

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE

5:30 P.M. Tuesday
November 6, 2012

MINUTES

Present: Chairman Leslie Lewis, Leandra MacDonald, Susan Stanbury, James Kelly, Sue Chollet and Alan Zeller.

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

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Welcome and Opening Comments:

Chai Lewis began with “we have a lot tonight so let’s get started.” She noted Nancy Vaihinger was present to answer any questions the members may have about the Finance CIP.

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (MacDonald/Stanbury) to approve the Minutes of October 23, 2012 as written with all in favor but Ms. Chollet who was not present at that meeting. Ms. Chollet did compliment the minute taker for detailed minutes. She was unable to make the October 23rd meeting and noted “they are very helpful when you can’t be there.”

Finance:

Ms. Vaihinger gave a brief review of her request for the purchase, upgrade and conversion of the Town Financial Management Packages. She emphasized one of the most important packages was the tax package “which is used to bill 74% of the Town’s income as well as the taxes for the school, county and state.” She noted the current package is “over 20 years old, about four upgrades behind, and is no longer supported by a license/maintenance agreement.” She went on to add that “fewer and fewer people know what to do with it when we have a problem and often make the problem worse.”

Ms. Vaihinger briefly reviewed the upgrade from a Unix-based system to a Windows-based system would require the purchase of an SQL server, hardware, operating systems, setup/installation and shipping. She referred to her memo to the Committee for further details. Ms. Chollet replied “very thorough memo.”

Ms. Vaihinger went on to explain her breakdown of the \$200,500.00 reserve request. When a member asked about the partnership with the City of Keene Ms. Vaihinger relied “that is not going to happen, it did not get through their budget process.” She went on to explain how she negotiated to keep the price the same without Keene’s collaboration, adding “I am still negotiating on the conversion costs so we may have even more savings.”

Chair Zeller asked for clarification of the migration of the existing data noting “I have experience with upgrades and moving information around. It is really not that hard.” Ms. Vaihinger gave a brief breakdown of the total cost noting “it is the custom modification that cost the most.”

Chair Zeller asked about the amount of time and how many people it will take to complete the upgrade. “I am just trying to get my arms around this.” Ms. Cholet inquired as to the number of records that would be converged. Ms. Vaihinger replied “ten years of records” adding “but we are thinking of cutting that in half and storing them in the vault in the basement.” Ms. Cholet asked “do they need to be maintained by law?” with Ms. Vaihinger replying “yes, tax and utility bills and various financials must be permanently kept.”

Ms. MacDonald suggested taking out the City of Keene reference “so it’s not reflected on the final report.” Ms. Stanbury pointed out a couple of inconsistencies with the justification sheets. When asked how long it would take to upgrade the management systems Ms. Vaihinger replied “not long” adding “as I get the money in, I will be spending the money.” She went on to agree the tax package (which was recommended by the Committee to be purchased first) would be functional by FY 2015. She also explained how the system would be totally turn-key “and handed over to us.” Ms. Stanbury interjected “that seems like a long time to wait for 2015, it’s kind of scary.” A brief discussion about the timing of the management package upgrades and the ability of the Committee to exercise its options when reviewing the budget followed.

In closing James asked about the City of Keene and if they were to get through the budget process, “would it still be feasible to collaborate with them and save even more money?” Ms. Vaihinger explained that was improbable. She reiterated the *direct* upgrade from the Unix operating system to the Windows operating system and cutting out the middle system was how Peterborough was saving money. “That was not their (Keene’s) plan” she said.

Office of Community Development:

Ms. Ogilvie began by noting “we are asking for \$15,000.00 annually for Geographic Information System (GIS) maintenance and upgrades.” She added “we have not submitted a request since 2008, but we need to start saving for our update on aerial photographs.” She noted the updates occur every six to eight years “and our last update was in April of 2010.” She also noted a reserve fund of about \$30,000.00 from a stroke of good luck in not being charged for the 2010 update. She noted the information from the aerial photographs “is what is used to create the all the data layers you see on various maps.” She also reported a fair amount of land use activity over the past few years “so this information will be very useful.”

Ms. Stanbury had a logistical question regarding the spreadsheet with Chair Lewis suggesting a status sheet for reserve funds be added for quick reference without having to go to the summary account for the reserve funds. She asked Ms. Ogilvie if that could be accomplished without it being too awkward.

Information Technology:

Mr. Farashahi (Fash) briefly reviewed his technology plan with the members. This plan includes the replacement and upgrading of town computers, printers, servers every four to five years and

associated network improvements. He noted this plan had been in effect since 2001 and that he had consolidated the servers in the system from 19 to 14 using virtualization technology.

Fash noted that since the Ice Storm in 2008 the Town House now has a generator “so I was able to reduce my battery back-up systems (UPS) in the server room from two to one.” Fash spoke briefly about the back-up to the back-up system as well as the back-up to that.

