



Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire

Community Development Department

6 Baboosic Lake Road

Town Hall - Lower level - East Wing

Planning - Zoning - Economic Development - Conservation

603 424-3531

Fax 603 424-1408

www.merrimacknh.gov

MERRIMACK PLANNING BOARD

DECEMBER 15, 2015

MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Merrimack Planning Board was conducted on Tuesday, December 15, 2015 at 6:01 p.m. in the Matthew Thornton Room.

Chairman Robert Best presided:

Members of the Board Present: Alastair Millns, Secretary
 Lynn Christensen
 Desirea Falt
 Vincent Russo (arrived at 6:45 p.m.)
 Councilor Thomas Mahon
 Nelson Disco, Alternate
 Jeff Sebring, Alternate

Members of the Board Absent: Michael Redding

Also in Attendance: Tim Thompson, Director, Community Development

1. Call to Order

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be conducted on January 5, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Matthew Thornton Room.

Chairman Best designated Nelson Disco to sit for Vincent Russo and Jeff Sebring for Michael Redding.

2. Planning & Zoning Administrator's Report – None

Member Millns commented about work taking place at Pennichuck Square. They have put in some false rows or half rows, which have effectively changed the angle of the slope. He stated he hopes the Building Official has done the necessary checks to ensure compliance. Today he noticed they are now building a completely new structure, which looks a bit like a square block. It is now above the height of the existing buildings. He stated his guess the intent would be to place signage in the area, and questioned if the Community Development Department has been approached.

Tim Thompson, Director, Community Development Department, responded they have. Their work is architectural/redesign in nature. It did not require anything from the Planning Board or the Community Development Department. They are coordinating with the Building Department with all of the construction that is taking place.

Member Millns questioned what would be required if signage were placed, and was informed they would have to acquire permits.

3. John J. Flatley Company (applicant/owner) - Continued review for consideration of Final Approval of an application for a site plan to construct 240 multi-family residences, clubhouse, and associated parking and drainage improvements, per the requirements of the Flatley mixed-use Conditional Use Permit. The parcels are located at # 645, 673, 685, 703 and 707 D.W. Highway in the I-1 (Industrial), Aquifer Conservation and Wellhead Protection Districts. Tax Map 6E, Lots 003-01, 003-03, 003-04, 003-05 & 003-06. *This item is continued from the June 16, July 21, August 18, September 1, September 15, November 3, & December 1, 2015 Planning Board meetings.*

*Chairman Best recused himself.
Chairman Best stepped down and Member Millns presided;*

Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, stated he was before the Board to continue the hearing and review for the 240-unit multi-family housing project being proposed on Tax Map 6E, Lots 003-01, 003-03, 003-04, 003-05 & 003-06. He was last before the Board regarding the site plan approval in September and in October and November discussing the potential changes to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Ultimately, those didn't carry forward. They made a submission in September that addressed CLD Consulting Engineers' (CLD) initial review for the project, and have received a second review from CLD dated November 23rd. They have been working with Town staff throughout the process and over the course of the past few months trying to resolve outstanding issues. They believe they have been successfully able to address a number of the concerns. However, there are a few items they wished to review with the Board.

Referring to the staff memo dated December 9, 2015, Mr. Brannon noted the first part of the memo addresses background. He stated they will be going to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a Special Exception strictly related to the pedestrian path and the bridge that has been discussed and agreed to. The access into the site they understand is a permitted use. They will only be seeking relief relative to the pedestrian access. They understand that and do not have any concerns with that being a condition of approval.

The last paragraph under the heading of Background pertains to the Public Works Department (PWD) requesting they provide an access to the site from Allen Road. Mr. Brannon stated that is not something his client is interested in doing. They have talked about it in the past before the Board, and it was their understanding the Board would rather they not do that as well. He requested they discuss it this evening to hopefully work through that. In their opinion, the paragraph is somewhat in error because it states the PWD and the Fire Department have recommended the access. They have received no correspondence from the Fire Department requiring that, and in fact do have correspondence from the Fire Department stating access to the buildings is acceptable as designed. He suggested that may have been a misunderstanding.

Mr. Brannon stated Allen Road does not come close to the site. Referring to a map, he noted the area of Lantern Lane and stated Allen Road is not constructed through the area; paper street. It is roughly 175' off the boundary line. He identified the area of the wetland and associated buffers and spoke of the parking design. The Applicant has no interest in connecting through and doing that work.

Mr. Brannon stated a Waiver request letter has been prepared. Copies were provided to the Board. The Waivers pertain to the location of buildings within 200' of the property and driveways within 300' of the property. The second waiver mentioned in the memo pertains to parking lot lighting. Mr. Brannon stated his understanding is that staff believes there to be the need for a Waiver due to uniformity and also due to downcast. The lights that are proposed are full downcast. The lantern style lights have the bulb located further up in the lantern, and there is a cover so that it is completely shielded by the top. There is no need for a waiver for that. In regards to the uniformity, he stated there are a couple of ways to calculate that. If they are too high they would rather just revise the lighting plan and reduce the number of lights. They did not request a waiver from lighting.

Director Thompson stated staff is comfortable with that approach. The plans staff have don't note the full cutoff with the detail for the lights, and assuming they can make the proper revisions, staff would certainly prefer to have compliance rather than a waiver.

Mr. Brannon stated #3 in the memo and #2 on the waiver request letter pertain to the driveway width. The design exceeds 36'. He stated they are actually at 40' because they designed the intersection to meet Department of Transportation (DOT) standards. Essentially they have a 14' wide entrance to the property. Because it is required to be curbed, they have 1' separation off of each curb. The entrance is 16' wide. They have two exiting lanes from the property each being 11' wide. With the 1' separation to the curb, that is 24'. Then there is a 10' wide median. They would have to cut into lane widths, and would then not meet the DOT specifications. As a result, they are requesting a waiver.

Mr. Brannon remarked in the section surrounding conditional approval, they have a few concerns relative to some of the comments. Number 6 addresses comments from the Conservation Commission. They are fine with each except for (d) as they believe it creates some conflict; if getting approval of the plan based on the design, letter d implies they stay out of the 25' buffer. In fact they are inside the 25' buffer, but inside with uses that are permitted

such as access. It doesn't require a special exception for access, which was confirmed with staff earlier in the day. The other impact would be for the pedestrian walk. They want to ensure that paragraph doesn't require them to revise the plan.

Director Thompson stated he and Jillian Harris, Planning & Zoning Administrator, discussed the issue regarding the Wetlands Conservation District. Access ways that are integral to the development of the property are permitted without the need to go to the ZBA. The driveway access is certainly permitted to be within that 25' buffer. However, they will need the Special Exception for the pedestrian way and the bridge as was discussed.

Mr. Brannon remarked the last item pertains to #8; specifically the language, which refers to two existing gravel roads noted on the plan. They are called out in the memo as emergency access roads. The memo states the roads are to be graded and maintained to allow emergency access to the railroad. The applicant has no issue with the Fire Department utilizing those roads for emergency access, but they are only proposing to improve them to the 250' Shoreline setback line from the river. Improving them any further than that would require another permit. The applicant is also not willing to plow them. Mr. Brannon stated his belief they are not plowed currently.

Mr. Brannon stated the applicant is fine with the remaining comments noting most of the comments have been addressed. In the interest of the review timeframe, they haven't been able to be checked and addressed for this meeting.

Member Millns questioned if the applicant is amenable to the requirement for a NFPA-13 compliant fire sprinkler system and the NFPA-72 fire alarm system. Mr. Brannon responded those would be requirements of obtaining a Building Permit.

When asked if the applicant is comfortable with the requirements from the Wastewater Division relative to sewerage lines and manholes. Mr. Brannon responded yes. He added his belief the plans that were submitted in September address a number of those comments. He does not believe CLD reviewed the Wastewater comments. They have no issue with ensuring those are cleaned up.

Director Thompson stated the Wastewater Division has not yet had an opportunity to comment on the revised plan given the change in leadership in the PWD. The department will do its best to ensure, upon the submission of revisions, that everything is addressed.

Member Disco remarked the plans the Board has are outdated and don't incorporate all of the things he believes the Board has discussed; one being the access road to the railroad tracks. He questioned why the Town desires access to the railroad tracks. Member Millns stated his presumption if a railroad car were to catch fire there would be the need for access by the Fire Department.

