

Budget Recommendations Advisory Committee
CIP Night 1
Nowak Room
Town Office Building
November 13, 2019 6:30 PM

Members Present: Bob Kelly, Chair; Christine Soutter, Vice Chair; Corey Stevens, Dan Gray, Don Clement, Judy Rowan, Nancy Belanger, Nicholas Gray, Anthony Zwaan and Liz Canada

Members Absent: Enna Grazier, Tai Chin Tung, Dave Beavens

Others Present: Russ Dean, Doreen Chester, Niko Papkonstantis, Kathy Corson, and Anne Surman.

Mr. Kelly called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

1. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Clement asked for an update on the 2020 General Fund budget. Ms. Chester said the number is \$19,641,769. Mr. Kelly asked for the number with pending CIP projects. Ms. Chester said there are \$1,313,175 of proposed warrant articles, so with the General Fund budget that's a total of \$20,954,944. The Sidewalk Program is \$120,000; the Sick Leave Expendable Trust is \$100,000; the Snow and Ice Deficit Fund is \$50,000; the Parks and Rec CRF is \$125,000; Pickpocket Dam Reclassification is \$90,000; Vehicle Replacements town-wide is \$254,283; the Conservation Fund appropriation is \$100,000; Communications Repeater is \$78,792; Westside Drive Design/Engineering is \$100,000; DPW Facility Garage Design is \$100,000; and Six Wheel Dump Truck and Plow is \$195,100. Mr. Dean clarified that the Sick Leave Trust and Snow and Ice Deficit Funds come out of the Fund Balance and don't affect the tax rate.

Jennifer Perry, the Public Works Director, and Matt Berube, the Water & Sewer Manager, were present to discuss the DPW CIP requests.

2. Capital Projects - DPW

a. Pickpocket Dam Reclassification

Ms. Perry said that the Pickpocket Dam came under a letter of deficiency from NHDES a few years ago. The dam is a high hazard because of the residences below the dam; if there were a breach, there could be severe harm. They've now had a revised letter with an emergency action plan and timeline for addressing the concerns. They've completed the base flood information for the 2 ½ times the hundred year flood level, for \$90,000. Next they will conduct a feasibility analysis of what modifications should be made to bring it into compliance, similar to the Great Dam study. The CIP sheet shows it as \$370,000 in 2020, but they want to start with the \$90,000 and adding \$20,000 that had been in the Solid Waste Fund under Landfill Monitoring for doing a hydrologic analysis, which would bring it to \$110,000 total. Mr. Stevens asked if that allows the town to meet the June 2020 requirements of DES. Ms. Perry said yes. They can move into the rest of the project in 2021. Mr. Stevens asked if the work for Jan 1 2020

is on track, and Ms. Perry said yes. Mr. Kelly asked if there were a continual comment period from DES, and Ms. Perry said no, the town has received and acknowledged their comments.

Mr. Clement said the subcommittee recommended that the \$20,000 be moved into the CIP, rather than the Solid Waste Budget. However, this still doesn't determine what dam modifications would need to be made. Exeter owns this dam, but half of it is in Brentwood. He doesn't think they should move forward until an arrangement with the town of Brentwood is in place. Ms. Soutter asked what the state has said about Brentwood's role. Ms. Perry said the dam is completely owned by Exeter. The state agrees that Brentwood should be involved in the process, but Brentwood doesn't have any financial obligation. Mr. Dean said Brentwood has been sent the report and letter of deficiency, but they haven't had any face to face discussion. Mr. Kelly asked if Brentwood could prevent Exeter from removing the dam. Mr. Dean said if they were inclined to do that, they'd have to make that known. Mr. Stevens said the letter talks about consequences for not making progress, so they may not have the option of waiting for negotiations with Brentwood. Ms. Perry said they had to acknowledge the letter from the state and commit to moving forward. Ms. Soutter asked why they haven't met with Brentwood. Mr. Dean said it's a timing issue. They're getting to the point where they will be sitting down with Brentwood. If Exeter were interested in removing the dam, Brentwood would probably want to see numbers. They need more information to have a meaningful conversation. Mr. Kelly asked if \$40,000 is enough to show that they're moving forward this year. Ms. Perry said they must get significant work done in 2020 to ramp up to even more significant work in 2021. Mr. Dean said the Great Dam process was a decade long. They haven't even asked the residents about the dam yet.