Fash noted that with better hardware and better maintenance “the machines live longer.” He reviewed his “spare parts” inventory and loaners (he has four being used for election process right now). “How many people have iPads?” asked Ms. Stanbury. Fash reviewed who had what, which included 25 laptops (5 for the Police, 4 for Fire Rescue, and the 3 iPads being used by the Utilities Department). “So it is emergency services and utilities essentially” replied Ms. Stanbury. Fash nodded but also pointed out the seven year old laptop being used by the Minute taker. “Some are used for limited functions like committee meeting minutes.” He also mentioned a few Department Heads have laptops as their primary systems “so when they travel they can get in to their files, it is very convenient” he said. Ms. Stanbury asked “how do you back-up these days?” with Fash briefly explaining the nightly back-up procedure. Ms. McDonald interjected “we are grateful we found Fash and that he does this dual (GIS and IT) role.” “Indeed” agreed Ms. Chollet.

Public Works:

Mr. Bartlett was present and with the amount of information to cover suggested they just go right down the spreadsheet.

Main Street Bridge:

Mr. Bartlett gave a brief update on the status of the bridge. He noted he had not recently heard from DOT (important in the fact the intersection and Retaining Wall are their responsibility). He noted “hopefully after the election we will know in which direction they are going.” He also explained the 80/20 funding responsibility (80% State and 20% Town for cost of engineering costs and construction of the Bridge). He noted the Route 202 retaining wall would be 100% state and federally funded.

Mr. Zeller asked if there had been any push-back or other suggestions from DOT regarding the town’s “Rolls Royce” request of a bridge with Mr. Bartlett replying “I have had no response.” A brief discussion about the state reimbursement process followed. Mr. Bartlett also reviewed the uniqueness of the bridge as well as the potential to bundle the Transcript Dam work and funding into these projects “as they are all connected.”

Ms. Chollet asked “if it is red-listed how safe is it?” A brief discussion about the load restrictions that have put into place followed. He noted a concrete sample may be reevaluated “to see if the load needs to be reduced further.” A brief discussion about the State’s responsibility and role in the reconstruction of the bridge as well as the Governor’s 10-year plan followed. They also briefly discussed what seems to be the #1 goal in the region, Route 93. Mr. Bartlett noted he was hoping to hear something soon. “We “we last talked in May, this is November, no feedback for the Commissioner’s Office is very disheartening.”

Route 202/Pine Street Sidewalk:

Mr. Bartlett noted NH DOT had indicated that sidewalk construction would be included with the Main Street Bridge and Retaining Wall projects but the town would be financially responsible for its construction.

Union Street Reconstruction/Upgrade:

Mr. Bartlett noted “this includes pavement, sidewalk and drainage and will be constructed in three phases.” He explained “Phase 1 is Union Street from Scott Winn Road to the west end of Adams Playground. Phase 2 is Union Street at Adams Playground and Phase 3 is Union Street from the east end of Adams Playground to Elm Street.” He noted “it is 3659 feet of roadway at a cost of \$911,000.00 which comes out to \$210.00 a linear foot including the restructure and spreading out the wheel ruts.”

Mr. Bartlett spoke briefly about Adams Playground noting the tremendous amount of pedestrian traffic in the area and ways to calm vehicular traffic and make it safer. He mentioned the project may be coordinated with the Department’s existing efforts with the Safe Routes to School Planning Grant for PES and the 5-way intersection at Main, Vine, High, Union, and Elm Streets.

A brief discussion about the wheel ruts and the patching followed with Ms. McDonald asking “does the fabric really work?” Mr. Bartlett gave a brief explanation of how the process works as well as the drainage plans.

Highway Garage Roof Replacement:

Mr. Bartlett noted the roof had been patched a few times but still was leaking. A brief discussion about the potential plans for an 8-bay garage at the new Wastewater Treatment Plant ensued. Mr. Bartlett James noted “spend \$75,000.00 on a new roof for the Highway Garage and if you move the Wastewater Treatment Plant what would happen to the Garage?” Mr. Bartlett replied “probably demolish it.” Mr. Kelly replied “do not do it, if Highway moves it would change the status of the \$75,000.00 right?” Mr. Kelly also asked about the time frame involved with the potential move.

Stormwater Drainage Reconstruction/Upgrade and Stormwater Separation in the Downtown:

Mr. Bartlett described the current status (as best he could, from what they know) of the stormwater catch basin and sewer lines on main and Grove Streets. “Historically, we do not know what is down there until you open it up” he said, adding “we do cameras as much as possible and go in and correct as best we can.”