Kevin Walker, Flatley Company, stated when they spoke with the Fire Department they had mentioned instead of going through their typical access, which was further north, if they could get an access to that area it would make things easier for them as far as any sparks that come off of the trains that are going down lighting something on fire, etc. They had that discussion with the Fire Department, and are fine with it.

Member Disco questioned if Lot 6E 003-001 is already a separate lot of record or if a subdivision was being implied. Mr. Brannon stated it is already a separate lot of record. A subdivision is not being proposed at this time. Member Disco spoke of the potential parking lot expansion behind the Homestead Restaurant. He noted it did not appear to have enough grading consideration. Mr. Millns pointed out the itemization could be seen on page 2 of the plan set, but does not exist on page 14 of plan set. Mr. Brannon stated the plans are the ones that were submitted in September. They had a review from CLD on November 23rd. These details are not on the plans the Board has or the plans that were submitted to the Town. The grading for that parking area is minor. The site slopes back slightly. He pointed out on the larger set of plans where everything would grade, noting everything would be diverted into the rain garden and treated.

Member Disco reiterated the plan did not show the grading changes that would be necessary to accommodate that parking lot. Mr. Brannon stated agreement the current plan set does not; they were waiting for the second engineering review to come back. They can't pile plans on top of plans until receiving feedback from the Town's consultant. He remarked if you look at the contours there is about 3' of elevation through that area. You can actually see that the existing contours would be pushing the stormwater towards that rain garden. They would be coming across that parking area, and it would simply sheet flow into that rain garden area. That is something they

would be happy to have as a condition of approval to address that. He remarked it is in the stormwater management report; they have ensured all of the onsite drainage can accommodate that. He added during one of the CUP hearings the owner of the restaurant was present, and it seemed the Board spoke positively about the Applicant trying to accommodate his needs with this plan.

Member Disco noted the lack of lighting on the plan, and questioned if there is additional lighting planned as part of the use of that lot for the restaurant. Director Thompson questioned if the intent is to show it as a potential future project or to be constructed as part of the current project. If the intent is to be a future project it can be shown in a conceptual nature as part of this plan but would require a site plan at some point in the future for that expansion. Mr. Walker stated the intent for it to be a potential future project. He suggested it may be able to get done under some minor modification. Member Disco suggested that intention be noted.

Member Disco remarked there is mention of an MS4 permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the December 9th memo where the PWD recommends discussing provisions for a new development as outlined in the draft MS4 permit, which was stated to be attached. He had not received a copy. Director Thompson stated it is attached to the packet, and was in the form of an email from Kyle Fox, Deputy Director, PWD to the Community Development staff. It outlines the recommendations Deputy Director Fox has. It is mentioned in the last paragraph under Background in the most recent staff memo. Director Thompson noted that is a Municipal Permit. It is not a permit the Applicant would be responsible for obtaining. It is an attempt and a request that they do what they can to ensure that the Town remains compliant with those permit requirements as they develop their project.

Mr. Brannon remarked the MS4 portion of EPA is not applicable to this project because they are not proposing any improvements to the municipal infrastructure. The Alteration of Terrain Permit in itself addresses the majority of the comments that are raised in Deputy Director Fox's email pertaining to erosion, sedimentation, water quality, and treatment. That permit is a requirement of this project, and will be obtained. Although he would have to take exception to the MS4 permit because it does not apply, he does think a number of the comments and suggestions within the email, by default, will be addressed and have been incorporated in the design, during the Alteration of Terrain permitting process.

MOTION MADE BY MEMBER FALT TO GRANT A WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 4.05.d (BUILDINGS WITHIN 200 FEET OF BOUNDARY) AND SECTION 7.05.D.20.c (DRIVEWAY WIDTH) OF THE REGULATIONS NOTING SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO THE SITE PLAN, OR CONDITIONS OF THE LAND IN SUCH SITE PLAN, INDICATE THAT THE WAIVER WILL PROPERLY CARRY OUT THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE REGULATIONS
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER CHRISTENSEN
MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0

Member Disco questioned if the service road/driveway would be built to Town standards. Mr. Brannon stated the construction materials will be to Town standards. One of the comments pertains to some of the street standards in Town, which they are not adhering to because they don't apply. One section requires that the minimum grade be 1½ percent. The slope of the parking areas are less than 1½ percent in some areas, primarily to meet ADA requirements and to push the grading around the proposed garages. It is sloping in so many different directions they have to ensure drainage and ADA requirements are met. They are not meeting that particular standard; however, it does not apply to parking areas. Director Thompson noted the comment came in one of CLD's reviews; whether or not that needed to meet Town standards. The throat of the driveway as it comes in and approaches the site certainly meets the requirements of Town standards. However, once you get into the parking areas that aisle as it goes in between the parking spaces does not meet Town standards as has just been described. From a regulatory standpoint we would not expect an aisle way within a parking lot to meet a Town roadway standard.

Member Disco questioned, in the long term, isn't this part of a loop road that will eventually connect into the road that goes north through the property. Mr. Brannon stated that to be incorrect. He stated it to be an emergency connection that is proposed through the parking area north of Building 3. That was an emergency connection that would connect behind the retail space. He commented they were very reluctant to have that connection because of security concerns, but did provide it because it was something the Board felt strongly about. It is not intended to be a thruway at all.

Member Sebring questioned how residents would be expected to get to the retail area. Mr. Brannon stated he would expect them to go whatever avenue they saw fit. Member Sebring commented they would likely use that road. Mr. Brannon replied they could. He remarked the goal is that it be there really for the benefit of the residents and not for the benefit of the commercial users to come on to a residential property and utilize that as another way out.

Member Disco noted the sidewalk shown across the front of the property. Mr. Brannon stated it to be their understanding there is a requirement to construct a sidewalk along the frontage of the property. One of the topics discussed during the CUP process was they would rather have that walkway be internal because they want to bring people to the commercial users. It will eventually follow an existing gravel drive that goes through the field area.

Member Millns stated he is not bothered by anything that is being presented, and by in large feels the project is virtually okay. Because there have been so many changes to the plans he personally believes conditional approval could be granted, but he would like to incorporate that there be a Compliance Hearing to provide the Board the opportunity for them to submit a completed set of plans. He commented that does not mean anything would be changed. Mr. Brannon stated he would not have a problem with that. Member Disco stated his support of the request, and his belief it is appropriate given the number of changes, etc. Director Thompson stated that could be made part of the motion to conditionally approve. He noted the one item that has not yet been finalized is the Allen Road connection.

Member Disco stated the desire to hear the argument in favor of it. Director Thompson stated the comment in item #7 of the memo is verbatim with the comment received from Deputy Director Fox; that the project should connect to the right-of-way of Allen Road with a full Town standard road or an emergency access road. He commented if the project were a standalone project he would certainly agree with and support the recommendation, but given it is part of the CUP for a multi-access, multi-use property, there are going to be other means of access and other means of getting out to D.W. Highway once this property is built out. He is not as concerned about creating the connection to Allen Road, and believes if the connection were to be made it should be a gated emergency access only type of access. There should not be full access from this property into the neighborhood to the south. He stated his belief that is not something that is warranted given the fact we are going to see two additional intersections with D.W. Highway eventually that will be connected throughout this property.

Member Falt stated a desire to hear from the public.

Member Millns opened the floor for public comment at 6:42 p.m.

Public Comment

Anita Creager, President, Merrimack Historical Society

Stated the Historical Society has been speaking with Mr. Walker regarding the potential for the area where the fish hatchery was previously to perhaps be donated or become a long-term lease for the Historical Society. Member Millns commented this is further down the line. Ms. Creager remarked it is way down the line. One of Mr. Walker's concerns is the condition of the structure that is there. She remarked, if it were to come to fruition it would be an advantage for everyone as it would place the Historical Society on Route 3. It would also be an attraction for the development.

Member Disco spoke of the Allen Road connection, and noted what he heard was that Allen Road is just a right-of-way and there is no road. Director Thompson stated that to be correct. Member Christensen stated Mitchell Lane does not loop around. That western most edge is Allen Road and there are three houses on Allen Road. Mr. Brannon clarified Allen Road from the Lantern Lane and Allen Road intersection is not built in this direction. Member Christensen stated that to be correct. Member Disco stated that to be his understanding, and pointed out it is another reason to perhaps not include a connection at this point in time. Member Millns commented if that is not built the Town would have to build it because you can't expect the applicant to build it as it is not on his property. He could be encouraged to do it. Director Thompson stated if the Board was to require that, it would be considered an off-site improvement because it is a public right-of-way.