Dr. Zwaan asked about the \$20,000 that Mr. Clement mentioned. Ms. Perry said that the hydrologic analysis could be done early in 2021, but it will be an important piece that needs to be available before they weigh the alternatives. Mr. Kelly said he'd rather extend the timeline rather than put it off and have to compress the timeline. Dr. Zwaan said he doesn't want to spend money if there are uncertainties, but there's a letter of deficiency from the state and they have to respond. If they have to keep coming back over several years, that won't go over well. **MOTION:** Dr. Zwaan moved to recommend to fund the CIP item for the amount of \$110,000: \$90,000 for the study and \$20,000 for the Solid Waste component. Ms. Soutter seconded. Mr. Clement said that the hydrologic study has to do with the Transfer Station and the groundwater there. If they're not doing anything to the dam, this study will be a waste of taxpayer money. Mr. Kelly said the Public Works Department thinks it's appropriate. Daniel Gray, Mr. Clement, and Mr. Stevens voted nay and the motion passed 7-3-0.

b. Sidewalk Program

Mr. Kelly said that last year, they approved funding \$60,000 out of the requested \$120,000 for the Sidewalk Program. Mr. Clement said this is a Capital Reserve Fund which has \$80,000 already. The subcommittee thought the requested amount could be reduced by half, to \$60,000. Ms. Soutter asked what they did for the sidewalks this year. Ms. Perry said they didn't do any sidewalk work out of the reserve fund; they did the Lincoln Street work instead. This level of funds doesn't get very far. It cost \$75,000 just to do the sidewalks at Great Bridge and High Street/Portsmouth Ave. They'd like to build up the reserve fund until they can make significant inroads. Nicholas Gray asked about the average spend from this fund. Ms. Perry said

the money hasn't been there to do a significant project. They don't want to do little patches, which don't last; they want to do significant work. Mr. Kelly said in the last two years, they did the full sidewalk program warrant article downtown, the Lincoln Street project, and the High Street section due to a water main break. Mr. Dean said the original appropriation to the CRF covered the High Street work. This year they did the sidewalks from PEA to the downtown. Ms. Soutter asked how much they need to do a significant project, and Ms. Perry said they'd be getting close with this appropriation. They need to find the right project.

Daniel Gray asked what the figure would be if they were to target roadways for paving which match up with a sidewalk they'd like to address. Ms. Perry said they have a rough paving plan, which is reviewed every spring, but don't have a corresponding sidewalk plan. Mr. Stevens said they should try to get more money in the fund, up to around \$150,000. Ms. Rowan said that the discussion around the Master Plan included supporting a healthy lifestyle, and improved sidewalks may help with that and with the parking issue. She supports adding to this fund.

MOTION: Nicholas Gray moved to fund the Sidewalk Program Capital reserve fund at \$60,000 for FY 2020. Ms. Rowan seconded. Mr. Clement and Ms. Belanger voted nay, and the motion passed 8-2-0.

c. Vehicles

i. Truck #5

Mr. Kelly said this is the upgrade of Truck #5 from a ½ ton to a ¾ ton truck. Mr. Clement said that the subcommittee recommended deferring this purchase. In the vehicle rating system, this had low points (the higher the points, the more it needs to be replaced). This would be an upgrade from a Ford F150 to a Ford F250 with a plow package, and the subcommittee didn't see that it needed to be done this year, although it was a split vote 2-1. Ms. Rowan said she supports the subcommittee's view. It's an eight year old vehicle that does around 9,000 miles a year, so it should be able to last a few more years. Ms. Perry said that the workers use this truck when snowblowing at the train station and other town buildings, and they have to physically lift the snowblowers in and out of the truck. The replacement truck would have a lift gate to help them. Mr. Clement said they could use a ramp instead. Ms. Perry said they do, but it's not a safe operation. Mr. Kelly said that last week during the Water and Sewer discussion, they approved a similar upgrade to a plow package so that Water/Sewer could clear their own facilities. Perhaps Highway could use the Water/Sewer vehicle? Daniel Gray said he supports the subcommittee's recommendation. There are other vehicles that are likely to need replacement.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to recommend not to replace the ½ ton Truck #5. Daniel Gray seconded. All were in favor.

ii. Truck #9

Mr. Kelly said they'd talked about replacing some components of this truck. Mr. Clement said the subcommittee recommended to approve this replacement. It's a 12 year old vehicle with 121,000 miles as of June 2019. This has a small lift on the back, so it's used frequently. Mr. Kelly asked if there were any parts in this truck that could be reused. Ms. Perry said this is a diesel truck; the mechanics said these trucks are a liability to maintain, and they want to get it out of the fleet.

