

Public Works and Buildings Committee
City Hall Council Chambers
Meeting Minutes
November 17, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilor Donald Hamann, Chairman
Councilor Jim Gray, Vice Chairman
Councilor Steve Beaudoin
Councilor Alexander de Geofroy

OTHERS ABSENT

Councilor John LaRochelle (Excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Peter C. Nourse PE, Director of City Service
Lisa Clark, Administration & Utility Billing Supervisor
Dan Camara, DPW GIS

MINUTES

Councilor Hamann called the Public Works and Building Committee to order at 7PM

1. Approval of October 20, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Councilor Beaudoin made a motion to accept the minutes of the October 20, 2022 as presented. Councilor Gray seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Input

No Public Input

3. Rt 202A Water Main Extension & Tank Project.

Mr. Nourse explained that this is \$13.5 million dollar project to bring water main to the Rt. 202A corridor. He stated this main could supply as many as one hundred and sixty household (160), many of which have contaminated well water. Mr. Nourse stated the project has been underway for many months and he is bringing this forward as an update to the Committee. He stated that to date three miles of water main have been installed from the tank site, cross country to Bickford Road and out to 202A heading west to near Sampson Road. He stated that the Winkley Farm subdivision water main is completed and the tie-in to Dustin Homestead is completed. Mr. Nourse stated that there was some initial confusion regarding the required backflow devices for homeowners that want to keep their wells for irrigation. He stated that an information letter will be supplied to each homeowner that explains this in detail to eliminate the confusion. Councilor Beaudoin asked if a well was only tied to irrigation and not to the home would they still need a testable reduced pressure zone (RPZ) device. Mr. Nourse stated that yes, they would need to have a high hazard device that would be tested annually. Mr. Nourse stated the water tank pedestal has been completed to the necessary height for the steel water tank. The steel bottom of the tank is next, but due to material delays the tank will not be online until July of 2023. Mr. Nourse stated this does not prohibit the ability to

supply water to the full Rt. 202A extension. He noted that the tank is necessary for fire flows and backup for the booster station, but there is sufficient pressure for domestic use all the way to the end of the extension. Mr. Nourse stated that the ledge blasting is set to start on Fiddlehead Lane. Councilor Beaudoin asked if we are still within the budget for blasting. Mr. Nourse stated that we are. Mr. Nourse displayed some photos of the tank area and pedestal. He stated that there was a leak in the new main on Winkley Farm, but it was fixed and as the wearing course of asphalt is not down it shouldn't cause any issues with the pavement.

4. Old Gonic Road New Housing & Sewer Utility Impacts

Mr. Nourse stated that there is a proposed development, "Bayberry Common" for this site. He stated that Greene and Company are the developers and the plan is to build twenty-five (25) apartment buildings that will include one hundred and seventy (170) three-bedroom apartments. He stated the development will connect to Brock Street via Old Gonic Road and Emerson Avenue. He stated that the full build out will occur over a two-year period and that the developer plans to go to the Planning Board in January. Mr. Nourse stated that the developer will be replacing a water main and adding sidewalks on Emerson Ave, they will be contributing twenty-six thousand dollars (\$26K) to the signalization optimization at Brock Street and Rt.125 and they will be adding a shoulder to the pavement on Brock Street to add a bypass lane. Mr. Nourse explained that in addition to these contributions the development will require upgrades the Rt.125 Pump Station to increase the capacity in the area. He stated that there is potentially another smaller development of about 50 apartments off from Wadleigh Road that may request Planning Board approval but is on hold for now. He stated there were discussions about a partnership between the two developers, however Mr. Nourse stated that the Bayberry Development is moving forward without the other developer. Mr. Nourse explained that these developments and limited capacity to the area make it necessary to upgrade the Rt. 125 Sewer Pump Station. He stated that it is not a significant 20-25 year, multi-million-dollar upgrade, but there are necessary upgrades needed to increase the capacity for the developments. He stated the larger upgrade project isn't due until the end of this decade and by doing this upgrade we might be able to extend that a few years. He stated that once this upgrade for the development is completed the City will retain about ½ of the increased capacity for future development. He stated that the upgrade is estimated to cost four hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$450,000.00). He stated the agreed to cost share for the developer is one hundred seven thousand, three hundred and sixty-eight dollars (\$107,368.00). Mr. Nourse stated as the project is built the developer will also be paying Sewer System Development totaling approximately three hundred thirty-one thousand, two hundred and forty-five dollars (\$331,245.00). Mr. Nourse explained to the Committee that this project would need to be managed by the City and that at this time it is not funded. He stated if we are to work with and accommodate the developers schedule, we would need to do a supplemental appropriation to the FY2023 Budget, and he suggested a motion to appropriate the \$450,000.00 with the revenue of \$107,368.00 from the developers up front contribution and \$342,632.00 from the Sewer Systems Retained Earnings Account. Mr. Nourse stated that Finance reports that the Sewer Fund can support the cost of the project and if approved the City would enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the developer to protect the City's exposure if the developer doesn't complete the total build out. Councilor Beaudoin asked the time

