

Town of Milford
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
August 16, 2023

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

Not Present: School District Representative

Recording Clerk: Jane Hesketh, Community Development

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Presentation of Requests
 - a. Arene Berry, Recreation Department Director
 - b. Eric Schelberg, Ambulance Department Director
3. Continued Committee Discussion on Definitions, Project Evaluation & Scoring Criteria
4. Upcoming Meetings: 8/23/22, 8/30/22
5. Other Business
6. Adjournment

Call to Order

Peter Basiliere, Chair, opened the meeting. Chair then took attendance around the table. With the exception of a School District representative, all members were present along with Community Development Director Terrence Dolan.

Department Presentations

a. Arene Berry, Recreation Department Director

Lincoln Daley, Town Administrator, was in attendance to present the proposals for the Recreation Department.

1. Removal of 127 Elm St. Building

L. Daley started by saying this is a similar request made 2 years ago. He explained why this request is being made; part of a phased approach to the eventual development of a Town Community Center. This plan was discussed in 2016 along with 2023. The plan is to have this as a warrant article for 2024. Cost is estimated to be \$520,000. It was noted, that due to inflation, this figure is substantially higher than the figure given with the project request from 2023. L. Daley explained it will need to go through the bidding process to get a final figure.

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 16, 2023**

3
4
5 **1. Removal of 127 Elm St. Building**

6
7 Mr. Daley explained the reasoning for this project is basically a culmination of many years of deciding what to do
8 with this property. It was purchased by the Town in 2015. Having a community center would provide numerous
9 benefits for the community. A feasibility study was conducted in 2023. There was a phased master plan. This study
10 recommended the building should be demolished since renovation costs would not be financially justifiable, and the
11 existing building would not function well as a community center. A community center addresses the needs of the
12 community for recreational programs. In addition, there is a safety issue since the building is condemned (but is still
13 being used for storage); it has a warning posted not to enter. Again, the previous studies showed this to provide
14 many benefits for residents in the community.

15
16 From a cost perspective, it could increase the tax base.

17
18 P. Basiliere: Explain how it will increase the tax base. L. Daley: the cost to create a new facility. This was discussed
19 among committee members. While it will not bring additional residents into the community, it will provide a
20 regional resource. M. Thornton asked about residents paying a user fee. L. Daley stated that initially non-residents
21 may be charged.

22
23 Paul Bartolomucci explained that in 2016 when he was involved with some of the decisions on this property, there
24 was discussion about charging for room rentals to bring in additional revenue. This would offset a tax increase. He
25 added the first part of getting this project started is to demolish the existing building. He went on to explain that on
26 the Milford Town website there is a 2016 report that is a 10 year plan. He did say the development of a community
27 center was going to be done in phases and L. Daley confirmed this.

28
29 John Andruszkiewicz to L. Daley: what is the safety concern with the existing building? L. Daley explained there is
30 vandalism being done and there are people still entering the building even though it has been posted not to enter.

31
32 Susan Smith: on the impact to cost and maintenance, she asked about the current costs for this and how many
33 security incidents there have been. L. Daley said he will follow up with DPW and the Police Department on this. He
34 added there is still power going to the building that generates an electrical cost, but no water, sewer or heat. There
35 are areas of the building that are deteriorating faster than others and work needs to be done to correct this.

36
37 S. Smith asked: Where does the debris go when demolished? L. Daley explained the prior contracts stated
38 contractors would remove all materials offsite, and there would be an environmental inspection done as well to
39 determine any contaminants in the debris.

40
41 Lincoln Daley stated there is a desire to move ahead with this overall project. There are additional sources of
42 funding being looked at for the demolition to alleviate costs to the tax payers. He emphasized the Select Board will
43 need input on this in order to move it ahead or as a 2024 warrant article.

44
45 P. Basiliere asked about the General Obligation Bond funding that is noted on the request and if the Select Board
46 would be willing to use that with the idea the bond value would be depleted. L. Daley said this is something to be
47 determined after the CIP process.

48
49 Chair Basiliere asked if there were any further questions on this. Hearing none he moved to the next request.