MOTION: Nicholas Gray moved to replace the one ton dump body Truck #9 in the fiscal year 2020 Capital Improvement Program for the sum of \$65,872. Ms. Belanger seconded. All were in favor.

iii. Truck #33

Mr. Kelly said this is a newer six wheel dump and plow truck, #33. It has fairly low miles. Mr. Clement said the subcommittee recommended deferring the replacement of this vehicle. It doesn't rate high on the points system. It has 40,000 miles; for these vehicles, hours of usage are a factor in addition to miles, but the subcommittee thought they could get another year out of this vehicle. It's \$195,000, so not a small truck.

Mr. Kelly said it looked like the maintenance has been fairly low on this truck. Ms. Perry said this was the truck that was in Water/Sewer prior to the past winter. It hasn't had the heavy winter usage the others have had, but it's a little underpowered for this work.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to not replace the six wheel with dump and plow truck #33 this year. Ms. Canada seconded. All were in favor.

iv. Sedan #24

Mr. Kelly said this vehicle has fairly high mileage but is still reliable. Mr. Clement said this is one of the old cruisers which was passed on to the DPW. The custodian uses this vehicle and carries his equipment in it. A car is not a good fit for this purpose; it makes more sense to use a small van at \$24,000 so that it can fit all the cleaning materials. The subcommittee felt this was a good purchase. Nicholas Gray mentioned that this purchase was deferred last year. Mr. Kelly asked if this vehicle could fill any other function for the town, such as minor transportation needs. Ms. Perry said this vehicle is pushing the limit. There's another that is more serviceable than this one. They look for repurposing possibilities before they hand in the keys on any vehicle. Mr. Clement said the days of transferring down old Crown Vics is past, they need smaller and more efficient fleet vehicles.

MOTION: Mr. Clement moved to replace Sedan #24 with a small working van. Ms. Belanger seconded. Dr. Zwaan suggested they stick to the number rather than specifying a vehicle type. Mr. Clement said they should move away from a passenger vehicle to a working van, so he wanted it to be specific. Ms. Belanger asked if they could get a van for that price, and Ms. Perry said yes, that was their description. All were in favor.

Mr. Kelly asked if they have to vote on the Sick Leave Trust Fund and Snow and Ice Fund, since they come out of the reserves and are the purview of the Select Board. Mr. Dean said he didn't believe they had voted on them in the past.

d. Westside Drive I/I Assessment

Mr. Kelly said this is related to stormwater and sewer work on Westside Drive. This is the second major I/I catchment area after Jady Hill Ave, which they addressed a number of years ago. Ms. Perry said that this area has a lot of inflow & infiltration with groundwater getting into the sewer via sumps in residents' basements. The roads are extremely wide, and the sidewalks are in poor condition. They're looking to provide additional drainage, which could include swales and other means of infiltration; reducing the road widths; and provide adequate sidewalks. Just getting started will cost \$100,000 in 2020. That will be a 50/50 split between

