

**Town of Milford**  
**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**September 20, 2023**

**Present:** Peter Basiliere, Chair, Planning Board Representative  
Patricia Kenyon, Secretary, CIP Member  
Bill Cooper, Facilities Coordinator, School District Representative  
Dana Dahl, CIP Member  
Kathy Parenti, Library Trustee Representative  
Michael Thornton, CIP Member  
John Andruszkiewicz, CIP Member  
Susan Smith, Planning Board Representative  
Paul Bartolomucci, CIP Member  
Terrence Dolan, Community Development Director

**Recording Clerk:** Jane Hesketh, Community Development

**Meeting Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Review and Approval of Mtg. Minutes: 08/30/23 Mtg.
3. Additional CIP Requests
  - a. Department of Public Works, Leo Lessard, Director
  - b. Water Department, Jim Pouliot, Director
4. Continued Committee Discussion on Definitions, Project Evaluation & Scoring Criteria
5. Upcoming Meetings: 09/27/23, 10/4/23
6. Other Business
7. Adjournment

**Call to Order**

Peter Basiliere called the meeting to order. He started with an introduction of the members and all were present. He continued with stating two departments were present for project presentations and, in order to allow them to proceed without delay, review of the meeting minutes will be moved to the end of the meeting.

**Additional Department Presentations**

**a. Department of Public Works (DPW), Leo Lessard, Director**

Leo Lessard started by addressing a question asked at the meeting of September 13, 2023. He informed the committee the DPW has 6 of the bigger six wheeler trucks in the fleet; there are other six wheelers but they are smaller.

1 **MINUTES**  
2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**  
3  
4

5 **Additional Department Presentations**  
6

7 **a. Department of Public Works (DPW), Leo Lessard, Director**  
8  
9

10 **8. Replace Town Hall Roof**  
11

12 Leo Lessard started his presentation. In 2021, there is a quote for the repair of the roof which was \$721,000. At this  
13 time, L. Lessard is waiting for an updated quote since he has no justification for this figure. Once he has an exact  
14 number, he will provide the CIP with this amount. Since last year was his first year, he put this aside last year. L.  
15 Lessard explained in addition to the roof, he wants to include the clock tower and the 2 pergolas; with the inspection  
16 he made of the roof for the HVAC, he found the roof was not in good shape. The price will include not just the roof,  
17 but the other items just mentioned; the flat part of the roof appears to be in good shape and was only replaced a few  
18 years ago.

19  
20 It was asked what the sequence of events will be with the HVAC and the Roof. The HVAC will be done first and the  
21 roof will be put out a couple of years; L. Lessard noted the roof is not frail and there are no leaks.  
22

23 Chair Basiliere asked about the condition of the Bell Tower. L. Lessard: he has not inspected it himself, but facility  
24 maintenance has looked at it but he will have this inspected by the contractors when they give a cost for the other  
25 parts of the roof project.  
26

27 Chair asked if there was anything more. It was asked how the pricing will be presented. L. Lessard stated each piece  
28 will be priced individually; roof, pergolas, clock tower, and bell tower. Then under each individual piece, there will  
29 be a breakdown of the individual costs.  
30

31 M. Thornton asked if there were records available from when the roof shingles were last repaired to determine if  
32 there was a warranty and when the roof was done. This was discussed.  
33

34 **9. Reconstruction of Town Roads**  
35

36 Leo Lessard started by saying this project will be for the Warrant Article that will be presented. Last year there was  
37 a Warrant Article for \$400,000 and this will be the same for this year. DPW will be working along with the Water  
38 Department for road repairs. L. Lessard continued by saying while the roads look as though they are not in bad  
39 shape, the Water Department will be digging for pipes and at that time DPW will add drainage and repave. He  
40 explained the plans for road construction/pipes. It will be a yearly project. There will be a list, and some of the roads  
41 from last year's list will be repeated; wash outs and unexpected repairs were used with the money from last year. L.  
42 Lessard continued to explain the plans for future repairs and the work from last year.  
43

44 It was asked if the DPW will ask the Administration for additional funds. L. Lessard noted the \$328,000 state grant  
45 and he will be requesting \$700,000 in his budget which is an increase from last year; he feels though the Warrant  
46 Article will still be needed.  
47