Member Russo arrived at 6:45 p.m., but was not seated as a voting member.

**MOTION MADE BY MEMBER DISCO TO GRANT CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL, WITH THE FOLLOWING PRECEDENT CONDITIONS TO BE FULFILLED WITHIN TWELVE MONTHS AND PRIOR TO PLAN SIGNING, UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER CHRISTENSEN**

1. The Applicant shall be required to have the final plans reviewed by the Planning Board at a Compliance Hearing prior to final signature of the plans by the Board;
2. Final plans and mylars to provide all professional endorsements and be signed by all property owners;
3. A draft copy of any proposed easements and any applicable legal documents to be submitted to the Community Development Department, as applicable, for review and approval by the town's legal counsel (legal review shall be performed at the applicant's expense);
4. Project phasing is to be visually indicated and noted on the plan per Planning Board approval;
5. The applicant shall obtain all necessary state permits (NH DOT Driveway, NH DES AOT, and any other applicable permits), provide copies of the permits to the Community Development Department file, and note the approvals in the notes on the plan;
6. Applicant to receive from the Zoning Board of Adjustment, and add a note indicating a special exception for activity within the 25' no-disturb wetland buffer or to re-design so as to no longer require the exception;
7. The applicant shall provide a note on the plans that indicate the "future parking" for the Homestead Restaurant is to be approved as a separate project, and is shown for illustrative purposes only on this site plan;
8. The applicant shall address the following comments from the Conservation Commission (as applicable):
 - a. The Commission requests no use of salt or de-icing compounds at the proposed site. This is due the vicinity of the Brook, the Merrimack River, and being in a Wellhead protection area.
 - b. The Commission proposes that only low phosphate, slow release nitrogen fertilizers be used as part of the project. The Commission further recommends that the applicant's contractor considers utilizing a soil testing facility to determine what levels and applications rates may be necessary before doing any application of fertilizes on the site.
 - c. Erosion control and maintenance notes using the word "hay", we prefer all references to hay in the plan set be changed to straw to minimize the introduction of non-native grasses and other plants through seeds often found as part of hay.
9. The applicant shall address the following comments from the Fire Department (as applicable):
 - a. The Town of Merrimack, Department of Fire Rescue, Office of the Fire Marshal requires (NFPA 1 Chapter 18) that fire department access roads be constructed and maintained so that fire apparatus can effectively operate during an emergency. The location of the access road(s) must provide for positioning of the fire apparatus to allow access to all sides of the structure. Unique building or occupancy conditions may trigger additional requirements from the Office of the Fire Marshal. Access to the multi-story buildings is acceptable;
 - b. Fire Department water supply (pressurized hydrants) is required. In keeping with the compliance of state fire codes, NFPA codes and continued practices with other subdivisions and residential complexes within the community the installation of Fire Hydrants on a minimum of an eight inch water main will be required with Fire Hydrants located every 500 feet along all roadways and no more than 250 feet to a driveway as calculated along the new roads starting at the nearest hydrant located on Daniel Webster Highway. The submitted plans do not show any hydrants located on the access road from Daniel Webster Highway. Final drawings showing the locations of the fire hydrants must be submitted to the Fire Marshal's Office for approval.

10. The applicant shall address comments from MVD and provide documentation of a development agreement (as applicable);
11. The applicant shall address the following comments from the Wastewater Division (as applicable):
 - a. A Town of Merrimack Wastewater Permit Application must be completed and approved by the Sewer Inspector/Collection System Manager before final plan can be approved by the Merrimack Wastewater Department. This permit also generates the appropriate sewer connection fees due the town before building permits can be issued;
 - b. Sheet 1: Utility Contacts should include WASTEWATER: Merrimack Wastewater Treatment, 36 Mast Rd, Merrimack, NH 03054, Attn: Ken Conaty, (603) 420-1625;
 - c. Sheet 3 & 4: Numbers used on existing sewerage manholes are incorrect.

Plan #	Actual#
2723	189
2695	601
2680	602
2645	603
6240	610
5161	611
6683	612
952	613
 - d. Sheet 11: Parking Lot Island needs to be redesigned. The existing design shows a drainage and snow storage area on existing manhole #604. Neither can be allowed due to inflow and access issues.
 - e. Sheet 17: Shows several trees planted in the sewer easement-not permitted.
12. The applicant shall verify that all applicable comments from the Town's peer review consultant, CLD, have been satisfactorily addressed;
13. The applicant shall address all applicable comments from the Lower Merrimack Local Advisory Committee (LMRLAC), as part of the NHDES AOT permitting;
14. The applicant shall address the following planning staff technical comments:

Planning Staff Technical Comments

- a. Applicant to clarify Note 2 - Sheet 2 to reference Section 2.02.4.C(4) for zoning, pertaining to Section 15 for dimensional requirements for PUD uses including residential;
- b. Applicant to clarify approved phasing from final CUP development agreement and Master Site Development Plan dated September 1, 2015 on Note 5 - Sheet 2 which references five (5), 48 unit apartment buildings whereas four (4) are approved as part of Phase 1 of the CUP;
- c. Applicant to clarify Note 7 - Sheet 2 to note compliance as per the CUP approval;
- d. Applicant to correct typo in Note 9 - Sheet 2 from "pre" to "per" under Community Center Parking;
- e. Applicant to remove "subsequent" from Note 10 - Sheet 2;
- f. Applicant to remove misplaced period in Note 15 - Sheet 2;
- g. Applicant to correct Note 16 - Sheet 2 which should reference Chapter 167 of the Town's Code of Ordinances (no longer Chapter 412);
- h. Applicant to include in Note 17 - Sheet 2 which sheet(s) are to be recorded with HCRD;

- i. Applicant to correct typo in Note 21 - Sheet 2 from "Oni" to "On";
- j. Applicant to provide documentation of approval from the Merrimack Conservation Commission and Merrimack Village District on wording of Note 22 - Sheet 2;
- k. Applicant to add wording "for a mixed use development on" prior to "this site" in Note 24 - Sheet 2;
- l. Applicant to correct Sheet 15 titled "Landscaping Plan 2" to "Site Lighting Plan 2";
- m. Applicant to add a note on open space per Section 4.10 on either the Master Site Plan or the Landscape Plan;
- n. Applicant to provide details for full cut-off lighting or to request a waiver as necessary;
- o. Applicant to revise lighting plan to show a maximum uniformity ratio of 4:1 per Section 11.05 or to request a waiver as necessary;
- p. Applicant to review the planting list to determine if recommended varieties from Section 11 can be substituted for similar varieties in the landscaping plan;
- q. Applicant to submit a revised architectural plan specific to the proposed development and no longer titled "Tara Heights" in Nashua, NH.

General and Subsequent Conditions

1. The applicant is responsible for recording the plan (including recording fee and the \$25.00 LCHIP fee, check made payable to the Hillsborough County Treasurer) at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds. The applicant is also responsible for providing proof of said recording(s) to the Community Development Department;
2. All proposed easements and any applicable legal documents shall be recorded at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds at the expense of the applicant;
3. The Applicant shall submit an As-Built Plan prepared by a qualified professional (Professional Engineer or Licensed Land Surveyor) after all units are completed to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, for the final building (assuming project phasing remains consistent with the CUP and is not amended).
4. The applicant shall address the following comments from the Fire Department:
 - a. As this proposal is for new multi-tenant residential buildings the entire building shall be protected by an approved NFPA-13 compliant fire sprinkler system. (Town of Merrimack Building Zoning Ordinance and Building Code, Section 11) Plans shall be provided to this office for review and approval before a permit can be issued.
 - b. The buildings shall be protected by an approved NFPA-72 fire alarm system. Plans shall be provided to this office for review and approval before a permit can be issued. Plans must be submitted to the Merrimack Department of Fire Rescue for any revisions and/or changes to the current plan on file and must be reviewed and approved by the Merrimack Department of Fire Rescue, Office of the Fire Marshal. The design and any changes must be fully compliant with local, state and nationally recognized codes. The Fire Marshal reserves the right to require any changes by the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) or for regulatory compliance at any time.
5. The applicant shall address the following comments from the Wastewater Division (as applicable):
 - a. All new sewerage lines and manholes installed are to be private. This system upon completion will be maintained by the owner not the Town of Merrimack;

- b. A capacity, management, operation, and maintenance plan shall be in place before any certificate of occupancy will be signed;
- c. All buildings must have an outside backflow preventer (clean check brand or equal) as indicated by Merrimack Sewerage Construction Standards;

MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0

Member Millns stepped down and Chairman Best presided. Member Russo joined the Board, Member Disco returned to Alternate status.