50
51 **2. Town Community Lands Recreation Fields**

52
53 Lincoln Daley explained this is a project for the horizon. The project is to develop additional recreational/sports
54 fields in the Bronx Community Lands. It was part of a 2005 and 2014 Bronx Community Lands Master Plan. In
55 those plans there was desire to use the gravel pit for various purposes. The first part of this project is to remove the
56 gravel from the pit in order to allow for future expansion. There is a desire to move the gravel this year in order to
57 move ahead with the master plan and revise the master plan looking at the needs of the community. In the long term
58 the request is to ultimately develop athletic fields on this land.

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 16, 2023**

3
4
5 **2. Town Community Lands Recreation Fields**

6
7 Paul Bartolomucci asked about the plans for a Solar Farm that was proposed to be constructed and is revenue still
8 being received from renting the land to the contractor building the Solar Farm. L. Daley responded: he said he will
9 display a layout of the land. In 2019 the Town entered into an agreement with the contractor that was for a 2-3 year
10 time frame for them to do “their due diligence” and research the property. There was a 1 year extension on this
11 contract in 2022 which expires mid-September 2023. At a recent Select Board Meeting, a request was made by the
12 solar company to extend this contract. This request is being reviewed by the Select Board. L. Daley then displayed a
13 layout of the land in question which is the Community Lands that consists of approximately 140-145 acres. L. Daley
14 proceeded to point out places on this parcel where the following are being considered: school or other purposes;
15 cemetery; ball fields; and other purposes. The Solar Farm, he pointed out, would be placed on the industrial zone of
16 the town. The current layout has been discussed. Mr. Daley went into detail about the plans for the Community
17 Lands. He went on to explain the town is currently negotiating with the solar company to build a solar farm on the
18 approximately 90 acres of town and abutting property. He complete his presentation about the solar farm by saying
19 this is being worked on with the idea negotiations will be completed by the deadline date of September 22, 2023.
20 L. Daley added that in regards to the request for ball fields, this is a first consideration and then look ahead to other
21 uses for this land.

22
23 Susan Smith to Lincoln Daley: there is a section of land near Heron Pond School that is currently being groomed, is
24 this part of the ball field development for this land? L. Daley: he explained the land is being groomed as part of a
25 maintenance operation and then using the display, he detailed the process for the committee as part of future
26 development. Paul Bartolomucci added that part of the problem in using this area is the lack of parking and L. Daley
27 confirmed this.

28
29 Susan Smith to Lincoln Daley: do you have an idea of when other structures, other than an athletic field, will be
30 developed on this land. L. Daley: there have been discussions about the future plans for this property; the school is
31 looking to expand the building. He added it is difficult to speculate the uses for the future which then ties into
32 updating the Master Plan for this property and this will include the school needs as well. Susan Smith added the
33 School Board is looking into a 5 year plan and feels athletic fields seems to limit the use for this land. L. Daley
34 added athletic fields can be used for other purposes and the main idea is to get the land groomed and ready to move
35 forward. Athletic fields can be developed easily vs developing an entire building; this would be for the short term.

36
37 John Andruszkiewicz to L. Daley: what’s the end date for the gravel operation? L. Daley: in discussions with the
38 contractor, there is about 1-2 years of gravel removal still to be done.

39
40 Susan Smith asked about the cost and the scheduled date since those project items are not filled in. L. Daley
41 explained this project is on the horizon and there are no concrete plans to date. He added the cost will be above the
42 CIP \$75,000 threshold. Chair Basiliere added, in terms of the urgency class, it will be either “desirable needed
43 within 4-6 years” or “premature needs for research”.

44
45 Susan Smith then asked what would be needed to just grade the property to make it developable. She understands
46 there are still plans to be established on the use, but feels this would be a good starting point to get the land prepared.
47 P. Basiliere asked which part of the land S. Smith was referring to. S. Smith said she is referring to the gravel pits
48 which L. Daley talked about and added: “What would be just the base cost for grading the space once the gravel is
49 removed?” L. Daley said he will get back to the committee in terms of the cost Susan Smith asked about.

50
51 Susan Smith to Lincoln Daley: to clarify, the ball fields could be a potential short term use for the land and then later
52 on used for something else: “Is this correct?” Lincoln Daley: yes. S. Smith to L. Daley: “how long then would the
53 ball fields be in existence?” L. Daley: it will depend on the other uses and plans for the future.

54
55 Mike Thornton asked about where the school expansion would be located. L. Daley responded the school would be
56 located in the middle with the fields around it, but the plan was developed in 2014 and needs to be updated and the
57 document is still in the planning phase.