General Fund and Sewer. Mr. Kelly said this is an area that has issues other than I/I, so they can kill two birds with one stone. This is one of 23 projects identified five or six years ago, and they're making good progress on that list. The Water/Sewer subcommittee also recommends this. Mr. Clement said that I/I is something they have to address, but this will be a multi-million dollar project. He's concerned about taxpayer impact. He suggested delaying a year and getting a better understanding of the town's financial situation. Mr. Dean said that one potential avenue is looking at funding \$50,000 from the General Fund Reserves and \$50,000 from Sewer Reserves to get this project off the ground. This project is in a neighborhood they hear about again and again. Residents there are looking for improvements. Mr. Kelly said that out of the 23 projects the EPA wanted to do, there were three of them that were going to address about 70% of the I/I: Jady Hill, Westside Drive, and Downing Court. He would support taking \$50,000 out of the Sewer Reserves so as not to impact the budget. Mr. Clement says the money is still taken from the taxpayers. They would still have to have the town appropriate the money. Mr. Dean said the General Fund piece would have to be approved at Town Meeting. Mr. Kelly said when money is to come out of the Sewer Reserves, so he as Chairman of the Water/Sewer Committee would go to the Select Board to make that recommendation. Ms. Rowan asked if this is a neighborhood that could be affected by climate change and intensified storms. Ms. Perry said they will have those discussions when they get into the conceptual design.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved to approve the \$100,000 for the request, to be split roughly 50/50 between the Sewer Fund Reserves and the General Fund to a strategy that the Town Manager sees fit. Ms. Soutter seconded. Dr. Zwaan asked how the 50/50 split affects the warrant. Mr. Kelly said it will say that in the warrant. Mr. Clement voted nay and the motion passed 9-1-0.

e. Water System Source Development

Mr. Kelly said this work was begun two years ago with an FY17 request for \$600,000 to look at the future of groundwater and surfacewater. Ms. Perry said they've been working with Underwood Engineers and Emery & Garrett looking at the groundwater system and potential new development. When they built the Groundwater Treatment Plant, they provided space for an additional filter. They're looking to ensure adequate capacity for future demand. It takes 4 - 5 years to bring a new source online. The contractors have identified three promising areas. They're also working on an evaluation of the Surfacewater Treatment Plant, which is an older facility.

Mr. Kelly asked if there was about \$200,000 left out of the \$600,000 of the initial warrant article. Mr. Berube said it was more like \$125,000. The balance will be spent, and they'll be looking to move forward to the next phase. At some point, even an additional well will not meet future demand.

Mr. Kelly said they have a diversified water system, but parts of it are very old. Given the groundwater issues of PFAS and PFOA, they should continue to diversify. Mr. Clement said this CIP is for groundwater source development, but it sounds like the subcommittee recommends adding money to continue the 2016 project of source development. Mr. Kelly said yes, it seemed that there were too many questions to recommend the single direction of groundwater development. Ms. Rowan asked what amount they are looking at this year. Mr. Kelly said adding \$300,000 to the existing \$200,000 to have around \$500,000 available so that they could finish the 2016 study and have the ability to do some development work.

Daniel Gray said there's \$125,000 left over, so they could potentially defer this warrant another year to see the full results. They may have to authorize a greater expenditure later. Mr. Stevens asked if the \$125,000 would get them to an answer. Ms. Perry said it's important to keep momentum behind this project, since there's so much at stake and there are new regulations proposed. When they have to recommend a big expenditure, they want to make sure they've done their due diligence. Ms. Rowan asked if adding \$175,000 to get them to \$300,000 would move them forward.

Mr. Berube said they're currently qualifying for a state aid grant for \$400,000 to purchase a potential groundwater site. Even if they don't put a well on it for ten or fifteen years, the land would belong to the town and would have that potential. Mr. Kelly asked if they needed matching funds for that, but Ms. Perry said no, the state is considering money spent in the 1980s as the matching funds. Mr. Kelly said any land acquisition should be part of an overall program.

Mr. Clement asked what level water consumption is at. Mr. Berube said about a million gallons per day. Mr. Clement said that it's about what it has been for the last several years. Mr. Berube said the report from Underwood Engineers said they will not be able to meet a max day demand in the future. The average demand is projected to be 1.5 million gallons, and the max day demand will be 2.72 million. They took into consideration some of the known potential buildouts. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Clement said they ran into that kind of projection years ago and the engineers turned out to be wrong. Mr. Kelly said there'd been a lot of growth in town in the last few years, and usage has not gone up significantly. As the rates go up, people conserve more. Ms. Perry said conservation is happening, but they don't have much of a buffer. If development continues, they won't be able to meet capacity.

Mr. Kelly said their original recommendation was to add \$300,000 to what he thought was their \$200,000 left. They should refocus their efforts. The next year should give them some answers and a justification to spend the big bucks. Daniel Gray asked if this proposal is to continue the work of the warrant of two years ago, and the warrant for FY2020 is effectively dead. Mr. Kelly said this warrant was specifically for groundwater development, and the subcommittee thought they should back up from that. Ms. Rowan asked what the \$300,000 would actually be used for. Mr. Kelly said it would be added to whatever's left to provide a full scope source water development, both groundwater and surfacewater. There's some fieldwork. At some point, they want a study that will tell them how to move forward.