4. Discussion of Capital Improvement Program for Town of Merrimack.

Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director, Paul Micali provided a PowerPoint presentation (can be viewed [here](#)). He stated the Town develops its CIP projects based on a number of factors. There are 21 projects that are looked at in the major category, such as a fire station, bridge replacements, paving, highway garage, etc.

With regard to bridge projects, Merrimack has the most aggressive bridge program in the State of New Hampshire. It started back in 2008 with the Bedford Road near the Joppa Road intersection replacement and has and will continue on until 2019 when the Town hopefully begins the US Route 3 Bridge down by the Merrimack Youth Association building.

This year the Town is undertaking two bridge projects; McGaw Bridge Road and Bean Road. They are both out to bid, and construction should begin within the next few weeks, weather permitting. It is hoped those projects will be up and running within 10 months.

The Bedford Road/Baboosic Brook bridge project is on the back burner and ready to move forward once the budget process has completed and the 2016/2017 bridge program begins with the State.

The Bedford Road Bridge is a culvert bridge. It is the same type of bridge that was over on Wire Road and the same kind of bridge that was over on Bean Road, which failed. Some improvements were made as a result of the May 2006 Mother's Day flood. Although a new culvert bridge, it remains an arch steel pipe construction. Those seem to be failing throughout the State. The intent is to replace that bridge in the 2016/2017 timeframe.

Chairman Best questioned if the list of bridge projects going through to 2019, is inclusive of all red listed bridges located in Town, and was informed the list basically represents every major road crossing bridge culvert the Town has. Although there are some smaller culverts, those scheduled for replacement are considered bridges given their span.

Member Sebring commented it appears the culvert bridges are approx. 40 years old, and questioned if they would be replaced with the same type of technology. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali stated the Bedford Road, Bean Road, and McGaw Bridge Road bridges would be steel constructed bridges. When asked, he stated the useful life would be in the area of 50 years.

The Town continues with its stormwater drainage improvements. When looking at paving roads and replacing bridges, we also look at stormwater drains and other projects. It is anticipated for the 2015/2016 construction season we will be looking at Jo Ellen Drive, Amherst Road, Brenda Lane, Wilson Hill Road, Waterville Drive, Thornton Road, and basin repair at the conclusion of the winter months. The Town works through the list. Should there be more than expected basins that require repair, it may be that the list is revisited and 1 or 2 of the roads may be dropped off the list. Chairman Best commented on the length of Wilson Hill Road, and questioned if there is a particular section experiencing drainage problems. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali responded they will go through the whole road and see where improvements are necessary. Chairman Best commented on the narrow travel lanes on Wilson Hill Road. He questioned if they would be updated to the 10-12 travel lanes, if repaved. He suggested that be taken into account when reviewing the drainage. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali stated he would bring that issue forward to the PWD when those projects are looked at.

There are 475 roads in the Town and about 180 miles of centerline miles. The department uses a pavement database to identify the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for each public road. The data, along with traffic volumes, drainage/sewer projects, funding, and other factors, is used to develop the paving/infrastructure improvement program for the year. The presentation identified the roads that were paved during the past five years. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali noted other projects planned are taken into account when determining which roads will be paved. He provided the example of the McGaw Bridge; with the bridge replacement taking place, once completed, that road will be repaved. The Town Council has put \$750,000 in the budget for the past few years for paving projects.

Chairman Best commended the Administration and Town Council for having a proactive plan that covers these things over time to smooth out the impact. When asked if there is a sense that the useful life of the repaired roads are meeting expectations, Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali responded he believes they are meeting the expectations that are set in the paving index. Efforts are made to do the feeder roads more frequently than a neighborhood road, e.g., Baboosic Lake Road, D.W. Highway, etc.

A grant was received to construct a multi-use trail that will connect Watson Park to the pedestrian bridge over the Souhegan River (Souhegan River Trail project). The trail is proposed to run under the Chamberlain Bridge through the sluiceway and along the north side of the river. Included in the project will be repairs to the failed sidewalk on the northeast end of the Chamberlain Bridge, repair of the mortar joints and addition of carved granite block identifying the bridge. Eighty percent of the cost is being paid by the State and 20% by the Town.

Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali noted the sidewalks will no longer be cantilevered. Member Millns commented he remembers having been told years back that the side of the sidewalk with the walls was not very well connected to the rest of the bridge structure. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali stated he is not aware if they were structurally tied. He believes it to be the height that was an issue. If any major repairs are done on the bridge there will be the need to raise those up to meet standards. Redoing the sidewalk is not considered a major repair to the roadway or the bridge. Chairman Best commented putting supports under the bridge so the sidewalk is no longer cantilever would be a large project. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali responded it is on the opposite side, not the bridge structure itself (fixing approaches).

Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali commented those are the projects planned for 2016/2017. The CIP identifies projects that are planned further out. Some are simply placeholders for matters being discussed, e.g., new library versus repairs to current facility. The Town Council has determined the Highway Garage would not be on the Ballot this year. Last year \$20,000 was put towards gathering additional information. The Town is in the process of hiring consultants to assist in that effort. Chairman Best questioned if the amount of money identified on the plan is the same amount as was identified on the previous Ballot, and was informed it is.

When asked about the status of the Fire Station, Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali stated it is identified in the 2018/2019 year of the CIP. Some minor repairs will be done this year. A lot is hinging on the outcome of the proposed NED pipeline as some of the routes could take it through that parcel of land. In addition, the Town Council has determined the #1 infrastructure priority is the Highway Garage.

Chairman Best questioned if the item listed on the CIP is the same parcel as the one the fire station is currently located on, and was informed there was a vote several years ago with regard to a tract of land located on Continental Boulevard belonging to the School District. If the Town has the funding to build the structure, the School District would donate the land (3 of the 12 acres of the lot). Member Disco commented on the \$650,000 donation towards the Fire Station, and questioned if that private donation has an expiration date. Director Thompson stated, as part of the development agreement that money does not expire.

Member Sebring commented based on the information provided, he would have thought the order of the Bean and Bedford Road bridges would have been reversed. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali responded the Bean Road Bridge came to the forefront about a year ago. The State came in and reduced the tonnage, and 6 months ago closed that bridge.

Members Millns asked if a decision has been made about the Wire Road into D.W. Highway connection. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali responded that depends a lot on the traffic study. From what he was told, if you put a roundabout in there you can't have traffic backing up from the Baboosic Lake intersection into a roundabout. It is likely another traffic study would have to be done. It was noted that project goes along with the U.S. Route 3 Bridge.

Member Millns noted the write-up refers to 19 accidents over a period of 6 years, and he would think there are other sections of Town where there is a much higher accident rate. He provided the example of Amherst Road where Naticook and Meetinghouse Road connect. Member Christensen commented she has never heard of an accident occurring in that location. Chairman Best and Councilor Mahon made similar comments. Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Micali suggested the Highway Safety Committee could be asked to look at that area. Councilor Mahon commented one problem at that intersection relates to the fact when you look east you cannot see the road. He noted he brought that to the Highway Safety Committee, which did not believe it a concern.

5. Discussion of Capital Improvement Program for School Administrative Unit #26.

Matt Shevenell, School District Business Administrator, provided a PowerPoint [presentation](#). He remarked the CIP covers a period of six years. With regard to HVAC equipment, the 2016-2017 year identifies an air ventilation system for the High School at a cost of \$515,000. The existing system is approximately 30 years old. It is an old HVAC system that recirculates air from the cafeteria, tempers it, and then brings it into the building before it is conditioned by the heating system. Because of the age of the existing unit, obtaining replacement parts is an ongoing problem. If the unit were to fail unexpectedly the building would be without proper heat in the cafeteria and the food service area for approximately 2 months before a replacement could be installed. The intent is to replace the existing unit with something of a different design, which has been put forward by Honeywell. The roof was done over this section of the building last year, and it was taken into account where these smaller units would be going. It was noted you cannot take air from a cafeteria area and recirculate it in a wheel because of the grease factor. The existing system does not meet current fire code.