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 16, 2023**

3
4 **3. Community Center**

5
6 Lincoln Daley began the presentation by saying this project ties in with the other project presented. The overall cost
7 is approximately \$9,000,000 and will be a 32000 sq. ft. facility. If a gymnasium is attached to the facility, the cost
8 would be over \$10,000,000. The need for a community center has been identified with previous studies.

9
10 This project is long term and it is on the horizon for future consideration. This will improve programming for
11 recreation. Lincoln Daley went on to explain the various plans for recreation and pedestrian uses in the town.
12 All these plans are part of a phased approach to develop needs identified in the previous studies.

13
14 Mike Thornton asked about what the project entails in regards to where the facility will be built. Lincoln Daley
15 stated the recommendation was to build a new facility after 127 Elm St. is demolished. There are a number of
16 constructive ideas to be decided on with one being to add on to the existing pool facility all of which will needed to
17 be explored.

18
19 Paul Bartolomucci spoke by saying he is a member of the Recreation Commission. He went on to say that the first
20 study design was to build where 127 Elm Street is. The latest design is \$60,000. The Recreation Commission sent a
21 letter to BOS saying they liked both designs and would like to work with them over the next 5-10 years to develop
22 programming the community needs. It will be multi-generational; will provide day care, after school programs, and
23 senior programs. Eventually, the initial plan was to develop a bridge to connect properties. He said the plan is
24 available on the website. L. Daley added with the acquisition of the land behind Brookstone Manor there will be
25 Dog Park installed there and to connect the properties. P. Bartolomucci added that Recreation has already
26 established a walking path from the Boys and Girls Club to 127 Elm Street with exercise equipment that was
27 previously stored there. This was approved by the BOS and all funding was through a grant.

28
29 Susan Smith to Paul Bartolomucci: "why is this so far out; 5-10 years and is the need not there right now?" P.
30 Bartolomucci: the need is there but the study showed the town does not have the tax base in order to support this;
31 basically it has to do with funding and if phased in the impact will not be substantial. Grants are always being
32 looked at but there is very little available for senior programming. L. Daley added this is just the beginning part of
33 developing programs.

34
35 Paul Dargie, BOS, stepped to the microphone. He asked a question about the cost of the Community Center being at
36 \$7,000,000 which is Phase 5, are there costs for Phases 1 thru 4? Lincoln Daley responded; there are no concrete
37 plans at the moment because the long term plans for the Community Center are being looked at. P. Dargie asked to
38 clarify if this means the Community Center will come before the plans that are still in the discussion/planning
39 stages. Lincoln Daley responded saying the Community Center has always been considered the last phase. Due to
40 the fact that both reports stated it would be necessary to demolish 127 Elm Street; given this the Community Center
41 plans were developed. He went to say the subsequent phases are dependent on that building being demolished.
42 P. Dargie: he agrees the building needs to go but from a planning level wouldn't it be best to establish a cost for
43 Phases 1-4. Lincoln Daley said the challenge is that the other phases are still up for discussion. Paul Bartolomucci
44 added the letter to the BOS was to work with the Select Board to establish the phases and what they would include
45 then once this was identified a cost analysis would be done that would be agreeable to all involved, but right now a
46 cost analysis cannot be done.

47
48 Paul Dargie stated he understands what has been said, but just found it curious that phase 5 was presented without
49 the other phases.

50
51 Chair Basiliere stated the point brought up is a good one and asked if an amount should be slated for the next 5 years
52 for the phases coming up. Paul Bartolomucci interjected by saying right now a cost cannot be determined because
53 the project/phases have not been agreed to. Paul Dargie recommended the CIP use the figure of \$6,000,000 as a
54 starting point for phases 1-4 for the horizon. Pete Basiliere asked if this will be within the next 5 years. Lincoln
55 Daley said it is for the horizon. Discussion continued about this topic especially in regards to the demolition of
56 127 Elm Street. A question was raised about the cost on the first bid; L. Daley said it was about \$400,000.
57 P. Basiliere asked if L. Daley could put together a history on the cost to demolish the building. Paul Dargie brought
58 up issue of the asbestos and the cost for that may be separate from the demolition.

59
60 Chair Basiliere asked if there was anything else. There was not. He moved to the next project request.