48 To clarify, it was asked: the total figure for the DPW (given the figures Leo Lessard previously noted) will be over  
49 \$1,000,000. This is the \$328,000 state grant, \$400,000 Warrant Article and the requested budget of \$700,000 (if  
50 approved). L. Lessard noted this is correct and most towns have funds of this amount available for the DPW.  
51

52 C. Labonte noted the \$328,000 is anticipated revenue that is already in the budget.  
53

54 Chair asked if there was anything more and there was not.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 **MINUTES**  
2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**  
3  
4

5 **Additional Department Presentations**  
6

7 **a. Department of Public Works (DPW), Leo Lessard, Director**  
8  
9

10 **10. Replacement of the Pillsbury Bandstand Roof**  
11

12 L. Lessard the fund raiser brought in \$40,000 towards the cost of \$90,000. There will be a Warrant Article for the  
13 additional \$50,000. It is an historical site that will require special construction. It was noted it did fail last year's vote  
14 but not by much.  
15

16 The committee discussed the wording of the article from last year; it was interpreted to be a request for \$90,000 not  
17 \$50,000. The wording of the Warrant Article was discussed. The figure is below the CIP amount of \$75,000.

18 P. Basiliere noted this will be handled by reporting it as: the CIP being aware of this and other projects that are  
19 Warrant Articles which are of significant money's but did not meet the \$75,000 cut off.  
20

21 P. Basiliere pointed out the cost (construction) on the request form should be reflected as \$90,000; the \$40,000  
22 offset will be reflected as donations, revenue as \$50,000 then Total Project Cost as \$90,000. L. Lessard noted this  
23 and will make the revisions.  
24

25 Chair asked if there was anything more and there was not.  
26

27 Leo Lessard added he will re-rank the projects according to priorities and provide that information to T. Dolan.  
28  
29

30 **b. Water Department, Jim Pouliot, Director**  
31

32 **1. WWTP Plant, Nutrient & Metal Upgrade (EPA Permit) Nutrient Upgrade**  
33

34 Jim Pouliot began his presentation with this project which was a Warrant Article that passed in March 2023.

35 P. Basiliere said this does not need to be a CIP project or a topic to discuss at length. The project was discussed with  
36 explanations given in regards to the expense for this project and how it is reflected in town expenditures. Selectman  
37 Dargie at the meeting of 8/30/2023 expressed the need to have this included due to the 10 year plan.  
38

39 The following projects were presented at the meeting of 8/30/2023. Mr. Pouliot explained he has updated the request  
40 forms to reflect items or details that were missing. In addition, it was noted by Terrey Dolan, there were previously 7  
41 projects and now there are only 5 projects.  
42

43 To update the committee, Mr. Pouliot proceeded to review the changes for the following projects.  
44

45 **2. Pennichuck Booster Pump Station**  
46

47 J. Pouliot stated \$1.1 million in grants has been secured from the county which will leave \$1.5 million to secure  
48 (bond) for the total cost of \$2.5 million. This project is being put out for bid in December and there will be a final  
49 figure for the Warrant Article slated for March 2024.  
50

51 **3. Brookview Booster Pump Station**  
52

53 J. Pouliot estimated this cost to be \$500,000. This project is not yet in the design phase.  
54

55 **4. North End Main Replacement**  
56

57 J. Pouliot gave a rough estimate of \$3.5 million. Mr. Pouliot outlined the streets that will be involved with the  
58 replacement stating this area has the oldest pipes.  
59  
60

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**

3  
4  
5 **Additional Department Presentations**

6  
7 **b. Water Department, Jim Pouliot, Director**

8  
9 **5. WWTF Secure Sludge Landfill Remediation**

10  
11 The rough estimate for this is \$2 million. In terms of priorities, there are temporary (less costly) fixes being done to  
12 remediate the situation until the cause of the problem can be clearly identified.

13  
14 Susan Smith asked about the project for Amherst Street Water and Sewer Rehabilitation. Mr. Pouliot explained this  
15 project has been taken off the list due to other priorities. It was asked if this should be a project for the horizon. It  
16 was noted by Mike Thornton that the MS4 project may impact this project. This topic was discussed. P. Basiliere  
17 stated this is something that should be included regardless of the time frame; suggestion was to present a written  
18 proposal for the project. J. Pouliot stated that it will be at least 10 years out.