With regard to roofing, the district has slated one roof project each year for the next 6 years and beyond. The first portion is the majority (around $\frac{3}{4}$) of the Middle School roof (\$1,139,750) going from the westerly side of the building where the playing fields are towards the cul-de-sac and Old Blood Road. That portion would be done first. There is a natural break in that area. Mr. Shevenell noted there are failures at the seams and splits between the seams. What is being seen currently is an area where there is a seam and a seam, and in the middle of the seam/middle of the piece of material there is no seam, but there is a spreading of the material that is coming apart. They have been patching those areas in linear strips (around 2,000 linear feet) over this past summer into the fall. That has been classified as "urgent" to get it done in the spring.

Member Falt commented that is a TPO roof. The District has been before the Planning Board concerning that roof previously, and mentioned it is failing quickly. Mr. Shevenell stated it is a GenFlex 10-year roof, and noted GenFlex is out of business. The roof had a ten-year warranty, although the District had expected to get 20 years out of it. The insurance carrier has looked at the roof. However, there is no recourse with regard to any type of claim. The insurance company suggested it could be that the sheets of material (10-12' wide) could have been folded back on one another, left for a period of time, opened up, and then put in place. That could have caused an initial weakening during the initial install. However, that is uncertain.

Member Falt noted there have been issues with the older TPO roofs. She requested clarification if the District intends to do a multi-layer roof for this repair. Mr. Shevenell stated they plan on the multi-layer roof with the insulation, the seven different layers, and the tar in between similar to what they have been doing. Those types of roofs have around a 35-year warranty.

The CIP identifies the remainder of the roof being replaced in the 2017-2018 year. It was noted the reason it is not being done as a single project is to try and spread the cost, understanding the cost of the HVAC system as well.

The next roofing project is the Reeds Ferry Elementary School roof; the '97 additions. They are slated to be replaced in 2018-2019. In 2019-2020 the same situation will be addressed at Thorntons Ferry. Mr. Shevenell commented the Director of Maintenance, Tom Touseau, walks the roofs at least 2-3 times a year. He looks at them and evaluates them. Right now it is his estimation that Reeds Ferry would come before Thorntons Ferry, but when we get closer to that point in time Thorntons could come before Reeds. The next roof would be the James Masticola Upper Elementary School (JMUES). After that would be the remainder of Thorntons Ferry. From there the JMUES would be addressed in 2021-2022.

Mr. Shevenell stated there are 11 acres of roofs in the District. The buildings were not built all at one level they were built and added on to at different periods of time. That is fortunate as, unlike the middle school, they are not looking at doing it all at the same time, but rather in advance of them becoming problematic. That is determined based on tracking repairs/patching, etc.

Chairman Best stated agreement with the proactive approach and the planning for the future. He stated agreement with the ranking of "urgent" for the middle school. However, suggested the remainder of the 6-year plan likely falls under some other category by virtue of it being a 6-year plan. Since the category uses necessary to describe things that are within 3 years and desirable between 4-6 years, he questioned if Mr. Shevenell had a sense of what he would recommend for those other roof projects. Mr. Shevenell suggested "necessary".

Chris Ortega, School Board Chair, commented they have to continually loop through and take care of the ones that have aged out. This will be something they will be looking at in perpetuity.

Member Millns questioned why there are flat roofs in this part of the country. Member Falt commented if you have a roof covering an area that wide and you give it a slope it would be incredibly tall. It is the least amount of structure required to carry the roof over it, if you are going for a pitch. Member Millns used the example of the main front door of the middle school; it is sloped, and it has the little spikes to break the snow up as it comes off. He commented he is unsure why more of that style/pitched is not done. He suggested that should be considered particularly on Thorntons Ferry. Chairman Best added another piece of that is when you have a building that is basically a whole bunch of little blocks that have been assembled, where does the roof line go; where is the center line, where does the pitch start and end, etc. Member Russo commented he works on a lot of roof top units, e.g., air conditioning, and he likes flat roofs. He added it is really difficult to put an HVAC unit on a pitched roof.

Mr. Shevenell noted, when reaching 2024-2025 there is a lull of 10-13 years where there are no roofing projects scheduled. It could be the Board would determine those would be the years where a Capital Reserve Fund could be built up for the purpose of larger expenses anticipated into the future.

With regard to asbestos removal Mr. Shevenell commented during the bidding process for previous asbestos projects they were able to get a bit more bang for their buck. When that was presented as an option; you can do an extra 10,000 sq. ft. and still be within budget, that is the direction they went. Now they are looking at 2017-2018 as the timeframe for completing the asbestos removal project at the High School (\$250,000). This is the remaining asbestos in the District that we now know of. It was noted there is no way of knowing if asbestos would be found if a renovation project were to be undertaken. The asbestos removal project at the High School consists of floor tiles. When asked, he stated the area to be around 25,000 sq. ft. When asked if it has been reviewed by a HAZMAT specialist, Mr. Shevenell responded absolutely. The District contracts with a company called RFP who comes in and does all of the testing and writes up the bid specification for the District. They manage the project to ensure it is done properly and do all of the sign-offs for it. When asked if the school would be closed when the tiles are removed, Mr. Shevenell stated the work would be done during the summer months. The area will be cordoned off, plastic sheeting, HAZMAT suits, etc. The areas that need to be closed off will be closed off.

When asked how the area is being protected at this time. Mr. Shevenell responded they are looking at it to see if there are any areas that are friable that are flaking, etc. At this time, there are none. There are just areas that are getting worn. It will have to be done before it starts to spider crack and come up. When asked about a sealant that could be put over it, it was noted they do seal the floors. That will be done over the Christmas break, and is done 2-3 times a year. The floor is stripped, re-sealed, burnished, etc.

With regard to paving, Mr. Shevenell stated the CIP identifies the front of the High School and the bus loop area where there is a significant slope. The area will be built up, leveled off, reclaimed, and a new paving job around the high school and the front of the high school (\$227,354) to be resurfaced in 2016-2017. When asked if the District's paving is coordinated with that of the Town, Mr. Shevenell responded absolutely. He stated that is done every year. It was noted the school paving projects can be rebuilding of roadway and tend to be more challenging with the twists and turns as opposed to resurfacing of long stretch of straight roadway. The School District gets the rate the Town is provided by its contractor.

O'Gara Drive is the next area the District would like to look at from where the front entrance area ends; going from O'Gara down to Baboosic Lake Road. That is planned for 2017-2018. Chairman Best questioned, and was told there is no plan to include speedbumps with the paving projects. Chairman Best commented new paving,

especially on parts of O'Gara, will encourage people to drive a lot faster. Member Disco questioned consideration for pedestrian travel on O'Gara Drive in particular. He noted, as part of the Town Center Master Plan, the Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC) put together a plan, looking at long range, to build a sidewalk along O'Gara Drive, and make it a loop sidewalk. He questioned what, if any, consideration is being given to that.

Mr. Shevenell responded it is not currently in the plan for 2017-2018. It is around an \$80,000 - \$100,000 additional cost for a sidewalk. However, there are a lot of variables that just came into play at the joint meeting between the School Board and the Town Council. Mr. Ortega stated the School District has a lease agreement that put the tennis courts at the end of O'Gara Drive through a Federal Grant in the 1970s on the parcel of property that contains the tennis courts, the basketball court, the skate park, and the ice rink. The Town Council has obtained permission from the Federal Government to obsolete the tennis court because of the poor condition it is in and the lack of desire to throw any more money at it. As part of the process, until the agreement expires, they are required to return that land to passive recreation/open space; essentially grass or maybe a park bench. The lease is due to expire in 2018. At the joint meeting, they were asked by the Council what they want to do post 2018 with that land, e.g., does the District wish to take over the skate park and the ice rink, enter some other agreement with the Town as it relates to the parcel, and what was discussed at that meeting is that the School Board may actually have its Planning & Building Committee look at potential uses for the property.

Mr. Ortega commented the District has a consolidated central office project that was using 1 parcel of land. It is not known if this parcel might be a potential lot for that. They have other needs that the school buildings themselves; JMUES, and for that matter the High School may have for that property. He commented they have been fortunate to have an agreement with Our Lady of Mercy to use their parking lot for staff parking at the JMUES, but if that agreement were to go away, parking would be an even larger issue. There is the need for the District to look at what purpose they give to that land, and it may impact the design of a sidewalk. He stated his belief the estimates Mr. Shevenell retrieved when they were working on the Town Center Committee came in at about \$100,000. The minimum was a threshold of \$400,000 for submittal for Federal grant dollars. The District would want to look at what potential use it may have for that property and therefore what design for a sidewalk would be put there. Mr. Shevenell commented he would hate to put a sidewalk in there without taking into account the other variables because then he is taking a sidewalk, changing the curb cuts, saw cutting items and adding items, and it is patchwork. He would rather look at the whole project holistically.