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 16, 2023**

3
4 **b. Eric Schelberg, Ambulance Department Director**

5
6 Mr. Schelberg came forward to make his presentation. The request is to replace the 2013 (3B) ambulance in 2028.
7 The department is trying to maintain a 5 year replacement cycle for the 3 ambulances that are in service. There are 2
8 ambulances that are staffed daily and the 3rd ambulance is called a “ready spare”. One ambulance operates 24 hours
9 a day and one for 16 hours a day.

10
11 In 2013, the Ambulance Department was able to purchase 2 ambulances and the older one was kept as a ready spare.
12 The objective is to have an ambulance last 15 years in life cycle. First 10 years the ambulance will operate daily and
13 the last 5 years it will be a ready spare. The idea is that one ambulance will operate in the 24 hour role for 5 years
14 and the other will operate in the 16 hour role for 5 years. After 5 years, the 24 hour ambulance will be the backup;
15 the 16 hour will move to 24 hours and the new ambulance will operate at the 16 hour role. Every 5 years the rotation
16 will continue and the spare ambulance will be taken out of service. The purpose of this is to avoid purchasing two
17 ambulances in one year. The current 2013 spare ambulance has 149,000 miles on it. E. Schelberg went on to explain
18 the ambulance service is getting about 2000 calls a year and the ambulances are adding up the miles on them; the 16
19 hour ambulance is getting approximately 25,000 miles a year and the 24 hour ambulance 35,000 miles yearly. He
20 continued by stating the backup ambulance places an important role by ensuring calls can be answered if both daily
21 ambulances are in service, a daily ambulance is down for repairs, and helps with surrounding communities not
22 having to step in.

23
24 The cost increase for new ambulances just keeps going up by about 10% yearly. He also explained the other costs
25 that go up. E. Schelberg hopes it will not be a 10% increase yearly, but this is the information he is getting from the
26 vendors. Durable equipment costs are also on the rise. Given the projected 10% yearly increases for the ambulance
27 and the durable equipment, the cost for a new vehicle is projected to be \$685,000 in 2028.

28
29 E. Schelberg explained there is a timeline of 18-24 months before a new ambulance is received. He noted the Select
30 Board did not want to purchase an ambulance before 2025. He stated the request is to have a new ambulance for
31 2028, but the time frame for ordering is not part of that request. P. Basiliere stated this should then be presented to
32 voters sooner. E. Schelberg stated probably 2026 given the length of time to receive and in order to maintain the 5
33 year cycle.

34
35 Dana Dahl asked about the normal life cycle of an ambulance. E. Schelberg answered said it is based on wear and
36 tear, and this will require more maintenance. D. Dahl asked about the life cycle for the durable equipment. E.
37 Schelberg answered based on the individual pieces, but said it is usually less than 10 years. Discussions ensued
38 about increased mileage with the number of calls; especially since many calls result in service to Manchester. In
39 addition, there is service for mutual aid communities.

40
41 A question was raised about the funding from Capital Reserve. E. Schelberg said the Capital Reserve was used to
42 purchase the ambulance currently on order so the fund has been depleted. E. Schelberg brought up an idea
43 Selectman Dargie had brought up about using department revenue to purchase vehicles. With a 5 year cycle, with an
44 estimated \$100,000 of revenue put into a revolving fund, this could then be put towards new vehicles. This is a topic
45 for discussion with the BOS. Additional discussion continued on this subject.

46
47 Patricia Kenyon asked about the mutual aid communities and if they pay for the service and if it is by the mile. E.
48 Schelberg said these communities are charged by the mile in addition to a base charge for the service provided.
49 There are about 30-40 times a year that mutual aid is provided. The subject of staffing was brought up because of
50 the shortage.

51
52 Paul Bartolomucci to Eric Schelberg: just to confirm the revenue that is currently received from all the transports
53 goes to general funds so the discussion should be about how much of that will go towards vehicle purchases and
54 how much of the general funds can be used. E. Schelberg currently revenue is about \$800,000 yearly. There was
55 further discussion on this.

56
57 S. Smith and P. Basiliere both confirmed with E. Schelberg that the request is for 2028, but ideally the
58 need to keep the 5 year cycle would mean the ambulance needs to be in service for 2028, therefore,
59 purchased in 2026. E. Schelberg confirmed this to be the case.