19  
20 Susan Smith asked if the Hilton Homes Water Main Project was off the list. J. Pouliot stated it is part of the  
21 operating budget.

22  
23 Chair Basiliere asked if there was anything else and there wasn't.

24  
25 P. Basiliere to T. Dolan: is that the last of the projects? T. Dolan: there may be some stray projects; in addition, he  
26 will be meeting with the Town Administrator in regards to projects for the Office of Community Development.

27 T. Dolan continued by saying he will distribute updates from the DPW. At this point, this is the last of the  
28 presentations from the departments. He then referred to Peter Basiliere for input on how he would like to proceed.

29  
30 P. Basiliere began by saying the committee should now go over the definitions using the Library Electrical Project  
31 as a model; members were given 2 criteria each to rank.

32  
33  
34 **Committee Discussion on Definitions, Project Evaluation & Scoring Criteria**

35  
36 Using the 2024 – 2029 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN PROJECT EVALUATION & REVIEW FORM, the  
37 committee went through each Project Evaluation Criteria in regards to the Library Electrical Project.  
38 Projects a thru f rankings are 1 to 5.

39  
40 **Bill Cooper**

41  
42 **a. Corrects a deficiency in operations, facility, or equipment:** ranked as 5 because this is exactly what it will do.  
43 B. Cooper then explained his reasoning specifically being the panels are old and no contractors are willing to work  
44 on them.

45  
46 P. Basiliere stated the definition: *A qualitative assessment of the degree to which the project addresses the*  
47 *deficiency and whether alternatives exist to work through the deficiency temporarily;* given the definition for this  
48 criteria the ranking of 5 makes sense.

49  
50 **b. Improves the quality of life for residents:** feels it should be ranked as a 1 since it really does not improve the  
51 quality of life for residents but improves the facility and the equipment.

52  
53 P. Basiliere stated the definition: *A qualitative assessment of the degree to which the project will meet residents'*  
54 *goals, expectations, standards, and concerns;* it could be a 1 but given the building and the services it provides, a  
55 higher number may be appropriate.

56 B. Cooper disagrees with this; noting how many people in the town use the library. B. Cooper stated he is looking at  
57 it in terms of the community as a whole. Citing the definition, Susan Smith questioned does this have to mean all  
58 residents, a majority of residents, does it matter how many residents. Peter Basiliere noted this is why this discussion  
59 is happening; while each member may rank this differently, it is important the criteria is being reviewed from the  
60 same point of view in terms of the definition. P. Basiliere added this criteria will probably be a lower number.

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**

3  
4  
5 **b. Improves the quality of life for residents:**

6  
7 Dana Dahl

8  
9 **c. Results in departmental operating budget cost savings or improved performance:** she ranked this as a 5. She  
10 feels this will result in improvement for the employees and they should make a difference. If employees cannot work  
11 properly or efficiently, it should be ranked as a higher number.

12  
13 Patricia Kenyon said she does not see how this would help employee’s performance or if there would be a cost  
14 savings. Bill Cooper added a new panel will provide peace of mind and an employee will not need to take care of a  
15 breaker problem when something shuts down. In addition, it will eliminate service calls.

16  
17 P. Kenyon cited the definition: *A quantitative assessment of the funds not spent if the project is implemented or the*  
18 *department's enhanced delivery of its activities.*

19  
20 P. Kenyon stated given the definition, she does not see how this could be ranked as a 5. P. Kenyon to K. Parenti: if  
21 the funds are not obtained this year, will it cost more if this work needs to be put off for a year. K. Parenti: prices  
22 will just continue to rise. P. Basiliere: the key word with this definition is quantitative and qualitative; if this project  
23 is implemented how much money will not be spent. Chair continued by saying that on one hand very little money  
24 will be spent since there are no contractors that will work on the electrical system. Bill Cooper added you can  
25 probably add about 10% to the cost if this waits a year. John Andruszkiewicz added: if you research the panels that  
26 are in use at the Library, they could actually catch fire and possibly burn down the Library; this would cost more to  
27 repair. P. Basiliere: that is a safety concern that would apply to criteria g, but this criteria concerns what that actual  
28 “hard dollar” savings are right now. Susan Smith asked if the extra 10% for the cost, if this waits for next year, can  
29 be used when ranking the criteria. P. Basiliere: yes it could be a consideration; it could be quantified in terms of the  
30 delivery of service. More discussion continued on this.

