

Town of Milford
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 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: 09/06/23 Mtg., 09/13/23 Mtg. & 09/20/23 Mtg.
3. Member Prioritization and Ranking of Department Requested Projects, Evaluation & Ranking Discussion
4. Upcoming Meetings: 10/4/23
5. Other Business
6. Adjournment

Call to Order

Peter Basiliere called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. He started with an introduction of the members and all were present.

Review and Approval of Mtg. Minutes

There has been a delay with availability of the taped meetings. The priority has been updates in video and audio equipment. Meeting minutes will be transcribed when the latest meetings are available to view.

Committee Discussion on Definitions, Project Evaluation & Scoring Criteria

Chair Basiliere started with explaining the *COMMITTEE EVALUATION SPREAD SHEET* is available on his computer and this will be displayed on the overhead screen. He will go around the table asking for each member's rankings for the 2024 projects which will then be input to the spread sheet.

Each member then conveyed their rankings to the Chair which were put into the respective members' column for the 2024 projects on the spread sheet.

Mike Thornton asked about the School District projects. Chair Basiliere said he wanted to handle those projects ranked separately in order to make better use of the committee's time in this meeting by discussing the projects that

1 were just ranked; time permitting in this meeting, perhaps the School District can be discussed at the end of the
2 meeting.

3 **MINUTES**

4 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 27, 2023**

5
6 When the committee rankings were completed being input onto the spread sheet, Chair then moved forward with
7 questions about the rankings by the committee members for each project ranked. The purpose was to ensure
8 members were in agreement with the definitions in terms of how they ranked projects; not to change the rankings to
9 be the same because everyone has their own point of view given the facts presented.

10 11 **Band Stand Roof Replacement**

12
13 Criteria g: addressing an emergency or public safety need which calls for a ranking of 1 OR 5. P. Bartolomucci
14 explained his view on this; it is a place where the public gathers and there are matching funds for the project so he
15 feels there is urgency there. Chair noted the definition for this calls for a special Town Meeting which would make it
16 a very high priority; this project would not rank as a 5 so it has to be a 1. Paul Bartolomucci agreed and changed his
17 ranking to 1.

18
19 Project Urgency Classification: Updates were made for members after the discussion for this classification with
20 most members changing to a 4, 5 or 6; further discussions continued and updates were made to the spread sheet.
21 Paul Bartolomucci feels if the Department Heads are bringing these projects to the forefront by submitting them to
22 the CIP, then the urgency must be 5 or 6; otherwise why would the departments bring these projects forward. It was
23 noted by Mike Thornton the CIP is looking at all projects for the entire town.

24
25 Criteria b: improving the quality of life for residents was discussed. Bill Cooper explained how he perceives his
26 priorities in terms of the benefit to students. While the Band Stand may not benefit every resident, it is an historical
27 structure that has been part of the town since 1860. It is a big part of the town's identity.

28
29 Criteria d: matching funds were discussed due to a distinct disparity in the rankings. Chair said his ranking of 4 was
30 because there are funds available from fund raisers, but it may not be there forever. This point was elaborated on in
31 terms of money being available for a project. As a result of the discussions, changes were made to the spread sheet
32 to a higher number for some of the members.

33
34 Criteria e: non-property tax revenue and fees that offset a part of the cost. The rankings for members were discussed
35 and updates made. There is no revenue obtained from the Band Stand. Updates based on discussions were made.

36
37 Criteria i: increases delivery of social services. The Chair gave examples of how the Band Stand is used for certain
38 functions but the project itself will not increase social services. Updates based on discussions were made.

39
40 Chair informed the committee about the average number on the spread sheet and how this number is applied for the
41 projects. The spread sheet is not how the determinations are made but a tool to assist with prioritizing projects given
42 the entire picture for the town's requested 2024 projects.

43 44 **Bridge Capital Reserve**

45
46 Peter Basiliere started by saying he did not rank this project because of his views on Capital Reserve Funds; if it was
47 for an actual bridge project it would be different but he feels Capital Reserve use is not a project but a withdrawal of
48 funds. It is for projects which the Capital Reserve is used for. It does affect the tax rate, but not a Capital Project
49 Expenditure. Mike Thornton stated it does come out of the town's revenue. P. Basiliere went on to say that once he
50 has a chance to think about this, he will rank the project; without a rank it will show as zero. The topic of a zero rank
51 was discussed in terms of the final figure and other projects.

52
53 Susan Smith: Even though this is designated for bridge repair, it is unknown which bridge will be repaired in 2024 at
54 \$500,000. P. Basiliere: the money that is put into Capital Reserve in one year is actually used for the next year and
55 the money is saved. M. Thornton: bridges are going to be constantly repaired which means that ever year \$500,000
56 will need to be set aside for a bridge even though it may not be the entire bridge.