He remarked the High School team does not have tennis courts they can use to practice on; go to Wasserman Park. It would perhaps be nice to have tennis courts down in that area that area useful for the High School team. It may be that we could get a Middle School team going, perhaps even an upper elementary team because of its proximity to the JMUES. If you look at that; tennis courts, associated parking, lighting, etc., and then you have the whole idea where you have the baseball field where the JMUES is, you have parking that happens along O'Gara Drive. Perhaps there would be the desire to look at creating parking for that use. Then there is always the concern with losing the parking at the Our Lady of Mercy Church. Their intentions are terrific, they've been a tremendous partner over the years, but it is hard to predict what the future will hold. If that parking were not available to anymore, that would be a major blow to the District because there is virtually no parking for staff there.

He commented the news they received recently of the Town declaring that area obsolete opens up options they had never considered. They now have to look at that sidewalk project as a piece of a larger project that could really be a benefit to the District as a whole moving forward.

Chairman Best commented to some extent the part of O'Gara closer to the High School where the lots start has sidewalks on both sides. Although he understands consideration of an overall plan, he is not sure he is completely on board with the idea that the sidewalk is that difficult to manage in and out of that. For example, with respect to the tennis courts, if you don't know what you will do with that site put the sidewalk on the other side of the road because nothing is going to change on that side. He suggested there to be ways to approach it, and that it would be important to do especially around a school.

Member Disco remarked there are grant programs available that will help with the sidewalk portion of paving programs just as has been done with the Souhegan River Trail; they were able to leverage the Town's money four times over to build a trail and system using Federal money. He suggested, if you have money to put into the road for repaving, this is the time to look into those types of available funds, even if it doesn't go beyond the tennis courts, but just reaches them.

Councilor Mahon commented on changes that have occurred around the construction of sidewalks; requirements have become less stringent, e.g., can construct without curbs, etc.

Director Thompson stated there was a recent authorization of a brand new National Transportation Highway Bill. He has not yet had the opportunity to review it in any kind of detail. He is hearing there has been a significant loosening on anything that is non-vehicular to try to encourage communities and States to put money into pedestrian, bicycles, and other non-motorized uses.

Paving is proposed for the Mastricola Elementary School (MES) entrance and JMUES office parking area. This is the entrance to the Smith gym and also where MES visitors park. The desire is to connect this paving project with the drainage project proposed for JMUES (\$150,000). There is very little drainage in the area and a great deal of cracking in the pavement. The desire would be for a total reclamation and sort out all drainage underneath. Chairman Best suggested as part of the drainage project, with some creativity there is space there if someone wished to break up all of the impervious surface with maybe something live and grass like, which would massively improve the appearance of the building. Mr. Millns disagreed commenting the parking area is compressed to a breaking point. It is necessary to have the teachers in the parking lot to control cars unloading students. He suggested there isn't a square inch of space not being used by people. Chairman Best responded there isn't space the way it is currently designed. There could be a better design. Mr. Shevenell stated he would take it under advisement.

Mr. Shevenell spoke of the consolidation of the Special Services/SAU Office project, which is listed within the CIP for 2017-2018 (\$1,945,000). The area being looked at is an acre of land that the Town took for taxes in '99. Around four years ago the District realized that, and asked if the District could have it. Ownership was transferred from the Town to the District for the sum of \$1.00. It is a nice flat piece of land at the end of the high school parking lot. He commented he would not say the site doesn't present any challenges, but as far as construction goes, if the soil is anything like the rest of the soil in that area it is very sandy and easy digging. There are gas lines that are now a lot closer than they used to be. The only challenge would be hooking up to the sanitary sewer system, which would be coming around Brentwood and splitting between Special Services and that building and hooking up in front of the old central office. The price does include the removal and razing of both central office and Special Services and the creation of additional parking.

Member Falt commented this is the third time this project has been on the agenda. She spoke of the time when Hurricane Sandy took the roof off and rain water gained access to the building. The Planning Board listed it as urgent, and then the next year the District said there is other stuff we are working on, and we need to evaluate our situation. She noted, at that time, they had stated they were going to do a study, and questioned if the current status is a result of the study. Chairman Best remarked his recollection was it was the voters who put the brakes on the project. Mr. Ortega stated the bond was placed on the ballot, and received a majority, but not the super majority that was needed to bond the project. They did contract over the last year with a group called NESDEC to do a space needs study for the entire district looking at all of the schools; how much space is being used and in particular whether the District could locate central office, SAU, and Special Services in any of those buildings, and they could not. The benefit of the study is they have very good metrics now in terms of space capacity, utilization rates, and how to manage that space.

Mr. Shevenell commented the slide indicates dates that are further out than are represented on the CIP. That is because the iterations they have gone through with the CIP Plan going to the Planning & Building Committee first then to the School Board, Administration had actually shifted this out somewhat to that 2020-2021. It was shifted back to 2017-2018. That is where it belongs. Chairman Best asked if the study was available, and stated a desire to receive a copy. Mr. Shevenell stated it is, and remarked it could be placed online.

Member Christensen stated she is very familiar with those buildings, and is in complete agreement with moving this project closer in the CIP. She questioned if consideration has been given to extending the new wing of the High School to incorporate Special Services and the SAU. She commented when in an existing building there are facilities that could be used by either possibly making them more usable. Mr. Shevenell stated part of the NESDEC study was to look across the district for areas that could be used. Member Christensen reiterated she was not talking about existing space, but adding onto the high school rather than constructing a brand new free-standing building. Mr. Ortega commented he could not say with any certainty that it would be less expensive, but he is not certain. Mr. Shevenell agreed it could be a consideration. Member Millns stated his belief it should be a consideration. He remarked he would have thought, from an engineering point of view, it would be a lot easier to connect to the drainage that is already there rather than having to blast new drainage for a standalone building.

Chairman Best remarked he would not know whether it would be less or more expensive. He would not necessarily assume it is less expensive because he has seen, with hospital projects, where renovations cost more than starting on a clean piece of land. He remarked it is offered up as an idea to run by those who do solve these problems and answer these questions to see what they think. Mr. Ortega stated it would be considered.

Councilor Mahon commented it was a brief consideration by the High School Space Needs Committee. He cannot remember why that was not a direction considered. Member Christensen remarked she believes it was a cost factor at the time, but that was when there was discussion of expanding the wing the way they were that it could continue to house future needs.

Mr. Ortega stated when that addition was first done in 2000 it was a little less than \$6 million, and the thought at the time to add Administrative space to an educational issue that needed to get solved would definitely sink it as far as the vote goes. That is why it was taken out.

The track upgrade at the High School has been classified as "urgent" by the School Board. Mr. Shevenell stated they are at the point where they have put a sum of money (extra \$15,000 - \$20,000) in the budget to do repairs on the track. It is an asphalt based, crushed stone underneath. The rubberized compound on top is lifting, separating, delaminating. They have cut out big sections of it, put patching on it, etc. It is done as far as being patched. The company, Maine Track & Field, who does a lot of these all over the country, will not patch it next year because they don't want to have the liability associated with doing the patching work. It is almost to the point where it is imperative that it has to get done in order to maintain safety.

While doing that it would make sense to bring it up to NHIAA protocol and rules by having an 8 lane straightaway. In talking with the Athletic Director, when you have track meets and you have these heats that are 100-meter dashes that are run in groups of 8. Right now we have to run them in groups of 6 through this permutation of numbers. They would put on two more lanes to the straight, would construct a retaining wall, which is needed because of the slope of the land; there are washouts occurring, the gravel and sand is not being held back by the grass that is there, and it is bleeding out onto the track surface. There is the need for a drainage pipe that runs the length of that whole area before you get to the track, and you need appropriate fencing and safety areas. For \$430,000 you would get a brand new track with an 8-lane straightaway, a nice retaining wall, and drainage that is proper and appropriate for the track.

Member Millns questioned if it was accurate to say if you don't do it you won't be able to run track meets at Merrimack, and was told that is correct. Mr. Ortega commented that is the reasoning for it being marked "urgent", and in particular the fact that the vendor refuses to patch it any further.