31  
32 **d. Matching funds are available for a limited time:**

33 There are no matching funds for this project.

34  
35 *An assessment of the amount of the private and public matching funds compared to project cost, the certainty the*  
36 *funds will be received, and the timeframe over which the town will receive the money.*

37  
38 Dana Dahl asked if there has been a situation where expected matching funds were not received; how is that judged.  
39 P. Basiliere noted there are: Public Funds: state grants, federal grants; Private Funds: various private organizations.  
40 Chair presented an example of a town project; he also noted the private funds are those that are most certain and  
41 public funds are on a case by case basis.

42  
43 Susan Smith asked about the Library Trust Fund and if it could be used for this project. Kathy Parenti stated it’s a  
44 Town building and trustee money should not have to be used for this type of project involving infrastructure. P.  
45 Basiliere added being a town building, that is correct and trustee money should be used for actual library related  
46 expenditures, however, if the trustees should come forward and say they wish to contribute funds then there is a  
47 certain degree of certainty this money will be available.

48  
49 P. Kenyon asked about the last part of the definition concerning the timeframe for receiving money and said she was  
50 not clear on this. Using examples from previous projects, P. Basiliere explained this; the town is trusting the money  
51 will be there. A ranking of 5 would mean funds are available and the timeframe is certain.

1 **MINUTES**  
2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**  
3  
4

5 John Andruszkiewicz  
6

7 **e. Non-property tax revenue and fees offset a portion of costs (excludes capital reserve funds):**

8 He ranked this as 1 stating there is no revenue from a new electrical panel.  
9

10 *An assessment of the project's income and when the town will receive the payments.*  
11

12 An example for this would be an ambulance that bills out. Recreation and Transfer Station are departments in town  
13 that receive revenue from certain services; there are only a few.  
14

15 Kathy Parenti  
16

17 **f. Identified in a long-range plan or program:**  
18

19 *An assessment of the degree to which the project supports departmental long-range capital investment plans or the*  
20 *town's master plan.*  
21

22 This project is part of the Town's long range planning and has been part of the planning for some time. She ranked it  
23 as 5.

24 Susan Smith asked if this should be ranked like criteria g; either a 1 or a 5 since there does not seem to be an  
25 example for this with ranks of 2-4. Peter Basiliere asked should the ranking for this be changed or should this  
26 criteria be removed and what is the value in having this. This topic was discussed; either remove it or change the  
27 ranking to be 1 or 5. Chair stated, unless this needs to be covered per the RSA, this should just be removed.

28 Terrey Dolan will check the RSA and will follow-up with the committee. Until this can be confirmed, the criteria  
29 will remain with a ranking of either 1 or 5.  
30

31 Susan Smith  
32

33 **g. Addresses an emergency or immediate public safety need or a state or federal mandate:**  
34

35 *Focused on critical town infrastructure, the current or imminent failure or government requirements require*  
36 *immediate action, including a special town meeting if the loss must be repaired or replaced before the next annual*  
37 *meeting. The rating is either a 1 or a 5.*  
38

39 S. Smith asked about the wording regarding a special town meeting. The threshold is \$75,000 out of the emergency  
40 capital reserve fund; if cost is more than this then there should be a special town meeting. It must be significant  
41 enough to impact the operation of the town.  
42

43 The ranking for her is a 1 since it is not an emergency yet. The topic of the special town meeting was discussed.  
44

45 **h. Benefits residents, businesses, or a segment thereof:**  
46

47 *A qualitative assessment of the degree to which the community benefits from the project. The ratings approximate*  
48 *multiples of 20% of the community, with a 1 ranging from 1% to 20% and a 5 ranging from 81% to 100%.*  
49

50 S. Smith said she needs to understand the approximate percentage of the community which is served, and how to  
51 determine the ranking without this information. P. Basiliere: that information is not on the project request form so an  
52 estimate may need to be made. B. Cooper: how does an electrical panel benefit the residents? P. Basiliere: as  
53 previously stated in criteria b this would be a lower ranking; as an example a Fire Truck would be 100%. This was  
54 discussed. Emergency Services, for example, would be 100% even if only 20% utilize the services. More examples  
55 were given. Susan Smith stated she would rank this as 1.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 **MINUTES**  
2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 Paul Bartolomucci  
8

9 **i. Increases the delivery of social services:**

10  
11 *The degree to which the project provides tangible public services that offer support and assistance to community*  
12 *segments. The rating ranges from a 1 for no increase to a 5 for the project's focus on disadvantaged resident.*  
13

14 P. Bartolomucci: the library provides lots of social services, but will a new electrical panel increase that; no but it  
15 would decrease the services if it failed. Numerous examples were given and discussions continued. Paul  
16 Bartolomucci stated that in referring to the actual meaning of this, being an electrical panel, he ranked it as 1.

