggested keeping the Pavilion in the CIP. “Let’s leave it where it is” he said adding if nothing else we could somehow include potential upgrades to the Armory happening down the road.” A brief discussion followed with Chair Smith concluding “either way we will have some money in the future. We can call it a *something is going to happen* reserve.”

The members then discussed the potential recreation fields dovetailing with the closure of the old waste water treatment facility. Chair Smith noted “for the time being there is something in there and we are thinking about it. I have no idea of the cost involved but at least we will have something in there.” Ms. MacDonald asked about the existence of a master plan process for the land. She suggested that perhaps the Planning Board get involved noting “we cannot just give it to the recreation department, we do not know the best solution yet, it might be best to sell the land. Perhaps the money would be better spent at PES, we don’t know until we make a plan. There are lots of options.” Chair Smith replied “that makes sense; we should have the Planning Board do an evaluation of that property and see what makes sense.”

Public Works Department:

The members discussed the Union Street Bridge as well as the reconstruction of Union Street. Drainage, overall condition of the road and public safety were all discussed. Chair Smith noted “I think what accentuated the problem was the completion of the West Peterborough project. It created more awareness as it was finished.” It was noted the work would begin by the Recreation Department building and go to Scott Winn Road. Ms. MacDonald asked if the sidewalks were going to be replaced (they are not) leading to a discussion about the alignment of the sidewalks to the Main Street Bridge once it is completed. The members then briefly discussed the other DPW projects.

Chair Smith concluded by thanking the members and discussing the meeting schedule for the next few weeks. The members agreed their next meeting would be Tuesday, November 30th. “We have plenty of time” noted Chair Smith.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton,
Administrative Assistant