Roadway Repaving:

Mr. Bartlett pointed out the need to maintain/restore the structural integrity of the pavement and explained the Chip seal program. He cited Old Greenfield Road Carley Road, “and to some extent East Mountain Road” as being the focus of the project location next year for the rural roads and Laurel Street as an in-town focus. He concluded by noting “water is the number one enemy of your road structure.”

Sidewalks:

Mr. Bartlett noted a primary goal for FY14 is the replacement of the brick edging on the sidewalks in the Downtown. He noted numerous efforts and ideas have been tried over the years to solve the problem with varying degrees of success. He noted the new sidewalks on Summer Street which consisted of full width concrete pours noting “which will most likely be the recommendation for solving the problem.

Ms. MacDonald asked if the brick strips could just be taken out with Mr. Bartlett relying “no, it upsets the integrity of the rest of the concrete. You break that off you will need to replace the whole thing.”

Mr. Bartlett also gave a brief update of the status of the Canal (it is collapsing). He noted “we are trying to get the State to recognize that and incorporate it into the Main Street Bridge program.”

Transcript Dam:

Mr. Bartlett noted the failure of the Transcript Bridge with seepage (water flowing underneath or around the dam). He noted not only the aesthetic consequences but the negative impact to recharging aquifers and wetlands upstream of the dam. He told the members an assessment was underway and regardless of the recommendations, he felt the project should be bundled with the Main Street Bridge and the Pine Street sidewalk work, with one bond being used to pay for all three projects.

Ms. MacDonald asked what would happen if the town did nothing (no work). Mr. Bartlett replied “eventually the eastern side will breach itself and certainly affect the retaining wall.” He noted “this is truly a local decision, repair it, intentionally breach it, do nothing or let it breach itself” adding “anyway you go it is a pay me now or pay me later thing.” Mr. Bartlett reminded the members “that Dam is a huge aesthetic to this town. “Almost all drawing and photographs of the downtown area depict it.”

North Peterborough Dam Feasibility Study and Reconstruction:

Mr. Bartlett updated the members on the status of the North Peterborough Dam. He noted the Dam has water flowing underneath the spillway in periods of dry weather “and if the seepage continues the Dam structurally fail, negatively impacting the recharge to the north aquifer and wetlands upstream of it.” He noted the feasibility study will allow the engineers “to give us a better financial picture of what is involved.” Ms. MacDonald asked “do all dams have this sort of data?” Mr. Bartlett replied “that depends.”

Town House Painting:

Mr. Bartlett explained the Town House Cupola “gets painted once every 5 to 10 years” adding “It was last painted in 1997 or 1998.” He noted the Town House trim gets painted every “5 or so years” and “it will be painted in 2013.”

Grove Street Bridge Street Lighting:

Mr. Bartlett noted the streetlights at the Grove Street Bridge had been there since the 1940s. He noted a tree fell on one of the lights last year destroying it. “Obviously, it cannot be replaced” he said “so we will remove the other three and install freestanding lights. That way when we get to the Grove Street Bridge work we won’t have to worry about them.” (The current streetlights are

embedded into the bridge stonework). Ms. Chollet asked about TIF funds and a brief discussion about that fund followed.

Public Works Facility:

Mr. Bartlett noted with a smile “next is the 5 million dollar Public Works Facility, let’s move on.”

Ms. Chollet noted the Facility should have a place holder if nothing else. “You don’t want to forget about it” she said. Mr. Bartlett briefly touched on the plans for an 8-bay garage for the new Wastewater Treatment Plant and “where things could go from there.”

Recycling:

Mr. Bartlett noted the replacement of the RC Loadall was consistent with the approved Fleet Management Plan, adding “it is really the only wheeled piece of equipment Recycling has. It was purchased in 2005 and runs every day.”

Mr. Bartlett also briefly discussed the town’s road grader and how it would not be replaced. “They just don’t make parts for it anymore so at this point we will just leave it alone.”

Fleet Management:

Mr. Bartlett reviewed the approved Fleet Management Plan. He noted the town owns six large dump trucks and four 1-ton dump trucks. Ms. Chollet asked for clarification about the terms being used for the equipment. Mr. Bartlett explained the need to refurbish the mechanically string trucks the town owns and “focus upgrades to the truck bodies, chassis’ and cabs.”

The members briefly reviewed several projects with Mr. Bartlett after a long night. In particular, Mr. Kelly asked for clarification on the Reserve Fund and Ms. Stanbury had spreadsheet questions. In closing Mr. Bartlett mentioned the Summer Street Well and the Pump Station building “that has broken in half.” He touched on potential plans to address the issue of bacteria forming a ring and restricting the flow of water as well as potential impacts to the aquifer. He also noted this would be a user-fee aid project and that town utility customers have experienced increases in their rates. “We have to sensitive to that” he said.

Ms. Ogilvie noted the next meeting was November 13, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. She also noted the School District would be in to meet with them on November 27, 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton,
Administrative Assistant