1 **MINUTES**

2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 16, 2023**

3
4
5 **b. Eric Schelberg, Ambulance Department Director**

6
7 Mr. Dargie stepped forward to provide guidance on this point. He stated this should be looked at as to when the bill
8 will actually be paid vs when the order is actually placed; therefore, those 2 dates need to be factored in to the
9 decision process for CIP. Mr. LaBonte confirmed there was a fire truck purchased before receipt of the vehicle.
10 Mike Thornton pointed out that doing it this way will save money in the way of interest.

11
12 The ready spare ambulance, when taken out of service, is usually traded in. This time, however, there will be an
13 auction with a sealed bid. The decision on this is still to be made. The usual amount received for a trade-in has been
14 \$1500.

15
16 Susan Smith asked about leasing vs buying. E. Schelberg said Capital Reserve has always been used in the past
17 which eliminated the need to pay interest. In 2013 it was a lease/purchase with interest having to be paid. It depends
18 on the BOS and the voters on how to pay for the new ambulance.

19
20 Chair Basiliere asked if there was anything else. There was not.

21
22
23 **Committee Discussion on Definitions, Project Evaluation & Scoring Criteria**

24
25 Chair Basiliere began with using the form provided to the members. He went on to say it is best to start now to
26 understand the form and the definitions and these apply to the project. For this meeting he wants to begin with the
27 "URGENCY" category. He referred to page 2 of the evaluation form which shows the Project Urgency Class
28 scoring as part of RSA 674:6; the 6 classes are shown below the CIP Purpose and Description. He continued by
29 explaining it is not a scale of 1 to 6, but how the project is viewed in terms of its urgency. He asked the committee if
30 there were any questions about the Urgency Classes.

31
32 D. Dahl asked about classification score 6 "Urgent". She went on to say to her this means it needs to be done right
33 now and why was this not budgeted for before. P. Basiliere brought up a project from 2023 about the Waste Water
34 Treatment. He explained why this came up seemingly suddenly. P. Basiliere feels it should be looked at in terms of;
35 "needed now" or "extremely needed". There were examples presented and discussed.

36
37 The project evaluation process was discussed. Each member will present their individual evaluations and these
38 evaluations will then be put onto a master sheet that will determine the average rating. Discussions continued about
39 the process with input from members who participated in the process in 2022. Various examples were discussed in
40 regards to what is considered for the evaluation and rating. Chris Labonte offered his input based on his experience
41 from being on the CIP in 2022.

42
43 Class #1 was discussed and evaluated. Chair said it should be looked at in terms of the Town Master Plan and if it
44 fits in with that.

45
46 Director Dolan emphasized the links provided on the Recreation Requests be researched. The links are to the plans
47 that have been discussed in detail and provide information that can help CIP members with their evaluations.

48
49 Chair Basiliere asked the committee to review the URGENCY classes for the next meeting and to look at the 12
50 categories for scoring (listed as a-l under the urgency classes). He said there were different views during the 2022
51 process. He wants everyone to have a common understanding when it comes to the 12 categories for scoring. He
52 plans to review these over the next 3 meetings.

53
54 The topic of when the 10 year plan will be revised. Terrence Dolan told the committee there were no bids submitted
55 for the project. T. Dolan learned many of the consulting firms are very busy right now. The plan is to put it out for
56 bid later this year.

1 **MINUTES**
2 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 16, 2023**
3
4
5
6

7 **Upcoming Meetings: 8/23/22, 8/30/22**
8
9

10
11 **Other Business**
12

13 Director Dolan presented the upcoming requests for each department (no request from the Police Department).
14 Lincoln Daley will stand in for Terrey Dolan on September 13, 2023 and that will be the presentation for DPW and
15 this will be held at the Police Station.

16 Discussion began regarding what meetings to present which of the upcoming requests. The School Projects were
17 briefly discussed in regards to the costs.

18 Library and Fire will be presented on 8/23/2023.
19

20 Chair Basiliere brought up the threshold of \$75,000 for CIP and should it be increased. He also asked for
21 clarification for a non-residents' participation in the CIP Process.
22

23 Committee members agreed it would be best to complete the Project Evaluation Forms weekly and bring them to the
24 next meeting.
25

26
27 **Adjournment**

28 P. Basiliere adjourned the meeting at 8:48 p.m.