Ms. Rowan asked why this work is so expensive. Ms. Perry said it's expensive to deal with water resources. For example, there's potential for having to do well permitting, which is extremely expensive. Mr. Kelly said there's a lot of engineering, paperwork, and involvement of the state. Ms. Perry said they'll continue to work with Underwood Engineers and Emery & Garrett, who have a wealth of local knowledge, and they are expensive. There are potential regulations that may arise. They have to think five or ten years into the future to secure the town's water supply.

Mr. Clement said drinking water is important, but he wants to see a specific plan for going forward with this process. Mr. Kelly said they had a surfacewater plant on Portsmouth Avenue and went to the voters with a \$17 million upgrade, which was rejected twice. Then they proposed a \$6 million groundwater plant. Now with PFOA, the pendulum is swinging back towards surfacewater. They need to hedge their bets instead of focusing only on groundwater.

Daniel Gray suggested restoring the funds that the DPW had proposed originally. Mr. Kelly said the \$800,000 wasn't defined, it was to be used towards making a plan going forward. Daniel Gray said they talk a lot about unfunded mandates, but this feels like the opposite, just throwing money at a problem. Mr. Stevens said whatever doesn't get spent on exploration will be spent somewhere down the line. Ms. Perry estimated that within the year, they will have a consolidated report on groundwater and surfacewater. This is not just a study, it's a dynamic that has to go on between the department, the town, and the Select Board. Mr. Stevens asked if the \$125,000 left would be enough to get to that result. Ms. Perry said it would be insufficient. Mr. Kelly said two years ago, \$800,000 felt like too much, so they put in \$600,000, and now they're finding that wasn't enough.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved to rebrand this warrant article as ongoing source water development at a cost of \$200,000. Ms. Belanger seconded. Mr. Clement and Nicholas Gray voted nay, and the motion passed 8-2-0.

f. Hampton Road Booster Station

Mr. Kelly said that Mr. Berube had suggested they purchase a modulating valve for the water tanks on the east side of town to adjust the pressure, which may obviate the need to redo the Hampton Road Booster Station. This warrant would be tabled.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved to table the warrant article for the Hampton Road Booster Station. Ms. Belanger seconded. All were in favor.

g. Folsom Pump Station

Mr. Kelly said they can do a lot of this in-house for significantly less. Mr. Berube said he thinks they can. They've worked on other pump stations and it's gone well. This is a smaller pump station. They can do it over the course of two years for \$75,000 per year. This would involve a new building, concrete pouring, electrical upgrades, and a new pump skid. They would enclose the pumps in a building, which would be a safer situation.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved \$150,000 to do the work on the Folsom Pump Station in-house. Ms. Belanger seconded. Mr. Clement said this is a rehab of an existing structure, so shouldn't it have been part of the Sewer budget? Mr. Kelly said the Sewer Budget went up enough.

h. Lagoon Sludge Removal

Mr. Kelly said this was taken out of the original treatment plant upgrade plans. There's no specific timeframe wherein this needs to be done, but as Ms. Perry has discussed, every year that goes by getting rid of sludge becomes more problematic and likely more expensive. Ms. Perry said that they could pay for this using existing money from the Wastewater Treatment Plant project and forego this line item for the next few years. They need to ensure this could be aligned as far as timing with the project closeout. Mr. Berube said they're projecting 1.3-1.5 million underbudget, so they could spend \$1 million and still have a contingency, and there are other potential moneys for this project.