Mr. Shevenell spoke of the new set of bleachers, the ones that were built around 2002-2003, and the older set of bleachers (visitor bleachers). The new bleachers are on cement piers, big across, sunk into the ground 4' down into the frost line, and everything bolted down. The older bleachers are resting on the ground; there is a slope of ground and some cement blocks they rest on. There are no railings, no ADA accessibility, etc. The District has done all it can to make them safe and repairable. It is time to change those out. The desire would be to recreate what we currently have, have the appropriate ramps, handrails, etc. That is in the CIP for 2017-2018 (\$320,000).

The bleachers in the Smith gym are the old wooden bleachers. They are to the point where as you pull them out and push them in, there is a lot of metal fatigue with the way they hinge back and forth. The District has been doing spot welding on them and keeping up with them. They are original to the Smith gym, and it is time to replace them (\$140,000). There is no ADA accessibility on those bleachers. They are made of a heavy wood material. They would be replaced by a composite type material with the proper railing, isles, and handrails. Those projects are slated for 2017-2018. When asked if the new bleachers would collapse, Mr. Shevenell stated they would.

The field upgrade at the High School is an ongoing discussion. Every year there is new information about artificial surfaces versus non-artificial services. The advantage of an artificial surface is utilization; you can use it earlier in the year and later in the year. You have the proper drainage done. You don't have to worry about mud after a rain, etc. With regard to shortfalls, there has been talk of the material used, the base material that has to be groomed into the blades of synthetic turf being a carcinogen. The project is listed on the CIP for 2018-2019 (\$1,435,000). It is a discussion in the Planning & Building Committee. Mr. Ortega stated his belief the concept is a reaction to the Fields Needs Study that was done about 5 years ago, which shows we are lacking, in particular,

in terms of rectangular fields in Town. The thought was if the High School field were on a synthetic surface we could get more use out of it.

Part of what he believes needs to be looked at is the estimate for the life of a field, being about 10-15 years, carry with it some significant ongoing costs. Maintenance is relatively simple. Longer term there is the need to be committed to some 10-15 year cycle of replacement. There may be the opportunities in terms of business sponsorship or partnerships to assist with the costs.

Mr. Shevenell stated window replacement to be a new item on the CIP. When the addition to the High School was done in 2000, they replaced the windows in the front of the building. They used to be aluminum frames, double paned with broken seals, and the film that you see when a double paned window has lost its insulation property. The front of the High School has newer windows that function very well. The intent is to start a program at the High School and perhaps surveying some of the other school buildings to look at the eventual replacement of windows. The windows they have chosen for replacement are ones that do not secure properly. To lock them in the evening they use a piece of hickory stick. The insulation between the two panes of glass is not there any longer. The desire is to look at the issue. The CIP shows the expense (\$180,000; 50 windows) in 2017-2018.

Mr. Shevenell stated the District has a set amount put aside each year for technological improvements in the building. The desire is to continue the initiative that was started a few years ago with putting LCD projectors in each classroom. They used to rely on the television sets as presentation systems. For a classroom purpose they don't truly serve the purpose because a teacher can't display a big enough visual. The project would include completing the WiFi saturation. The District is looking at upgrading its network and server environments. The dollar amount identified for 2016-2017 is \$249,250. He provided the example of the server that takes care of all financials, personnel records, budget development, etc. needs an upgrade. The server that it currently resides on is not able to accept that upgrade. The District is in the process of purchasing a new server for that purpose. They will get it ready by Thursday of this week so they can hit the upgrade deadline of Friday. That upgrade is needed primarily because it will include a lot of important information on the Affordable Health Care Act and things the District needs to act upon as far as how they generate their 1095 documents, etc. The District also wants to continue on the computer replacement cycle.

They also want to improve the technology layout and access for students. They wish to put in more cabling, perhaps relocating of labs, and designing instructional technology spaces. For the Thorntons Ferry Library they received money from the Trustees to do a renovation on that. Right next door to the Library is a computer lab that has been created by pulling together machines from other areas. Mr. Shevenell stated they have come a long way and he is satisfied with where they are and where they are going.

Chairman Best commented he agrees with the position technology purchases/upgrades have to be an ongoing thing. Having had the opportunity to teach some classes at NHTI he understands the LCDs are on the back side of the technology curve. Some of the things they have now are certainly much better and provide additional features. He suggested that be looked at to ensure a future purchase is not obsolete the day it is installed. Mr. Shevenell commented there are Smartboards in targeted areas, and they will continue to look at what is available. Mr. Ortega commented on some of the uses of the technology, and remarked it is really powerful what teachers are doing with technology and the tools they are given. He spoke of the computer replacement cycle having been at 10 years, and commented he actually does not agree that even getting that down to every 6 years is the right schedule. Computers are becoming obsolete within 3 years or less. He stated the Board of Education continually asks the Director of Technology/Library & Media Services should we be doing more. There is a point of capacity to take on new technology and how to integrate it into curriculum. They believe they have struck the right level of funding.

Chairman Best questioned the amount allocated towards training for newer technology. Mr. Shevenell stated there to be a good deal of professional development that takes place particularly with the Educational Technology Integration Specialists. They teach the teachers how to use the applications, hardware, etc.

Chairman Best questioned if individual teachers have some control over whether they choose to use it. Mr. Shevenell stated his belief if any arms are getting twisted it's those of the Administration. Teachers want more. Mr. Ortega remarked he thinks Ms. Rose, in terms of the way that things were deployed initially, took a very smart approach, and identified early adopters; people who were ready to integrate the technology in their classrooms. What has happened is over time their peers are seeing what they are doing with it and how they can actually extend learning opportunities through technology, and are now asking for it.

Chairman Best questioned if there are efforts taken to ensure there are not 10-20% of teachers on the trailing edge that just won't move it. Mr. Ortega stated it to be part of the whole evaluation model that is being put forward as far as utilization of technology, whether you incorporate it into your classroom, etc. It is one piece of many, but it is in there.

When asked, Mr. Shevenell stated the District has a Network Administration, a Director of Technology/Library Media Services, two Computer Technicians, and a Computer Software Manager. Member Sebring responded, for this number of schools that sounds extraordinarily light. When asked about security, Mr. Shevenell stated there to be layers of security in place.

6. Discussion/possible action regarding other items of concern.

Director Thompson reminded the Board of the definition of each of the categories; Priority 1 is urgent, cannot be delayed, needed immediately for health & safety, Priority 2 is necessary, needed within 3 years to maintain a basic level and quality of community services, Priority 3 is desirable, needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of services, Priority 4 is deferrable, can be placed on hold until after the 6-year CIP period, but supports Community Development goals, Priority 5 is premature, needing more research, planning & coordination, and Priority 6 is inconsistent, contrary to land use planning or community development goals.

Merrimack School District CIP

HVAC Equipment – Priority 2

Member Falt stated agreement with the identification of necessary as did Member Russo and Chairman Best. Member Sebring questioned if it is not "urgent", and noted it has to be done some time in the next 6 or 8 months. Chairman Best commented it certainly could be a situation that is urgent if their system fails. They seemed to believe it could wait, which is why they selected "necessary".

Roofing

Chairman Best commented the middle school with 2,000 linear feet of patches on the roof certainly qualifies as "urgent". He added as they start to plan things out for future years, it is hard to call it urgent 2, 3, or 4 years out. As a result he would categorize the rest of the items as being "necessary". Member Christensen remarked "necessary" for the next two years and then "desirable" for the last three using the criteria of 2-3 years and 4-6 years.

Merrimack Middle School (2016-2017) – **Priority 1**

Merrimack Middle School (2017-2018) – **Priority 2**

Reeds Ferry Elementary School (2018-2019) – **Priority 2**

Thorntons Ferry Elementary School/James Mastricola Elementary School (2019-2020) – **Priority 3**

Thorntons Ferry Elementary School (2020-2021) – **Priority 3**

Mastricola Elementary School/James Mastricola Upper Elementary School (2021-2022) – **Priority 3**

Asbestos Removal – Priority 2 – Move up to 2016-2017

Member Millns stated his opinion it should be Priority 1. He remarked he does not like the idea of asbestos floating around any longer than it has to be. He stated asbestos we now know is a killer and however diligent everybody is he would like to see it gone sooner rather than later. Member Sebring stated agreement. Chairman Best commented he does not necessarily disagree. However, he knows from discussions with the School Board about the asbestos in the floor tiles and the way they approached it over a long-term plan. He remarked they have explained to us on quite a few occasions why it is something you can attack over a time period because they can protect the surface and keep it from being airborne and all of that. He added asbestos insulation is the most dangerous of all of the varieties of asbestos because it becomes airborne as a fiber whereas an item like a floor tile is least likely to present that kind of a danger.