frame for the needed capacity. Mr. Nourse stated that the developer estimates two years until build out. Mr. Nourse stated that due to engineering required, long lead times on this materials & specialized equipment and labor shortages we would need to get started on this right away. Councilor Beaudoin asked if the MOU would require the developer to pay the contribution and anticipated fees if he did not complete the project. Mr. Nourse stated that he believed it would, but it would need to be written that way and he would defer to the Legal Department to answer the question fully. Mr. Nourse stated that there was a proposed MOU from the developer that staff wasn't comfortable committing to as the deadlines left the City with exposure. Councilor Gray suggested that the MOU or required surety should be set up to cover the City's exposure should the developer not build or only build a portion of the development. He stated that he would be part of the discussion for the MOU, but the Legal Department would work out the details

Councilor Gray made a motion to recommend the full City Council approve a Sewer Fund Supplemental appropriation for the Rt 125 Pump Station Upgrades in the amount of \$450,000.00 with the Developers contribution of \$107,368.00 and Sewer Fund Retained Earnings of \$342,632.00 as funding sources. The motion was seconded by Councilor Beaudoin and passed unanimously.

5. Speed Tables

Mr. Nourse state that this was on the agenda as a resident had inquired why Rochester does not use speed tables as they had seen them in Durham. He stated that he had provided the Committee with information from Federal Highway Administration and NH DOT. He stated that the speed tables are not what we normally see as speed humps or bumps that are typically used in parking lots to slow speeds. He stated that historically the City Council and Public Safety Committee have not been in favor of these types of devices. Mr. Nourse stated that speed tables are larger structures that are raised three to four inches above pavement on each end and are the lengths are typically twenty to twenty-two feet to accommodate wheelbases. He stated that they are increasingly emerging in the United States. He stated that there is one at the Granite Ridge on Market Place Boulevard near AT&T. He stated it is at the crosswalk as they often are. Mr. Nourse stated that there will be one in the by-pass lane of the Strafford Square Roundabout at the location of the crosswalk. The intent is to slow traffic for the crosswalk and for the merge on to North Main from the roundabout. He stated that he is not opposed to them but to include them in the O&M it would be at the cost of something else as they are approximately three thousand each to install and then additional maintenance as they become part of our infrastructure needing signage, markings and painting Council Gray asked if the one a Market Place has caused any plowing issues. Mr. Nourse stated that it has not. Mr. Nourse stated that there are documented issues with slowing down emergency response vehicles and suspension issues. He suggested if this is ever considered that the Council be cautious as to where they are implemented and that the Fire Department and Police Department should have input on the discussion. Councilor Beaudoin stated he had read the supplied documents at that he believe they said that NFP requires Fire Department to sign off on these and the report suggested they not be used on public thorough fairs due to the emergency response times. Councilor Beaudoin stated that he agreed these should be implemented with caution and suggested that request should come to the Public Works Committee as they are additional infrastructure. Mr. Nourse stated that it could be Public Safety as the City Engineer

