

**TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE**

**3:00 P.M. Tuesday  
October 31, 2017**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Roland Patten, Kim Rode, James Kelly, Leandra MacDonald, Bob Hanson, Alan Zeller, Ed Juengst, Johnathan Ericson and Carl Mabbs-Zeno

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

After a tour of the Public Works facility located on Elm Street the members reconvened at the Town House and the meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. with Chair Hanson (Mr. Hanson) introducing the members and staff.

**Department of Public Works (DPW):**

*DPW Facility:* Operations Manager Seth MacLean began with noting “we have just been to the facility, does anyone have questions about it? I know there is a placeholder number of 4 million dollars for a new facility on Water Street with the assumption that the Fire Department will be doing something at our location in the near future.”

Mr. Kelly asked “what if the Fire Department stays where it is?” Mr. MacLean replied “either way, we need to take a hard look at the current highway building, determine the value of the property and based on master planning decide what we should do.” He noted the life of the building itself with the cost of retrofitting or refurbishment versus building a new building “may not be a big difference. The building is in poor condition, it is energy inefficient and could be residentially or commercially valuable. It would be good to have a bit of direction on where the community wants to go with this.” Mr. Ericson asked if the town had a long-term preventative maintenance plan “or are we just going to fix it when it fails?” he asked. “Right now, fix it” replied Mr. MacLean. Mr. Ericson went on to note the importance of stabilizing the building and incorporate preventive or incremental repairs. “We have talked about preventative maintenance programs and other facilities have them (the Recycling Center for one)” said Mr. MacLean. Mr. Patten suggested “there are two things in front of us (Library and Fire Station) that when

all said and done totals 12 million dollars. Knowing there may be another (4 million dollar) project is important to know about.” He asked Mr. MacLean “are you brave enough to put that in the (CIP) plan?” Mr. MacLean replied “if that is the plan, yes, I am happy to do it.” Mr. Ericson interjected that during the tour of the Fire Station last week Chief Walker was not advocating a new facility but pointed out and demonstrated the current conditions and how those things could affect services. “In my mind that moves things up” he said adding “command and control in an emergency are important, thought needs to be put behind that.” He went on to say “certain things have to be done, make a case for what you need. The Library is important but people want to drive on their roads too. Make your case, communicate what you want and what it costs and see what the people are willing to pay.” A brief discussion about the Library’s marketing efforts and getting themselves out before the public followed with the member’s recommendation to Mr. MacLean to speak up and let the community know what is coming up. “I will do that” replied Mr. MacLean. Ms. MacDonald agreed adding “there is not a lot of downtime square footage at the facility, you don’t even have a real lunch room. We need a range of motion here, a strategic plan with options is important.” Mr. Juengst reiterated the roadway repair summary (consisting of deferred maintenance right through to full reconstruction) and told the members “everyone uses the roads unlike any other thing on the list.” All the members agreed Mr. MacLean had submitted excellent data for their review.

*Road Program:* Mr. MacLean reviewed how they had embarked on a study of the entire road network (using BETA Software Systems) which involved driving every foot of the roadways and assessing all engineering standards. The intent of the program was to determine the road surface rating (RSR), understanding the impact of the current funding level of the road network’s RSR (now and in the future) and providing detailed capital planning and tools to inform budget recommendations and maximize pavement preservation funding.

Having completed that task Mr. MacLean told the members that on a scale of 0 to 100 Peterborough’s overall score was a 70. He explained the measure used was a scale of very poor (totally disrepair) to perfect (excellent). “All thing considered, we did well” he said adding “and we found the current funding of \$450,000 each year *is* sufficient in road preservation *as long as* it is dedicated to preventive and routine maintenance. \$450,000 is adequate to hold the line status quo, no gain, no loss.”

Mr. MacLean went on to review a graph projected for the members. This Graph showed levels of pavement condition and the type of appropriate road maintenance

each category would require (*very poor/reconstruction, poor/reclamation, fair/preventive maintenance, good/routine maintenance and excellent/deferred maintenance*) on a degradation curve of 25 years. He noted “you can see by these roadway repair categories using money to take care of what you have makes a huge difference.” Reiterating that the \$450,000 was sufficient to *hold the line at 70* “spending more money on what we already have invested will decrease rehabilitation money and we can actually start to make gains on our road network system” he said. The members briefly reviewed the empirical data collected for the road assessment (what should be done for what roads) based on engineering standards and the idea of treating roads in need as a separate project (not part of the operating budget of the road network).