Member Millns stated his belief the District should be doing asbestos removal every year. If that means \$250,000 in 2017-2018, he would like to see some of it done in 2016-2017. He remarked what is being suggested is doing that in July/August of 2018. He is not in agreement with that. Chairman Best stated he would not resist if the

desire is to make that kind of a suggestion to them. He remarked they happen to have it listed in their highest dollar year, and could probably smooth out their budget by moving it up a year. Member Christensen stated that would have been her suggestion.

Paving – Priority 2

Member Disco recommended consideration be given to pedestrian transportation along with these projects. Chairman Best stated agreement.

Consolidate Special Services/SAU Offices – Priority 2

Member Christensen commented she does not believe that can be moved forward as it will likely take that much time to get it planned correctly. She is of the opinion it is necessary. Member Disco stated agreement. Chairman Best stated his belief it is necessary to do something with their offices. He is aware they are reworking their own thoughts about what the future plan is. He is intrigued that there is a Space Assessment Report to review. Member Millns stated his support for consideration to be given to attaching the facility to the High School. Member Christensen commented on her preference for it to be attached to the high school for the sake of usability. Chairman Best commented he can also think of reasons for having certain services separated from any of the core school services. However, perhaps the best recommendation would be for them to approach it with an open mind and a blank piece of paper, and consider every option.

Member Falt stated her desire to see this go through. There were many in the community that felt strongly that this needs to be dealt with quickly. She encouraged the District to press forward with it as soon as possible. Councilor Mahon commented it would be a 20-year note; the appropriation impact for that year would be high, but the dollar impact would be relatively low.

Drainage – Priority 2

Track Upgrade – Priority 1

Bleacher Upgrade – Priority 2 - Move High School bleachers up to 2016/2017

Merrimack High School / James Mastricola Upper Elementary School

Member Millns suggested the High School bleachers be done at the same time as the track. Chairman Best commented he is sensitive to that, but was also sensitive to their message that these new bleachers would meet with ADA standards.

Field Upgrade – Priority 2

Window Replacement

Merrimack High School (2018-2019) – **Priority 2**

Merrimack High School (2021-2022) – **Priority 3**

Technology Infrastructure Upgrade – Priority 2

MOTION BY MEMBER MILLNS TO APPROVE THE RANKINGS OF ALL SCHOOL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ITEMS AS STATED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER SEBRING

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

Town of Merrimack – CIP

South Fire Station – **Priority 2**

Chairman Best commented the Board underuses the lower ranks of premature where it needs more research and planning, but this is probably one that actually does need more research and planning. He remarked he does not want to necessarily disparage what the Town Administration has come up with.

Councilor Mahon questioned what more research and planning was needed. Chairman Best responded if the proposed pipeline changes the location, etc. Councilor Mahon stated the only difficulty is in trying to sequence this with other capital budgeting projects in terms of the cost on the tax rate. Right now you are looking at \$6 million in bonding in two consecutive years between the School District and the Town. One if not both will not pass.

Councilor Mahon commented this year there is a significant increase in activity for the department, significant development coming in particularly in the south end of Town, etc.

Chairman Best commented what he heard from the Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director was that we are still making some decisions, and we have some things that could change our project pretty significantly. Member Millns commented last year the Town Manager indicated she was trying to work out the call demand between fires or health & safety type calls. He is unclear as to whether that exercise has been concluded. He commented he gets the feeling the health & safety calls are the greatest demand. Member Christensen and Chairman Best voiced their agreement. Chairman Best remarked when you read the description they list placing ambulances there in addition to storing fire equipment.

Bridge Replacement – Bedford Road/Baboosic Brook – Priority 2

Bridge Replacement – US 3 D.W. Highway/Baboosic Brook – Priority 2

Chairman Best stated his opinion it is necessary, and commented he wishes the finances would support doing it faster. Members Millns and Falt voiced agreement with the ranking of “necessary”.

Stormwater Drainage Improvements – Priority 2

The Board was in agreement it is necessary year after year.

Paving – Infrastructure Improvements Gravel Roads – Priority 2

Chairman Best commented having read the explanation for these expenditures, it made a lot of sense in terms of getting them done and avoiding the possibility of having to replace the motor grader.

Paving – Infrastructure Improvements Executive Park Drive – Priority 2

Chairman Best stated his belief the project made a lot of sense to him. It is such a wide road it requires extra maintenance.

Highway Garage Renovation & Replacement – Priority 1

Chairman Best stated, and members Christensen, Disco, and Falt voiced agreement, the project should be prioritized as “urgent”.

Wire Road Intersection Improvements – Priority 2

Member Millns stated his opinion the project is “premature” noting the information provided that it requires additional traffic studies. Councilor Mahon clarified the layout is dependent on the traffic study. The fact that they want to do it in the same year that they do the Route 3 Bridge because of proximity makes sense. Chairman Mann remarked this intersection is certainly one that has caused some accidents and is difficult to navigate.

The consensus reached was for a priority of “necessary”.

Griffin Street Boat Ramp Access Improvement – Priority 3

Seaverns Bridge Canoe Launch Ramp Access Improvements – Priority 3

Souhegan River Trail – Priority 2

Sewer Line Extension (Mayflower and McQuestion Sewer Basins) – Priority 3

Member Millns remarked you are talking about \$2.3 million for 23 houses. He questioned, and was informed it is part of the overall Sewer Master Plan. Chairman Best commented it being part of the Sewer Master Plan is only half the answer to him. He wants to make sure it is part of the Sewer Master Plan because it is an interim step that leads to some other connection that they will be able to add to this. Member Christensen stated it is expanding the sewer out. Chairman Best reiterated he wants to understand that the 23 houses aren't all we will get out of this. Member Millns commented you won't even get 23 to start with; half of them have septic systems still functioning. Chairman Mann noted when he read the information it stated the intent to build 8" lines and you don't build that for that number of houses. Eight inch lines are for large volumes.

Parking Lot Repaving/Walkway – Priority 2

Chairman Best commented it is a shame they feel they have to take this step on a building they would love to get out of, but the parking lot is in lousy shape. Member Millns stated there are a lot worse parking spots. He would have said it is "deferrable" because of building a new library. Chairman Best noted no one is building a new library yet. The placeholder is 2021-2022. Member Falt stated if it is not done next year, it may not fit in the plan the year after causing it to be pushed out a few years. It will only get worse.

Passcards & Security Camera – Priority 4

Chairman Best commented there was a write-up in the materials provided the Board. He commented it is interesting that the Library has decided to put that in their budget rather than asking for some capital expenditures for that. Member Christensen commented the library budget is separate and controlled by the Library Trustees. Councilor Mahon clarified that is the case once the budget is adopted.

The necessity of the cameras was questioned. Member Falt commented if you look at it in the light of the heightened security of the nation she can see where they are coming from. Member Millns commented to some extent he understands the passcards.

HVAC – Priority 5

Sprinkler System – Priority 5

New Library (Placeholder) – Priority 5

New Athletic Field (Placeholder) – Priority 5

Wastewater – Executive Park Drive Pump Station – Priority 3

Chairman Best commented on having read through the descriptions, and noted the project is with regard to pump stations that are 40 years old, obsolete, and no longer repairable.

Wastewater – Sawdust Storage Pole Barn – Priority 3

Wastewater – Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase III and pump Station Upgrades – Priority 3

**MOTION MADE BY MEMBER CHRISTENSEN TO APPROVE THE RANKINGS OF ALL TOWN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ITEMS AS STATED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER FALT**

**MOTION CARRIED
7-0-0**

7. Approval of Minutes – December 1, 2015.

MOTION BY MEMBER CHRISTENSEN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2015 WITH CHANGES
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER FALT

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-1

Councilor Mahon Abstained

9. Adjourn

MOTION BY MEMBER MILLNS TO ADJOURN
MOTION SECONDED BY COUNCILOR MAHON

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

The December 15, 2015 meeting of the Merrimack Planning Board was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Submitted by Dawn MacMillan