MOTION: Mr. Stevens moved to zero out the request for lagoon sludge removal at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Ms. Belanger seconded. All were in favor.

i. Squamscott River Siphons

Mr. Kelly said there are some capacity issues, and the department recommends adding a third siphon. Ms. Perry said the proposal includes the design and installation of that siphon, as well as the design of improvements to the pump station at Webster Avenue. There has been a lot of development there and it's underpowered. Dr. Zwaan asked the age and condition of the current siphons, and Mr. Berube said it's two 8 inch pipes installed in the 1950s. They can't get a camera down there to do a condition assessment, but they always worry about 50 year old pipes. They're undersized, and they'll start to back up when it rains. Mr. Stevens asked if they would need to be shut down, and Ms. Perry said they would remain active, but they would rehabilitate those pipes. Mr. Berube said they could dry them out and reline them. Mr. Kelly asked if there's any potential for SRF fund forgiveness. Mr. Berube said they didn't qualify. Ms. Perry said they do a pre-application with the state; every June they submit to DES all the projects they're considering, and this one did not make the grade. Mr. Clement said that part of the Jady Hill project was to reduce the I/I that was getting into this wastewater, so did it reduce the amount coming into these two siphons? Ms. Perry said there had been a significant reduction in I/I, but there will be an event that these siphons can't handle. Mr. Stevens asked if there were existing stakeholders there that would benefit. Ms. Perry said that there's a direct relationship to development; not 100%, because there are aging pipes that need to be addressed, but this is geared to new development. The state will look at development with potential flows that are over 5,000 gallons per day, and if they know that the town is at capacity in receiving them, they will turn that down.

Mr. Clement said they need to do whatever they can to avoid having contamination of the river, but he wanted to hear more about an overall plan and whether they need to do this immediately. Mr. Kelly asked if Webster Ave and the siphons were part of the Facilities Plan. Ms. Perry said no, but they've worked with consultants to come up with these preliminary concepts. The Facilities Plan was just for the main station and the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Mr. Kelly asked if they can do the siphons project without doing Webster Ave. Ms. Perry said they could be separate, but this has to happen first.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved to approve putting the Squamscott River Siphons project of \$1.6 million on the warrant for consideration. Ms. Soutter seconded. Daniel Gray, Nicholas Gray, and Don Clement voted nay, and the motion passed 7-3-0.

j. New DPW Garage

Mr. Kelly said this involves three funds, General, Water, and Sewer. This would replace the 60 year old facility on Newfields Road. This would serve Highway Maintenance, Water, and Sewer. Ms. Perry said this came up when the town hired HL Turner to do the townwide facilities study. Part of the garage does not meet current design standards for snow load. They didn't want to jeopardize town equipment and staff, so after further analysis they put a snow load monitor on the roof and retained a contractor who can do the removal if necessary. They haven't had any issues in three years, but they should be looking at a new facility that meets the needs of the department. The crews work long hours and do a good job maintaining the fleet, but it's a very tight operation. They've damaged the high bay doors over the years. It's an inefficient energy building. These are square footage costs based on their existing space; they haven't looked at a needs study which may recommend some areas of expansion. The

mechanics need more space, and they have a woefully inadequate meeting space. For 2020, they're requesting \$100,000 to do preliminary work and get more detailed cost estimates.

Nicholas Gray said the subcommittee was unanimous that it wasn't the right time for this kind of investment. There could be deficiencies in the building, but it's meeting the majority of its purpose at the present time. They didn't feel comfortable spending \$100,000 on a study and design; this kind of facility could be designed for less. Mr. Stevens asked if something could be done for the snow load issues. Ms. Perry said it's not just the roof, it's the beams supporting the roof, which are substandard. The roof itself has had water damage over the years. Mr. Stevens asked if this building will be part of the town wide facilities study. Ms. Perry said it was not included because it was in the CIP. Mr. Papakonstantis said the language of the RFP is still being finalized, but this wasn't one of the buildings they were looking at.

Mr. Kelly said the Maintenance budget last year was underspent and it looks underspent YTD, can that be used? He also asked if there is a way to pull out an architectural study, as the numbers do seem high. Ms. Perry said the Maintenance budget will be spent; they recently presented the Select Board a plan to address the Town Hall cupola and gables that will encumber the money from this year and some from next year. \$250 a square foot sounds like a lot, but it's just a ballpark. Mr. Kelly wondered if they should just go for the \$3.8 million for the full project. Ms. Rowan said this is probably not the year to make a big investment in this facility. Daniel Gray agreed, saying this is not the time. Mr. Stevens said that Public Works works hard to keep things close to the bone. This may not be the right year, but when it comes to it they'll spend the money wisely. Mr. Kelly said it's a worthy project, but he'd like a little more information on a plan without spending the \$100,000. He suggested having the department put their thoughts about facility needs on paper.