Mr. Juengst again noted the importance of getting the numbers needed to fix the roads out to the public. “We have a lot of things coming” he said adding “and the public is seeing the projects one at a time without knowing what else is in the pipeline. People are only thinking about the Library, they need to know what else is out there so they can intelligently vote on the priorities. You need a base number for the public. The CIP is a plan and plans are never perfect but you need to get a placeholder in place to help people make informed decisions.” “I agree 100%” replied Mr. MacLean adding he felt he could get a realistic number in a couple of weeks’ time. Mr. Hanson asked specific roads in need be identified as well. As a brief discussion on how the roads were rated Mr. Mabbs-Zeno suggested “people may not be driving on zero-level (very poor) roads because it is a zero-level road.” Mr. MacLean noted an example of one zero-level road was Gray Hill Road, “there are only a few houses on the road and it is a dead end” he said. Referring to the upcoming Main Street Bridge project and projected increase in traffic on Hunt Road Mr. Hanson noted they should also be considering not just the current patterns “but what is relevant to what is coming.”

In closing the Road Management Program discussion, the members suggested the DPW get more detail into the CIP *now* and consider the difference between building in operations monies versus bonding every year. Ms. MacDonald interjected “we keep saying *oh we can bond that* but there are better ways to use your money.”

*North and Transcript Dams:* “This is the same as last year” began Mr. MacLean. He told the members about the seepage and the flow under and around both dams which can cause them to fail. Citing the Main Street Bridge project he noted the

time was right to act on the Transcript Bridge (repair, rehabilitate or breach). He noted the failure of the North Dam will have a negative impact on the recharge to the north aquifer and wetlands lying upstream. “It is in bad shape and needs to be dealt with” he said adding “the approximate cost is \$750,000” He noted the suggestion of bundling the two dams with the underground utilities, making it one big project, and bonding it as such.

A brief discussion on what to do with the Transcript Bridge followed. Mr. Zeller asked why it couldn’t just be left alone. Mr. MacLean cited deficiencies as well as the recommendations by the engineers for the Main Street Bridge project.

*Underground Utilities:* Mr. MacLean noted this relocation of aerial utilities to underground utilities be done as part of the Main Street Bridge project. Ms. MacDonald interjected “this is almost a half million dollar project” “\$460,000” replied Mr. MacLean adding “it is a safety and aesthetics issue.” Mr. Juengst noted the project would include the removal of several telephone poles on Concord Street. The members also briefly discussed the money that was freed up as a result of the sidewalk for the Main Street Bridge and retaining wall project was in fact being covered by federal/state funds (removing the town’s responsibility for paying for them, freeing up the money). Mr. Patten suggested the group wait to discuss the matter with Town Administrator Rodney Bartlett next week.

Ms. MacDonald asked about the plan to stage construction equipment at the Library during the bridge project with Mr. Throop explaining he did believe that would not be the case. “The Library project has been moved up and it is my understanding that parking lot will not be available for staging” he said.

*Snow Blower:* “You saw it today” said Mr. MacLean adding “it is in tough shape, we need to do something with this machine. We have been playing with fire with this machine.” He told the members employees have been fabricating replacement parts as they are not available commercially (it is a 1987 model, 30 years old). Mr. Ericson asked if the machine would last until Fiscal Year 2021. With a smile Mr. MacLean replied “I have asked them and the boys think they can keep it running.”

*Recycling Center Cardinal Scale:* “This is relatively straight forward” said Mr. MacLean adding “There is no way to know its lifespan, it is 18 years old, in bad shape and needs to be replaced. It has even been struck by lightning a couple of times.” He went on to note the scale is in poor condition and annual maintenance costs have escalated. When Mr. Zeller asked if the scale could be covered when not in use to better protect it, Mr. MacLean replied “we could but that does not

erase the damage the machine has incurred over the years” adding “but that is a great point, to better maintain equipment with alternative ways to protect it.”

A brief discussion about the Recycling Center being a profit center (generates funds) but does not stand independently followed.

Mr. MacLean concluded by briefly reviewing the normal fleet maintenance program “there is no change there” he said adding “the program works well as it is.”

Mr. Juengst noted the deputy town administrator was preparing a year to year tax rate increase projection with Mr. MacLean noting “so I am pressed to get a road program number.” Mr. Juengst replied “something pretty soon would be of significance.” Noting the washout/flooding of several roads in town from the recent storm Mr. Throop interjected “remember it only takes one day (one day like yesterday) to change the estimates and forecasts.”

**Review CIP Meeting Schedule:**

The members concluded with a brief review of the remaining CIP meetings (deliberation with the Town Administrator, revisit of Department Heads as necessary and final deliberation and presentation of recommendations to the Budget Committee and Board of Selectmen).

**Other Business:**

None

**Next Meeting:**

Tuesday, November 7, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. at the Town House

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton  
Administrative Assistant