17 P. Bartolomucci: The Library provides many services, more than most realize, but when it comes to the electrical  
18 panel (unless it fails); it does not affect the services to the public.  
19

20 Susan Smith: how can this project be ranked as a 5? As a committee we know it needs to be replaced. B. Cooper: it  
21 is a safety issue. Discussion continued in terms of how to rank this project.  
22

23 **j. Supports job creation and development by retail, commercial, or industrial businesses operating in**  
24 **Milford:**  
25

26 *The project enables business expansion within the town that results in job creation or higher-paying jobs. The rating*  
27 *ranges from a 1 for slight growth to a 5 for firm, committed additions by existing or new-to-town businesses.*  
28

29 P. Bartolomucci this project will not provide additional jobs. Some ideas were brought up and discussed in terms of  
30 job creation as examples for projects that would apply to this. One of the main ideas brought up was how improved  
31 services, offerings in the town, draw businesses/people from outside to live and/or work in the town.  
32

33 Mike Thornton  
34

35 **k. Increases the commercial or industrial tax base:**  
36

37 *The project enables business expansion within the town that increases the tax base. The rating ranges from a 1 for*  
38 *slight growth or completion after the CIP period to a 5 for a firm, committed expansion in the first or second year of*  
39 *the CIP period.*  
40

41 M. Thornton feels this should rank as 1. An electrical panel will not increase the tax base. Some examples were  
42 given for projects that would be relevant to this criteria. P. Basiliere there is another element to this; the time frame  
43 for the growth.  
44

45 Patricia Kenyon  
46

47 **l. Provides capacity for anticipated or planned residential, commercial, or industrial growth:**  
48

49 *An assessment of the degree to which the project supports known residential or business growth. The rating ranges*  
50 *from a 1 for projects that have been brought to the Planning Board or will be within six months to a 5 for firm,*  
51 *committed proposals that have received all appropriate regulatory approvals.*  
52

53 P. Kenyon: An electrical panel will not support growth. The ranking would be 1 since this is the lowest.  
54 Chair, for examples, what would the residents be buying for planned residential, commercial or industrial growth?  
55 Ideas were discussed.  
56  
57

58 The form itself was discussed. It was noted the form does seem to lean more towards emergency vehicles and  
59 infrastructures.

1 **MINUTES**  
2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023**  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 **Review and Approval of Mtg. Minutes: 08/30/2023 Mtg.**  
8

9 Two corrections:

10 Page 2 line 12: Aquar Funds (change from: Aqua Funds)

11 Page 2 line 14: final figures for the March Warrant Article (change from: final figures for the Warrant Article in  
12 March 2023)  
13

14 P. Basiliere asked for a motion to approve minutes of 8/30/2023 with corrections. Bill Cooper made a motion to  
15 approve and Susan Smith seconded. All were in favor (P. Basiliere abstained from voting since he was not in  
16 attendance at this meeting).  
17

18  
19 **Upcoming Meetings**  
20

21 9/27/2023 (primary ranking meeting)

22 10/04/2023 (discussion and summation of rankings with the spread sheet)  
23  
24

25 **Other Business**  
26

27 For next week, Chair asked members to start working on their individual forms. Discussion ensued about the process  
28 for updating the spread sheet with information from each member's evaluation form for each project as well as the  
29 process for completing evaluation forms. Projects for 2024 will be ranked with 2025 projects looked at. School  
30 Projects will be part of the ranking.  
31

32 Upcoming BOS meetings were discussed in terms of when the CIP rankings will be available as well as  
33 coordination with the Planning Board. In addition, the timing for public notice was discussed and the statute will be  
34 reviewed to determine this.  
35  
36

37 **Adjournment**  
38

39 Chair Basiliere made a motion to adjourn and all were in favor. Meeting adjourned.