attends that Committee as does a Fire and Police Department Representative. He stated he defers to the Committees on how it would be handled. Councilor de Geofroy suggested that it is another tool for traffic mitigation but that he agrees it should be used with caution and discretion. Councilor Gray suggested that the Public Works and Buildings Committee should be included in the discussion. Councilor Hamann stated that all necessary staff are on Public Safety Committee and though he is not opposed to hearing it at this Committee it may belong at the Public Safety. He stated that he would discuss with the Public Safety Committee Chairman.

6. DPW Facility Budget Summary

Mr. Nourse displayed the attached budget summary on the monitor. He stated that the appropriation for the New DPW Facility was in the amount of twenty-two million dollars (\$22,000,000.00) and that twenty-one million, four hundred and forty thousand (\$21,440,000.00) was borrowed in advance for the project. Mr. Nourse explained that the actual project cost to date are twenty-one million, four hundred eighty-eight thousand, eight hundred and eighty-four dollars (\$21,488,884.00). This is forty-eight thousand, eight hundred and eighty-four dollars over the advance bonding (\$48,884.00). He stated the project is under budget with a remaining balance of five hundred eleven thousand, one hundred and eleven dollars (\$511,115.00), but he noted there are still two outstanding issues. Mr. Nourse stated that last month this Committee discussed the first issue of the required space modifications to accommodate two new positions. He stated that originally the modification costs were proposed at sixty-three thousand dollars, which included the building modifications and the furniture for the spaces. Mr. Nourse stated that he has been able to reduce that number to the original contractor proposal of forty-seven thousand. He stated that the department will find the funds in the O&M Budgets to furnish the spaces. Mr. Nourse stated that he was unable to get three quotes as two of the three additional contractors called did not respond to the request for quotes. He stated that was able to get a quote from the new facility's original contractor for forty-four thousand.

Mr. Nourse stated that the second issue at the facility is the sidewalk construction issues on site. He stated that there is significant scaling and pitting on nearly all the sidewalks at the new facility. Mr. Nourse explained that initially the facility contractor, Hutter Construction, suggested the problem was caused by the City's salt applications. Mr. Nourse explained that the City's observations did not support that idea and the City had a 3rd party materials testing company come in to look at the issue. The materials testing company performed an analysis that resulted in an opinion that the problem was caused by carbonization, which is due to an improper curing process. The analysis suggested that if carbonization caused the problem, then the problem will continue and the sidewalks will continue to erode. Mr. Nourse stated that Hutter Construction also had a 3rd party look at the sidewalks. He stated that the results from their analysis stated that an improper curing compound was used. He stated that the City's panel has decided that it would be in the best interest of the City to remove and replace all of the sidewalks. He stated that the cost share for the City will be 1/3 of the total cost and Hutter Construction will pay the other two-thirds. Mr. Nourse stated that the salt may have been a contributing factor as the City's specifications did not call for a siloxane sealant to be used, which is a typical specification in all City sidewalks. Mr. Nourse stated that both studies conclude that the larger issue was the curing process. The panel also decided that

using the City's current sidewalk consultant, SUR Construction vs. the Hutter Construction Company sub-contractors would be the best course of action. Mr. Nourse stated that Hutter Construction has agreed to the cost share and will do a reduction change order to the contract based on the cost of replacing the sidewalk. Mr. Nourse stated that the original estimate for the sidewalk replacement was approximately sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000.00) but estimates that number will be somewhat higher as the work will be done next spring. He is proposing a conservative estimate of thirty thousand dollars be used as a place holder.