Ms. Belanger said she's concerned about the safety of the employees. Where are the deficient beams relative to where employees spend time? Ms. Perry said the beams are in the Highway garage and the conference room. That's the oldest part of the facility. The mechanic area is slightly newer and not as deficient.

Mr. Kelly said if they go to Deliberative Session with something prepared, they won't get much support. That probably won't happen between now and February. The Library had significant issues and couldn't move forward. He thought perhaps money for a small study would be more appropriate. Ms. Soutter said she wants to allocate the \$100,000 or close to that to get them started. It may not be fully spent on the design, but it would give them money to work with. Mr. Clement said the money is still charged to taxpayers even if it doesn't get spent, so it's not sound reasoning to move ahead. Nicholas Gray said that as with the Library, they should assess whether repairs could be made before committing to new construction. Ms. Perry said they haven't looked into repairs yet, although they can as part of the process. They don't have a tabulation of their needs, but it's advisable to have an engineering first which knows about public works facilities to plan this building. There are specialized aspects to the facility, it's not just a garage.

Nicholas Gray said he only heard an issue with the roof, not a list of problems that would necessitate a full replacement of the building. Mr. Kelly said the doors are also damaged and the air quality is not great. Mr. Dean said that the facilities plan devotes 30 pages to this facility and the administration building, and it does get into some of the issues and makes recommendations about where they should go. It doesn't get granular on additional follow up

work, so that's what they're looking for, and that next step requires a dollar figure. The DPW Administration building is also fifteen years old and should be looked at as well. Mr. Kelly asked if the facilities report discusses the specific issues that Nicholas Gray was looking for, and Ms. Perry said she doesn't recall, but it didn't address everything, they've continued to identify issues.

Daniel Gray said when they did the Library, there must have been a vetted study that looked at repairing the issues. Ms. Soutter said the Library raised funds to do that on their own. Nicholas Gray said they didn't indicate they spent funds to get quotes, but Ms. Soutter said they did their own fundraising to do them, she believes around \$30,000. It's not going to be free, and can't be done in-house. Daniel Gray said they need more information; they can't be throwing arbitrary numbers at it. Mr. Clement said they must look at whether these deficiencies can be corrected and at what cost. Taxpayers are struggling to pay their bills. Ms. Soutter said that the BRC members are paying taxes too.

Mr. Kelly said they will keep having this same discussion in coming years if they don't have real numbers on repairing and replacing the facility. He suggested reopening the Maintenance budget of \$100,000 and revising it to \$125,000, the \$25,000 to be spent on an architect/builder to do an assessment. Mr. Dean said the library spent \$80,000 over a five year period to get the library project to the point where it went before the voters.

Ms. Belanger asked where he came up with \$25,000, and Mr. Kelly said it seemed like a good number in light of the studies they've done in the town over the past 10 years. Mr. Clement said that they're letting Water and Sewer off the hook by putting it in the DPW General budget. Ms. Belanger said they could put further money in the other departments in future years.

Ms. Perry said this would be a good start.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved to reopen the Public Works General Fund budget. Ms. Belanger seconded. All were in favor.

MOTION: Mr. Kelly moved that line item 55058 in Administration and Engineering, for Contracted Services, be given a 2020 budget of \$25,000 for the purpose of doing pre-preliminary design on the Public Works Facility Garage. Ms. Belanger seconded. Ms. Perry said the result won't be as detailed as people may want, but the department will get the most that they can out of the money. All were in favor.

Ms. Chester stated that the new Administration and Engineering budget is \$413,659.

MOTION: Ms. Soutter moved the Administration and Engineering budget of \$413,659. Daniel Gray seconded. All were in favor.

Ms. Chester stated that the revised Public Works budget is \$5,593,447.

MOTION: Ms. Belanger moved the revised Public Works budget of \$5,593,447. Daniel Gray seconded. All were in favor.

Ms. Chester stated that the overall is 2.87% and the bottom line before warrant articles is \$19,666,768.

3. Minutes

- a. There were no minutes approved at this meeting.
- 4. Review Calendar
 - a. The next meeting is Monday, November 18th.
- 5. Adjournment
 - a. Mr. Kelly said the meeting stands adjourned at 9:57 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joanna Bartell
Recording Secretary