57 Susan Smith: essentially the CIP is evaluating if the reserve should be funded annually. P. Basiliere feels this should
58 not be on CIP but the BOS may decide otherwise.

59 M. Thornton: If every year the same amount is put into Capital Reserve, it will be about a number of bridges.

60 P. Bartolomucci noted that larger culverts come under bridge repair; he cited recent rains that washed out culverts.

1 It was left that a decision needs to be made about Capital Reserve spending and if it should be a project for CIP
2 review.

3 **MINUTES**

4 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 27, 2023**

5
6 **Pennichuck Booster Pump Station**

7
8 Criteria d: Matching Funds; members agreed this is a 5 for this criteria; \$1,000,000 is available from the county.
9

10 Project Urgency: M. Thornton feels it should be rated a 4 which means it could wait for up to 6 years. After
11 discussion, he agreed it needs a 5 ranking due to the wait time. In view of the money from the county and the time
12 line, these facts call for a higher ranking.
13

14 Criteria l: Provides capacity for anticipated or planned growth; this project will supply more water for the town. In
15 addition, once the pump is installed it can be easily changed to produce even a greater flow of water. After
16 discussion, rankings were changed. It was noted, this does not include residents on wells. This point was debated.
17 Even though not on this system, it will make the town a more attractive place to live. After discussions, members
18 made changes to their original rankings.
19

20 Criteria g: Addresses an emergency or immediate need or state/federal mandate; the meeting of September 20, 2023
21 this criteria was discussed in terms of the definition. The ranking for this criteria is a 1 OR 5. As a result, it was felt
22 there are no projects that would be ranked as a 5. Having noted this, updates were made to the spread sheet.
23

24 **Truck, 36K GVW (Replace 2005 Sterling Vehicle)**

25
26 Project Urgency: Chair noted the disparities in the rankings. It was noted that during the presentation DPW stated
27 less trucks would be needed if there were more trucks with 10 wheels. This point was discussed and it was pointed
28 out this would be the first 10 wheeler purchased. In addition, the current truck is 15 years old with a standard
29 transmission. As a result of discussions, updates were made to the urgency by giving it higher rankings.
30

31 Criteria c: results in departmental operating budget cost savings or improved performance. Updates were made.
32

33 Criteria b: improves quality of life for residents; discussions began on this topic and examples given for giving this a
34 higher ranking. As a result, updates were made.
35

36 Criteria i: increases the delivery of social services. This is a lower ranking as agreed; a new truck does not provide
37 social services.
38

39 **Town Hall Repair and Maintenance Program – HVAC Replacement**

40
41 Project Urgency: differences in rankings were addressed and updates made as members felt necessary to do so; this
42 project has been an item for some time now.
43

44 Criteria c: results in departmental operating budget cost savings or improved performance. Paul Bartolomucci feels
45 there will be less money spent on repairs and ongoing maintenance initially; therefore this will reduce operating
46 costs. P. Basiliere noted the environment for the staff will improve which will improve efficiency/performance.
47

48 Other criteria were briefly touched on; updates made as a member felt necessary to do but there were no detailed
49 discussions or debates.
50

51 **Reconstruction of Town Roads**

52
53 Criteria g: Addresses an emergency or immediate need or state/federal mandate. This was discussed, and in view of
54 the definition that requires a special Town Meeting and the fact this is ranked as either a 1 OR 5, rankings were
55 changed to 1's.
56

57 Criteria c: results in departmental operating budget cost savings or improved performance. P. Basiliere noted he
58 ranked lower because it does not directly affect the operating budget for the department.
59

1 Other criteria were briefly touched on; updates made as a member felt necessary to do but there were no detailed
2 discussions or debates.

3
4 **MINUTES**

5 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 27, 2023**

6
7
8
9 At this point in the meeting, the Chair noted the time as 8:30 p.m. and the fact the meeting had been in session for 2
10 hours. Given that, it was agreed to move the last 2 projects and one of the School District projects to the next
11 meeting on October 4, 2023.

12
13 Project to be added to the spread sheet:

- 14 - School District: CTE Program

15
16 P. Basiliere will update the COMMITTEE EVALUATION SPREAD SHEET and send to all the committee members.

17
18
19 **Upcoming Meetings: 10/04/2023, 10/11/2023**

20
21 10/4/2023: Terrey Dolan stated for this next meeting: Meeting Minutes, Spread Sheet for Tax Rate, Ranking of
22 remaining projects (remaining scores will be sent to P. Basiliere). The tax impact will be evaluated along with the
23 project final ratings to decide which projects will be put forward to the BOS for possible acceptance for the vote in
24 March.

25
26 **Other Business**

27
28
29 **Adjournment**

30
31 Chair Basiliere made a motion to adjourn and all were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.