Mr. Nourse summarized the two remaining issues. He stated that the funds are available in the DPW Facility accounts to fund the building modifications and the sidewalk repairs. He stated that the amount spent to date that is over the advance bonding is \$48,884.64, plus the \$47,000.00 for the building modification and the \$30,000.00 for sidewalks, add up to a total of one hundred twenty-five thousand, eight hundred and eighty-four thousand (\$125,884.00) and the available project funds are \$511,115.00. He stated that as recommended by the finance department the estimated \$125,884.64 will have a change of funding source to what is called cash accounts and the remaining \$385,230.00 will be deauthorized. Mr. Nourse suggested a motion to recommend the full City Council approve the department to move forward with both projects as presented. Councilor Gray stated that he is encouraged that the department found the funds for the furniture and he stated that he supports the effort to move forward as planned. Councilor de Geofroy asked why the siloxane was not specified. Mr. Nourse stated that it was missed in the specification documents on the original project bid. Councilor Beaudoin stated that this explanation of funding was much better than the last and that he too supports both plans. ***Councilor Gray made a motion to recommend that the full City Council approve the DPW to move forward with the DPW Building Modifications and Sidewalk Repair Project as proposed with the existing facility funds. Councilor Beaudoin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

7. Other:

Strafford Square Roundabout – Councilor de Geofroy asked about the Strafford Square project schedule. Mr. Nourse stated that a preconstruction meeting was held at the DPW on Monday (11/14/22). He stated that SUR Construction will be out there next week and start working the project. He said they have until next November to complete the project.

Abandoning Septic Tanks – Councilor Hamann asked the process for abandoning septic tanks. Mr. Nourse stated that he believes they are crushed and filled. He stated that they follow the state guideline which can be found at their NH DES Subsurface Bureau. There were additional questions on the subject and Mr. Nourse stated he would get the information back to the Committee next month.

Councilor Hamann adjourned the meeting at 7:48 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lisa J. Clark, City of Rochester Administration and Utility Billing Supervisor

New DPW Facility Project Funding & Expense Summary				
Appropriations				
Gen	15013010	772000	18526	\$9,000,000.00
	15013010	772000	20584	\$2,000,000.00
Water	55016010	772000	18526	\$4,500,000.00
	55016010	772000	20584	\$1,000,000.00
Sewer	55026020	772000	18526	\$4,500,000.00
	55026020	772000	20584	\$1,000,000.00
				\$22,000,000.00 Bonding Authority
UP Front Bonded in advance				
Gen 2020				\$5,000,000.00
Gen 2022				\$5,700,000.00
Water 2020				\$2,500,000.00
Water 2022				\$2,870,000.00
Sewer 2020				\$2,500,000.00
Sewer 2022				\$2,870,000.00
				\$21,440,000.00
Expensed to Date				
Gen	15013010	772000	18526	\$9,000,000.00
	15013010	772000	20584	\$1,729,034.64
Water	55016010	772000	18526	\$4,500,000.00
	55016010	772000	20584	\$878,999.39
Sewer	55026020	772000	18526	\$4,500,000.00
	55026020	772000	20584	\$880,850.61
				\$21,488,884.64 Acutal Expended to date
Appropriations Total				\$22,000,000.00
less expenses				\$21,488,884.64
REMAINING FUNDS AVAILABLE				\$511,115.36

Expenses Total	\$21,488,884.64	
Advance Bonded (actual)	<u>\$21,440,000.00</u>	
Expended over bonded in advance	\$48,884.64	per finance will convert to cash
Estimate Building Modification	\$47,000.00	Per finance will convert to cash if approved
Estimate Sidedwalk Expenses	<u>\$30,000.00</u>	per finance will convert to cash
Estmate to be spend over bond up front	\$125,884.64	Total amount to change funding to cash instead of Bonding
Remaining funds with bonding Authority	\$511,115.16	
less change of funding from bond author	<u>\$125,884.64</u>	
Under budget - Deauthorization Bonding	\$385,230.52	

FUNDING SOURCE CHANGE & FINAL DE-AUTHORIZATION TO BE DONE AT COMPLETION OF SIDEWALK AND BUILDING MODIFICATIONS IF APPROVED