

**TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE**

**5:30 P.M. Tuesday
October 8, 2015**

MINUTES

Present: Chairman Leslie Lewis, Susan Stanbury, Roland Patten, James Kelly, Ed Juengst, Bob Hanson, and Alan Zeller.

Also Present: Peter Throop, Director, and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development.

With Chair Lewis running a bit late Vice Chairman Stanbury called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Patten/Kelly) to approve the Minutes of June 30, 2015 and October 1, 2015 with all in favor.

Presentation: Department of Public Works

The members welcomed Department of Public Works Director Rodney Bartlett to the meeting. Mr. Bartlett was scheduled to present the CIP for Highway, Buildings & Grounds, Recycling, Fleet Management and Utilities.

Highway:

“The first item on the list is the *Main Street Bridge*” said Mr. Bartlett. He gave a brief history of the design and preparation of bid specifications that started in 2009. He noted the bridge was on the state’s “Red List” noting it showed accelerated deterioration. “We are in Fiscal Year 2017 and the funding for the project will have funds available in October 2017” he said. He noted final preliminary design would be out in the next few months as all of the major decisions for the bridge and the retaining wall have been made. “It will be presented to public bid by mid-2017 in time for federal dollars” he said.

Mr. Bartlett told the members the construction would last more than one construction season “and the bridge will be closed April through October if not November of 2018. That is how it looks right now.”

Mr. Hanson asked about the Route 101 bridge construction with Mr. Bartlett replying “their plans were to begin in 2016 but we have had long discussions about the timing and we are hoping the Main Street Bridge will be done first but that may change.”

He reiterated that project was an 80/20 (state/town) funded project. When asked about the retaining wall Mr. Bartlett briefly explained *24-foot roads* and that while they do not exist “there are nineteen towns in New Hampshire that have them.” He noted the 24-foot definition was that the state would maintain 24-feet of road “which we do not agree with.” He noted the state should be responsible for the whole road “not just the pavement between the white lines.” He told the members NH DOT had deemed Peterborough had 24-foot roads in 1955 and “anything outside the 24 foot range is our responsibility.”

Concerned about possible detour routes Mr. Hanson asked about Hunt Road. “It is a terrible mess right now” he said. Mr. Bartlett replied “allocation of funds to fix the potholes is not going to happen” adding “more likely the road will be closed to truck traffic which would be detoured from (Routes) 101 and 202 to Grove Street.”

Mr. Zeller asked about the initial plan to keep one lane of the bridge open during construction. Mr. Bartlett noted the DOT found less environmental impact with closing it altogether. Mr. Hanson asked “will it be the same?” Mr. Bartlett replied “yes, but on the north side will be a separate pedestrian walkway.” Mr. Patten asked about adding traffic control with Mr. Bartlett replying “no changes are planned.”

Downtown Stormwater Separation:

Mr. Bartlett noted separate stormwater catch basins for existing sanitary sewer lines on Grove and Main Streets. “It is fairly easy to separate them” he said adding “and we would provide new storm drainage in the roadways where drainage is non-existent as we separate the systems,”

Roadway Repaving:

Mr. Bartlett noted this project proposal indicated which, when and how the roads get fixed. He reported the repair of Powersbridge, Upland Farms and East Mountain Roads using a roadway management system that includes shimming followed by chip sealing. He explained the difference between this system and the alternative which is reconstruction and paving, adding “this is much less expensive than paving.” Ms. Stanbury asked “how many miles of road do we have in town?” Mr.

Bartlett replied “about 75 miles.” He also noted that the roads and street in the downtown and those on town water and sewer were extremely expensive to repair. He told the members about his plan for an expendable trust fund for road maintenance and repair. A brief discussion about the price of asphalt (dropping from over \$100.00 to \$69.00/ton) as well as excessive snow removal costs coming out of the repaving budget followed.

Sidewalks:

Mr. Bartlett briefly reviewed the construction and reconstruction of the downtown sidewalks and the replacement of the brick edgings. He told the members that while several approaches were attempted the edging had met with varying degrees of success. He told the members about the issue of differential movement between the bricks, granite curb and concrete and noted the most recent, full-width concrete replacements “seems to be the best alternative.” He told the members the focus was to finish the Downtown area and that cost was offset by \$20,000.00 from the Greater Downtown TIF.

Buildings and Grounds:

Transcript Dam:

Mr. Bartlett told the members “we have to decide whether to keep and repair or breach the dam. We will be starting a public process (public hearings on what to do) shortly.” He reported anywhere for 300,000 to over 2,000,000 cubic yards of silt buildup behind the dam. Mr. Hanson noted “so the silt problem could be very expensive to deal with”, with Mr. Bartlett replying “yes, unless it breaches on its own” adding “although once on the state list, it is now considered a non-menace dam, and is not inspected by DES.”

North Peterborough Dam:

Mr. Bartlett told the members this bridge, while fairly stable *is* inspected by DES. “It has some interesting challenges for us” he said noting the seepage under the dam spillway and how if removed would negatively impact recharge to the north aquifer and upstream wetlands.

Chair Lewis noted concerns for global warming and 100-year storms. “Do they talk about that?” she asked. Mr. Bartlett replied that they do “but they don’t call it that anymore, it is all based on rainfall” he said.

Townhouse Rehabilitation - Architectural Services:

Mr. Bartlett noted the Townhouse was last renovated in 1996, is listed on the National Historic Register and turns 100 years old in 2018. He noted a \$10,000.00 LCHIP grant had been received for a historic structure assessment (which has been completed) and another LCHIP grant had been applied for to continue with architectural work and plan development. “Our goal is to continue to maintain the beauty and elegance of the building and improve the performance quality in the Upper Hall” he said.

Townhouse Painting:

Mr. Bartlett told the members the Townhouse trim was last painted in 2013 and was scheduled to be repainted every five (or so) years.

Townhouse Cupola and UU Church Clock Painting:

Mr. Bartlett noted the Townhouse cupola was painted just last year and should be repainted every five (or so) years. Mr. Bartlett did not know the last time the UU Church Clock face had been painted. He noted estimates for the project were being reassessed at this time as the original estimate was \$5,000.00 ended up being for one face of the clock. “So we are having a discussion with the contractor” he said.

Recycling:

RC Loadall Replacement:

Mr. Bartlett explained the replacement was scheduled for FY 2016 consistent with the Fleet Management Plan “but then the fork truck died.” He went on to note that because the fork truck repairs were very expensive, the decision was made to replace that truck in FY 2016 and push the Loadall out to FY 2017.

Equipment Replacement:

Mr. Bartlett reviewed the Fleet Management Plan as well as replacement interval times. He noted a new program addressing rehabilitation versus replacement was near completion. “My hope and goal is to come back and show it you revised overall fleet management plan”.

Mr. Bartlett pointed out the justification form for a new snow blower. He noted the snow blowers today are geared to airports. “They are larger and can throw snow hundreds of feet, we don’t need that so we are opting for a front-end loader with a snow blower attachment” adding “so we get two for one.”

Ms. Stanbury asked about Utilities with Mr. Bartlett referring to page 7 of the CIP Spreadsheet covered that department. “That sheet shows repairs and maintenance for pipes, gates, valves. Those sorts of things” he said.

Chair Lewis asked “should we talk about water and sewer?” Mr. Bartlett updated the members on the replacement of the Well House and the Summer Street Well. He looked to the members and said “what is critical for the future is our facilities” adding “we need a truly concerted effort to understand *what, how* and *when* maintenance services are scheduled. Out of all of the things we have in front of us, maintaining our facilities really needs to be the focus right now.”

In closing Mr. Bartlett touched on the Public Works building (very poor energy efficiency but the guys can get out of the weather to work on trucks); the Townhouse (the continued plan for architectural work); and the Fire Department (“this is probably our biggest hurdle” he said noting the ongoing assessment of where they are going to be, the Transfer Program and the changing profile of the Department). “Their future depends on the Transfer Program future” he said adding “my goal is to get a much better handle on it.”

Mr. Throop interjected “another thing we have not talked about is the Economic Development Authority’s (EDA) focus on high-speed broad band for the town. He mentioned the postcard being sent to all resident of town directing residents to an online survey. He added the survey coincidentally has an internet speed test on it to show performance throughout town. He noted “while considering the cost, strategy and financing, it could provide a base for a significant boost to the overall economy.” With regards to the current internet capabilities in town Chair Lewis agreed. “I would never recommend a business locate in the Downtown” she said.

Mr. Throop noted two things to be thinking about “that are not on the spreadsheet” he said. He went on to note the Library as being one of the items and the municipal infrastructure as being the other. He pointed out the importance of understanding capital demands beyond the six years in the CIP plan. “I am looking out to 2040” he said adding “we need to get a grounding and a sense of what the debt service timing will be.” Chair Lewis at first suggested this would be a good topic for the Committee’s spring meeting next year but then asked Mr. Throop to put it on the schedule as it would be helpful to have it referenced in her report to the Budget Committee.

Mr. Bartlett noted the importance of making fiscal management a priority. “We have done a great job to this point; but with less and less grant and gift monies

expected in the future, we need to manage our present money better to get more out of those dollars” he said. A brief discussion about municipal infrastructures followed with Mr. Throop noting the recent Raising New Hampshire Conference and a presentation by Charles Marron noting the cost of replacing aging infrastructure far outstripping the capacity of most towns to repair or replace them.

Mr. Juengst briefly noted his experience living in Arizona in a community of 7000 in a home owners association. He told the members they had their own capital reserve and 50 miles of road. His point was that it is helpful to have a long range view of the future and to try to figure out where the money is going to coming from. He noted capital reserve education for the residents was essential in their success.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant